



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 2

2nd Session

Number 22

VERBATIM REPORT

Thursday, March 8, 1973

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would like to welcome to the galleries today, forty-eight grade VIII, IX and X students from Sunnyside High School, Sunnyside, with their teachers, Mr. Reginald Gardener, Principal, Mr. Calvert Allen and Mr. George Lockyer. We welcome you here and trust your visit is most interesting.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. WM. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the honourable House a petition which I just received from some twenty odd families in a small community near Westport, White Bay South, the community is known locally as Hound Cove.

The substance of the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is that these families who were originally on what was the main road of Westport are now off on a branch road because the main road, sometime later after their road was built, went behind them. Since that time this road of theirs, this originally main road but not branch road has not been kept up to standards as far as maintenance is concerned in any way. During this particular dreadful winter, these twenty odd families with some forty children going to school have had to suffer for days on end without this road being plowed and the children have had to struggle over drifts of nine and ten feet in some cases in an effort to go to school. Needless to say a lot of school is probably being missed as a result of that particular hardship.

The prayer of the petition goes on to say that they would like to have this one half mile of road, that is all it is, Mr. Speaker, sanded and adequately plowed quickly in the winter and in the summer time of course to upgrade the road and bring it up to standard and to do other things which are necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation at all in personally supporting this petition. I think that their prayer is well founded and I ask, Sir, that it be received by this honourable House and

referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. P. J. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Southeast Placentia, which I am sure has the unanimous support of all the residents of the Town of Placentia itself.

I am more than pleased to have an opportunity to present this petition because it does provide me time to outline briefly to the House the serious situation which prevails in the Town of Placentia, with respect to water and sewerage for Southeast Placentia.

But Mr. Speaker, in order for the residents of Southeast Placentia to obtain water and sewerage, there must be a new water source found in the Placentia Area. Now there have been several studies made and all the engineering has been done on this, I think it was done in 1967 and then updated in 1970 or 1971, because the Town of Placentia, Jerseyville, Freshwater are now supplied by the same source, and incidentally that same source supplied the base when it was in operation.

But the Town of Placentia itself, which has a population in excess of 2,000 people, get their water from this source on the opposite side of the Gut. Now there are two pipes crossing the Gut in Placentia and late last fall one of these pipes broke and as a result, the residents of the town are left with just one pipe crossing the Gut and the water pressure there in the Town of Placentia itself is about twenty-two pound.

It is extremely difficult to operate such things as automatic washers and even they experience difficulties waiting with their pressure of water, that is trying to get sufficient water to flush toilets and things of that nature. The system in Placentia itself, Mr. Speaker, I am told has been there since really before the turn of the century. It is one of the earliest water systems in Newfoundland.

In addition the situation in Placentia is desperate because the water lines themselves are old. There is not doubt that there are holes in these lines and as a result this poses, I respectfully submit, a serious health hazard to the residents of the town. There are no sewerage lines in the Town of Placentia itself and the only method of sewage disposal is septic tanks and cesspools.

You do not have I suppose in any town in Newfoundland today the concentration of population in such a small area as you have in the Town of Placentia. I really feel, Mr. Speaker, without adequate sewerage for that Town, we could, if that water supply in the town should become contaminated, have a very very serious outbreak of typhoid fever. There is insufficient pressure on the line right now. In addition to that, there are holes in the existing line. With no sewerage facilities in the town itself, and you have the tide rising and the sewage coming up, it is just unbelievable, Mr. Speaker, to think that in this day and age the situation with respect to water and sewerage prevails anywhere as it does in the Town of Placentia, one of the oldest towns in this province and as I mentioned earlier in another speech, once the French Capital of this island.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit the Town of Placentia has a special claim for consideration for water and sewerage. From 1965 to 1970, eighty-five householders with their families were moved into the Town of Placentia, with an increase of 404. There are today, over 2,000 people concerned and as I said before, if this water line should ever be contaminated, you could be faced with a very, very serious health hazard. It is startling, Mr. Speaker, to contemplate the consequences. I implore and beseech the government, particularly the Department of Municipal Affairs, to give this matter

serious consideration.

Since the election, I have had numerous consultations with the council in the area and I have met with the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I hope he sees fit to support this petition because I do not know any other one is so urgent and so desperately needed as this one for financial assistance, Mr. Speaker.

So I respectfully submit that this petition be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates. Again, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for immediate action on what I think is a very, very potential health hazard.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman from Placentia East and I do not agree on everything in the world of public affairs in this province, but I think we agree wholeheartedly on this petition.

A number of us, Sir, on this side, have had representation from residents in the area affected by the prayer of the petition, the area of Southeast Place. We support it wholeheartedly without any reservation. These people have a very great need. The honourable gentleman, their member, has eloquently and forcefully spoken of the need. I will not attempt to outdo him either in eloquence or in force but I will merely adopt his words as my own. When he uses words as well as he has used them, I think that is the least that we can do.

These people have a need, Sir, at least as great as that of any other part of this province. It may be no greater than that of other communities in this province but it is a great need. I do hope the government find it in their wisdom and power to do something with this this year and certainly, Sir, they shall do so with our full support and with our wholehearted and very strong request that action be taken this year to correct this problem.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this petition. I have had a number of representations made to me personally about the water and sewerage problems in the Placentia Area, especially from Southeast Placentia.

I might say, Sir, that for some weeks past, that the people in that area have had some difficulty communicating with their member but now that he has presented the petition in the House, Sir, on their behalf, I hope that he will hang right in there, he will not let go until the people down there get that badly needed water and sewer system.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

HON. H.A. COLLINS, MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING:

Mr. Speaker, I have the complete copies of the Kostaszek Royal Commission Report on Blackhead Road which I would want to tabled, also a complete set of of the St. John's Urban Region Study, which I would also like to table.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance, I give notice that he will on tomorrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions in relation to the advancing or guaranteeing of certain loans.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bill, "An Act To Amend The Welfare Institutions Licencing Act."

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following Bill, "An Act Respecting The Disposal Of Waste Material."

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

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

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to question 41, on the Order Paper of February 26, in the name of the honourable member for St. Barbe North, also answer to question number 46, in the name of the same honourable member, on the Order Paper of February 26.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the reply to question number 36, appearing on the Order Paper

February 23 and asked by the hon. member for St. Barbe North.

HON. DR. A.T. ROWE (MINISTER OF HEALTH): Answer to question number thirty-four on the order paper of Friday, February 23, asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question in the absence of the designate Minister of Rural Development, the member for Trinity South, has there been any change in the status of the rural development authority? We have heard the most intriguing stories from a variety of sources. Has there been any change in it? What is the story?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that the rural development authority was set up as an autonomous body in the beginning and with the establishment of the department it is now reporting to that department and that has caused some problems in getting it, as part of the department itself, but the position I think is well in hand now and will be clarified within the next few days.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, since I cannot repeat the main question. It is obvious there has been a significant change in the status of it. Has the authority, by which I mean the six members, this rather strange three ministers and three private citizens, has that authority been abolished?

MR. MOORES: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is no. The authority still remains in existence and still carries out the same function. It is to stop the overlapping of where the department or the authority, whichever one you want to take, happens that it caused the problems but the authority is still in operation as it was originally set up.

MR. ROBERTS: So in effect we are unstructuring the restructuring.

MR. MOORES: No, we are probably distructing and restructuring.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. Minister of Highways, Sir, and I apologize beforehand that this is a bit repetitious from other days. In view of the fact that the

Great Northern Peninsula highway is still blocked with snow north of St. Barbe and the school students have only had five-and-a-half days of school since February 12, can the minister give some indication as to where the five pieces of snow clearing machinery are now that were supposed to go to St. Barbe North? Could he also, Sir, give some indication as to whether or not he has received any reports regarding the supervision of the snow clearing operations in St. Barbe North and the fact that it is not so much the machinery itself and the amount of snow itself but it is the way that the machinery is being used in the district and the fact that there do not appear to be enough shifts and the machinery does not appear to be working throughout the night even on some very clear nights?

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member for St. Barbe North what school he is speaking about and what area.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): The school, Sir, under the Straits of Bell Isle Integrated School Board and they have two schools in Flowers Cove, they have a school in Green Island Cove and a number of other small schools going up, not one specific school, Sir, but the superintendent of the school board, Mr. Galen Campbell, did contact me by phone yesterday, in fact he was on the air with CFCB in Corner Brook and he himself has suggested that they have missed five-and-a-half days of school since -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! -

MR. ROWE(F.B.): I am answering a question from the hon. Minister of Highways, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry. Proceed.

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. member that on the first request, if he does not mind me mentioning the questions he asked me a couple of days ago, you said seventeen days missed. There were seventeen days you mentioned a few days ago from Flowers Cove and now it is five-and-a-half.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): Mr. Speaker, I am simply repeating information that has been passed along to me by the superintendent of the school board in St. Barbe North, the Straits of Belle Isle School Board, and a number of reputable citizens and I would be quite prepared, Sir, to give the hon. minister the names of these individuals, outside of the chambers of the House, Sir. I do not think we should bring these individuals names up at the present time. This is the information that I have received just twenty minutes ago, Sir.

DR. FARRELL: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, if he would like to have the answers to the questions which you gave me not today but the day before and which I have found the answers for. There were different references to times of school closings than you have just given today. It is a fair statement, just like your fair statement attacking the Department of Highways.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

DR. FARRELL: I am sorry, Sir, the hon. member. It was a question, that no attempts were being made to push back snow banks and this type of thing. I will not ask for the author of these statements but I did check most of the questions out. All suitable snow clearing equipment, machines in St. Barbe North are working full-time whenever weather or other conditions permit and in many cases it is very difficult to push one lane passage through snow drifts because it fills in again overnight due to conditions, Sir. Anyone knows the straight shore up there, knows there is little if any opportunity or time to permit the luxury, probably I am using the wrong term, of pushing snow back from those cuts because it is hard enough to keep them open as it is.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): It is certainly not a luxury, Sir, it is a necessity.

DR. FARRELL: All right I am just telling you. I am answering the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

DR. FARRELL: I am sorry. You asked again today though if I could give a report on what we were doing on that and I presumed - I am sorry if I am -

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not be so touchy -

AN HON. MEMBER: Shut up, ignoramus.

DR. FARRELL: I am not in the least touchy.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): Mr. Speaker, a point of order. A point of order, Sir. Sir, I asked two questions today and I am not getting answers to them. The minister is referring to five questions that I did not ask in this House and I gave him these five points outside of the chambers of this House, Sir, and now he is trying to embarrass me by bringing this up and saying I ask them in the House last day.

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, I certainly have no intention of embarrassing the hon. member for St. Barbe North.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

DR. FARRELL: I am in a very good mood, Mr. Speaker, a very good mood. As far as the five pieces of equipment we sent out there, I do not know at this moment but I will certainly find out exactly where they are, Sir. And the second part of your question was?

MR. ROWE(F.B.): The second part of my question, Sir, was, and I again stress, Sir, that this is not firsthand observation on my part, it is a result of reports that have come to me by phone or by mail, I have received a great number of reports that one of the biggest problems with the snow clearing operation in St. Barbe North is the actual supervision of it and the way that the machinery is being used and I simply asked the minister if he has received any similar reports.

DR. FARRELL: No, Sir, I have not received any as far as the supervisory people around the coast, direct complaints from them, and they are doing the best they can as far as I know.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I wish to direct to the

Minister of Highways regarding the Red Bay road. Could he inform the House, Sir, as to the official report from the Department of Highways in that area to what progress they are making in clearing the Red Bay road today?

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like for that question to be tabled and I will endeavour to find an answer.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I directed a question to the hon. Premier and he promised the House that he would undertake to get the information concerning the steel plant, I wonder if the Premier has any statement to make today.

MR. MOORES: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is no.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question concerning the steel plant, would the hon. Premier indicate whether or not steps are being taken to dismantle or scrap the steel plant?

MR. MOCRES: Mr. Speaker, I have no idea. I do not know if the Minister of Industrial Development does and if he does I am sure he will answer the question.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, there are no plans in the working at the present time for dismantling or scrapping the steel plant. We are carrying on negotiations or discussions with various interested groups and when we formulate a course of action we will certainly inform the hon. House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is rather interesting. The Premier told us yesterday that to his knowledge there were no proposals to sell the steel plant.

MR. DOODY: Excuse me, Sir. The Premier is absolutely correct, of his knowledge, that we are not. I am the Minister of Economic Development.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question and I can tell the hon. minister that there are proposals to buy the steel plant.

MR. DOODY: Why ask the question?

MR. NEARY: Will the minister indicate what security they have now at the steel plant?

How is the property protected and how many employees are now down there? Have they all been terminated or is there a security staff there? Just what is happening at the steel plant now?

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, how many questions is that?

MR. NEARY: That is one question.

MR. DOODY: No, Sir, there were about six. I will take notice and get the information.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the arrogance of this government, the arrogance. We cannot get the information.

HON. GERALD OTTENHEIMER:(MINISTER OF EDUCATION): The honourable gentleman has the right to answer or to take notice of the question. The honourable gentleman opposite does not have the right to argue with the minister's desire to take notice of that question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker - go back to Cambridge. That is not a point of order. That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. NEARY: I would like to direct a question to the honourable Minister of Social Services.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would like to remind honourable members that the minister does have the right to refuse to answer and to take notice of same and it should not be debated.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the arrogance of this government. He does not want to answer the question. That -

MR. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member for Bell Island asking a question?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I want to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services.

Will the Minister of Social Services indicate to this House what will happen to the provincial old age assistance of thirty dollars a month when the federal old age pension is increased the first of April. Mr. Speaker, is the minister going to answer the question?

HON. ANTHONY J. MURPHY:(MINISTER OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE): The minister

is not going to answer the same question every day the week. I told the honourable member yesterday. If he is interested in the welfare of the people, I would appreciate it, but he is not.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I did not get the answer to the question yesterday and I am amid -

MR. MURPHY: Well, I refuse to answer.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the honourable the Premier. Will the honourable the Premier indicate whether old age pensioners in this province are going to continue to get their thirty dollars a month when the federal old age pension is increased the first of April? The minister will not answer. Will the Premier answer?

HON. FRANK D. MOORES: (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, just as a point of politeness only. The question was asked yesterday. The Minister of Social Services said that it would be answered in due course. That due course I would think is when the budget is brought down. Then the honourable member will have his answer to that particular question.

MR. NEARY: That is too late, Mr. Speaker, I have to have the answer before that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable the Premier.

MR. MOORES: If I might just comment on the question itself. It may be too late for the honourable member. If anything is done, it will not be too late for the elderly people concerned.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing?

Is he or his department doing anything to stall the ever increasing cost of building lots in the city? I see by the morning's paper where building lots have gone up now to \$15,000. Surely within a very short time they will be out of reach of all ordinary citizens of this town or outside of the town.

HON. HAROLD A. COLLINS: (MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING): Mr. Speaker, I think that question is noted and we will have an answer for the honourable member.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

Could the minister inform this House when the Cook Report will be tabled?

HON. EDWARD MAYNARD: (MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND FORESTS): The Cook Report will be tabled, Mr. Speaker, as soon as it is completed. Right now it is being redrafted into a final form by the people who did it up, the National Research Council in Ottawa.

MR. THOMS: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

Could the minister inform this House if there is any move afoot within his department to freeze farmland within the area surrounding the City of St. John's?

MR. MAYNARD: That question is noted, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. ROWE: I would like to ask a question of the minister responsible and if no minister is directly responsible then the Premier.

Would the minister responsible indicate to the House at what time the new Special Areas and Highways Agreement under the Provincial Department of Regional and Economic Expansion is likely to be signed and made public?

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, we are presently looking at an amendment to the second DREE Agreement which will be available to this province for this year. The third agreement will be entered into at the time when the various task force committees have brought in their reports and the government has a comprehensive plan, which is one of the favorite expressions of the honourable member from Bell Island, to present to Ottawa, in an overall programme of progress for the province. In the meantime there will be an interim amendment negotiated for the present DREE Agreement.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate when this amendment, this supplementary agreement to agreement number (2), is likely to be announced publicly.

MR. DOODY: I think it will be - well, of course, as the honourable member knows, it is more in Ottawa's control than the provinces but I would think

that it will be in a matter of a very short time, say a matter of weeks.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the honourable Minister of Education and Youth.

Could the honourable minister inform this House what time he expects to get a report on the special committee which was established to study recreation in this province, headed by Mr. Terry Trainor?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, since restructuring I do not expect now to receive that report. I would presume that that would go to the honourable Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

HON. JOSEPH ROUSSEAU: (MINISTER OF REHABILITATION AND RECREATION): I will take notice of the question.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Legislative Disabilities Act."

MR. MOORES: It was adjourned, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like just to carry on with a few very brief remarks pursuant to what I was saying the other day before we adjourned the debate on this particular bill. That is to say that today with the demands of government offices, particularly that of the Premier, there is a very heavy workload for a great many things that had not been the case before. In a great many instances there are people who are members of this House of Assembly who can much more ably do, because of their knowledge, both in the public service and the knowledge of the province generally, are much better in a position to do this work than would be somebody contractual from outside.

Today we have, Mr. Speaker, a situation where we must develop research and have more knowledge about such projects as I mentioned the other day, for instance doing the Great North Norway Plan. We had to take it to the other side of the coin where craft development and the handicapped had to be given consideration and maybe there is a special programme going on somewhere where this sort of assistance could be required. We have to, with the Intergovernmental Affairs Division

being set up in the Premier's office, a great deal of work to be co-ordinated there as well.

There are also, Mr. Speaker, various briefs that come in from time to time that are very hefty. They have to be researched and précised so that decisions can be made more rapidly.

All in all the bill as presently before the House will have a few minor amendments when the bill comes before committee. I think the parliamentary assistant to the Leader of the Opposition will be changed to the Leader of the Opposition and in the case of the special assistant in my office, who has been there for some time, the member for Green Bay, that will be made retroactive to the time he started actually working in the office.

I think with these two amendments, Mr. Speaker, these will be the only changes. As I say, I think the need is genuine. I think it is great and I think if we abuse this particular privilege, I think we will stand to pay the penalty for it. I think this act itself basically was - we have continually tried to amend it from time to time or set it up for specific enquiries, which is always politically, I suppose, hay for political fodder. Really what we are saying here is that we are now amending the act so that it has the versatility which I think is required at this particular time.

I will be speaking after the spokesmen on the other side have spoken on this particular subject and Mr. Speaker, I would just like to close those remarks now.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, let me just make two or three great re-points on this, Sir.

First of all, of all the members in the House, I should be the last one ever to speak against the principle of a parliamentary assistant to the Premier because, as the Premier has said, the

position was created originally by this House in 1966 or 1967 largely for me, I had been the executive assistant to the then Premier, Mr. Smallwood. In the summer of 1966 I resigned that position and went to White Bay as a candidate and was returned by the voters there in the election that fall, an act of kindness, wisdom, generosity whatever one wishes, which they have seen fit to repeat twice by increasing margins. I wish the same could be said of my party throughout the province, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier has outlined the need for further assistance for him and the government feel that these people should be drawn from the House of Assembly. We agree with that. The Legislative Disabilities Act must be amended because a member of the House cannot accept payment from the government other than his sessional indemnity and expense allowances, unless there is specific legislative provision. The Legislative Disabilities Act is the act which permits such permission to be given and of course that is the effect of the amendment.

The retroactivity makes sense, because the honourable gentleman from Green Bay has been working with the Premier for some time now and if the act is not amended to come into effect as of a given date in the past, then the Premier is in the unhappy position of not being able to authorize or the government not being able to authorize payment to the gentleman for work which he has done. Again, that is not a new principle, Mr. Speaker. The original act allowing a parliamentary assistant. That act was put through in the session which began in the winter of 1967. I had been at work as parliamentary assistant to the Premier since the fall of 1966, since the election in fact, and had worked for no pay. When the bill went through and it became legal to be paid, I was paid retroactively. My bank manager was exceedingly grateful for that, as was I.

I would also like to thank the Premier for agreeing to allow the opposition, I gather he is going to change parliamentary assistant to House Leader of the Opposition. That has been worked

out. I think that is a good thing. My colleague, the House Leader, is too bashful to be present but I am sure that he is within range of my voice and he has asked me to say that while he is too bashful to be present, in a half-serious fashion, he believes his bank manager will be grateful. He may be on the phone to the bank manager at present lobbying for this amendment.

The work of the House, Mr. Speaker, is becoming more complex. If we are to go ahead with the new rules which are being worked upon by a committee, by an informal committee at present because, of course, the select committee lapses when the House lapses then we will be making further changes which will require more attendance from each member.

I think that that is a good thing. I think that if Newfoundland wishes full-time politicians, Newfoundland must make it possible to have full-time politicians and the rates of pay and the other benefits must be commensurate with what men could reasonably expect to get in private life. I am not saying they have to be the same. A member of the House who is a lawyer should not expect to earn as much for service to the House as he would at law, or doctors can earn more in private practice, especially now with the new fee scales, than they could as a member of the House, but still, Sir, if we wish members of the House to serve the public full-time, the public will have to be prepared to pay for it.

I do not think this will be abused. As the Premier has said, there is a remedy in the hands of the electorate and he is aware of it. I am even more aware of it. The electorate are fully aware of how to use that remedy and I can assure him on the basis of what I know that they have no hesitation whatsoever in using the remedy which is theirs if they feel it is necessary. We will support the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: If the Premier speak now, he closes the debate.

HON. F.D. MOORES (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the members of the opposition for taking this enlightened view. I think

basically what we are talking about really is the integrity of the people in the various positions to make sure that it is not abused. I am sure that the press and the public will make sure that it is not abused. I think it is legislation that is very badly needed and one that we intend, as I said previously, not to take advantage of for political reasons but rather for the sake of expediency and efficiency. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of this bill.

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

On motion, second reading of a bill; "An Act Respecting The Department Of Rehabilitation And Recreation."

HON. J.G.ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, just a few short comments and any questions that honourable members across the House may have, I will attempt to answer them.

The Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation grows out of parts of the old Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation and parts of the Department of Education and Youth. There are two halves to the department and the Division of Rehabilitation is responsible for the homes for senior citizens or the homes for special care. Also, the special services unit, which contains the rehabilitation unit that was recently set up, will be also part of the department (Division of Rehabilitation) and the institutional schools, that would be the boys' and girls' training schools, the two boys' training schools, here in St. John's, at Pleasantville, and at Whitbourne and the girls' training school.

In addition, the Division of Rehabilitation will have the Northern Labrador Services Division and that act will be introduced shortly. The Northern Labrador Services Division of the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation as well as the functions of the Department of Labrador Affairs will now be subsumed under a division of Labrador Services, in that half of the department, the rehabilitation

half.

The recreation half is composed of what was the Physical Education and Youth Division of the Department of Education with one change in that now, the two divisions will extend to the Division of Recreation and Sports Activities, and the Division of Youth Activities is presently being structured. Its basis will be the 4-II field workers who were previously in the Division of Physical Education and Youth and from that we will build on with the necessary personnel and the Division of Recreation and Sport, of course, is the mainstay of the Physical Education and Youth Division of the Department of Education.

The department is one that is composed in essence of the elements from the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation and the Department of Education and Youth and the Department of Labrador Affairs.

MR. NEARY: Like all the other bills that have been brought into this House under restructuring, we think it is a great waste of time, waste of the peoples' money and waste of the time of this House. In this particular case, Sir, I think that the government have made a very grave mistake, a very grave error in judgement. I do not think they should have separated the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation unless, Sir, they took in the Department of Health or the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations. Certainly, the way they have done it now, Sir, it is going to cause a lot of headaches for the minister who just introduced this bill and the minister of Social - I am not sure if he is Social Services or Social Assistance - I think in the beginning the Premier said it would be Social Assistance. In other words, the minister would just be responsible for issuing cheques, but now I believe they have changed it to Social Services to give him a little grandiose title and make the minister feel like he is doing something.

Sir, all the field staff and all the social workers and welfare

officers and so forth are all in the minister's department. There are many aspects of the Department of Recreation and Rehabilitation where we will have to draw on the social workers and welfare officers, and who is going to be responsible for their supervision, Sir?

I would like for the minister to tell us that. Is the minister going to build up his own empire down there? Have his own staff? Just how are the two departments going to work? Because the work is so interrelated, Sir, it is almost impossible to separate the work. I think it was a grave mistake to separate the department in the first place, but I would like to hear the minister's comments on this when he is closing the debate.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to reaffirm for my own part what the honourable member for Bell Island has already said. First of all, this is just another one of these bills, these restructuring bills, and usually they are pretty harmless. There is not much of a problem in them when you move various divisions from one department to another, all they do is waste money, take up time of officials, time of cabinet ministers and time of members of this House, and that is all the damage they really do which is not by any

means a lot of damage something that we can get over with in a few months. But in this particular bill I am afraid what has happened may be harmful, may be more pernicious than what has happened with respect to some of the other departmental restructuring and structuring. It seems to me it is a mistake in principle without having any expert knowledge on social assistance, social welfare or related topics. It seems to me there is a mistake in principle in isolating a department which then becomes the department which is really only interested in what a lot of laymen would call issuance of dole or money orders or dole orders for people who are on social assistance, short term or long term. I would imagine other things are involved in that too. Perhaps widows' allowances and that sort of thing will probably stay with the department which is issuing these cheques. So that (the department, this Department of Social Assistance or Social Services, whatever the name might be, becomes really a sort of a department for paying out money and it is isolated from really what is the most important function of any government when it comes to social welfare, namely trying to rehabilitate, to fit in welfare schemes with other on-going things, manpower, rehabilitation and field staff and all that sort of thing. The welfare officer should always wear several hats. He is involved not only in dishing out money to people who cannot find work or who are disabled or incompetent or something along those lines. He also should be trying to enquire into such things as motivation and any problems that might create the situation or that might be causing the situation, with a view to finding cures and remedies for them.

So I too would like to hear the honourable minister of this prospective, new department, the bill of which we are now discussing, the Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation. What are his views? Obviously he must support this division between the old department, for want of a better word, and the rehabilitation department. I would like to hear his feelings on what kind of conflicts are likely to emerge between two ministers. For example,

we have two separate, under the one government it is true but two separate departments growing up now with two political heads. Whenever that happens, whenever there is any overlapping sometimes you get conflict, sometimes you get a lessening of morale with regard to the officials who are not quite sure as to what their duties are. I would like to hear the ministers on this. It seems to me at first sight to be wrong in principle to separate that aspect, that is the aspect of giving out money for short-term, long-term assistance into one department and make that department responsible only for that activity and then to have all the really laudatory types of things, the combating of rampant welfareism, combating of unemployment so that people on short-term relief can get back to work and all that sort of thing, to have those isolated away in either one department or several departments. Maybe I am wrong as I will be the first to admit when I hear the arguments of the honourable minister, if they are convincing. But at first blush, at first sight, I must say it seems to me to be a step backward rather than forward, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Before any other honourable member speaks, I would just like to say that we have another group of students just arriving into the galleries. I would like to welcome forty-two Grade X students from the John Burke Regional High School in Grand Bank, with their teacher, Mr. Maxwell Snook. We trust that your visit here is most enjoyable and indeed welcome you to the galleries.

HON. T. HICKEY: (MINISTER OF PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a word of support for this bill, having been the former minister, the old Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation. I would like to correct at least some of the remarks or set aside some of the fears expressed by honourable members on the other side. The government looked at this very seriously for a long, long time before making the final decision in terms of dividing the old department. It is

wrong for anyone to suggest that the Minister of Social Assistance is only responsible for the issuing of cheques, nothing could be further from the truth. The Minister of Social Assistance, as I understand it, in this bill is responsible for the field staff as they now exist. He is responsible for all programmes under the social assistance, under the Canada pensions agreement. He is also responsible for child welfare, responsible for employment opportunities and he in fact is responsible for the field staff as they presently exist.

The Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation on the other hand has responsibility for a special area of jurisdiction such as the homes for special care, as the minister outlined. As it has already been indicated, Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of this government to pay particular attention to an area which up to now has not had the special attention that it requires, namely, the home for retarded children, the home for the aged, the boys' home, the girls' home and so on. There is no conflict in dividing the old department or setting up the two departments, as we see it, because, as I said, we looked at it very carefully. The staff of the Social Assistance Department, as it is now known, provide a services, Mr. Speaker, to various agencies, numerous agencies throughout this province, both federal, provincial and voluntary organizations, parole boards, Any number of agencies outside of government use the services of the old Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation and the now new Department of Social Assistance.

The reason I say there is no conflict is because whenever the honourable Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation requires the services of those officials, he or his officials have only to make the request and I am sure they are treated equally as other agencies are, as other departments of government are. There is no conflict there. There is no intention, as I understand it, and I am sure he will elaborate upon this point when he closes the debate, there is no intention to build his

own empire or to build another department as strong in numbers as the Department of Social Assistance.

It is a step, Mr. Speaker, which has been long overdue, to give special attention to these areas with regards to aged, retarded children and the other agencies that come under the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation. I cannot see how anybody can find any fault in the division as it now exists. If the division had been made whereby the staff were split and had a dual responsibility to two ministers or something of that sort, I could certainly see justifiable criticism. But as it is divided right now, it can only work in a very smooth, efficient manner, doing the job that this government once did for these special areas which come under the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation. I for one have much pleasure in supporting the bill.

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

HON. J. G. ROUSSEAU: (MINISTER OF REHABILITATION AND RECREATION): Mr. Speaker, first of all I - like my colleague who has had some experience in this field, I am sure that in supporting the bill he is going along with the principle that this department indeed can serve a purpose. To the honourable members across the House, I think possibly a cause for concern might be the term "rehabilitation".

Now as I see "rehabilitation" I think it is proper to say that indeed that many departments of government are involved in rehabilitation of one kind or another. My colleague (who is standing on the floor and sitting now) of Industrial Development, rehabilitates many industries. My colleague in Manpower and Industrial Relations rehabilitates. My colleague from the other half of the department, as it existed before, my friend for St. John's Centre, also serves a purpose in the rehabilitation process in the sense of rehabilitating those on social welfare. The aspect with which my department is concerned is the rehabilitation of the physically and mentally handicapped. So that in effect I do not see an overlapping.

I would assure the honourable members on the other side of the House that all ministers on this side of the House are on speaking terms with themselves and each other. There is no intention, in my instance, to build any empire.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I did not hear the remark.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well I will say, give us twenty-three years, but we are on speaking terms with ourselves and I am sure that no empire will be built. I think we all accept that if we build an empire, we may indeed be taken

from an empire that we may find ourselves in in some future date. I do not think that serves any useful purpose. This department, a lot of thought was given to it. I think what we have done is take a number of units out; the units of homes for special care, the homes for the senior citizens, the homes for the mentally retarded children, the institutional schools for the boys and girls and other such units which had certain functions to perform and the rehabilitation process which we speak about in the Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation extends to these people in the sense of the physically and mentally handicapped, the rehabilitation of these people and not the rehabilitation of those on social welfare. I can assure honourable members across the House that there will be no conflict between myself and my friend from St. John's Centre. As a matter of fact he has on many occasions offered me the use of his field staff which I certainly will be using.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is very touchy these days.

MR. ROUSSEAU: He is not touchy from this side of the House.

I have no reason to believe that there will not be the same co-operation between two other ministers should, at some time in the future, they be there. I am sure that the recognition that the two departments have to work hand in hand, as indeed many departments of government have to work hand in hand with the various ministers co-operating in a number of ways, gives me no cause for concern. I would hope that this department would serve the purpose for which it was instituted. I personally think it is a good department. I am certainly extremely pleased to be minister of this department. I have grown to become very fond of it. I would hope that I will be in this department for quite some time to come. I think it has a real job to do in this province. I would like to, in some small way, play a part in the job that this department has to do.

AN HON. MEMBER: Education is the minister's cup of tea.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Education is not the minister's cup of tea. The minister

is versatile in so many jobs, you never know where the minister may end up. He may even end up in the back benches.

I have pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of this bill.

On motion a bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Rehabilitation And Recreation," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Forestry And Agriculture."

HON. E. MAYNARD (Minister of Agriculture and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have any particular comments to make on this. It is a straightforward bill creating a department. I would answer any questions, if at all possible, that the honourable members on the opposite side want to ask.

On motion a bill, "An Act Respecting The Department of Forestry And Agriculture, read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Rural Development."

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the minister is here. This is a bill to establish the Department of Rural Development in line with the restructuring procedures of the departments, which the Opposition do not apparently think is the greatest thing that has hit Newfoundland in the past one hundred years, but with which we disagree. This is another one of the standard bills to set up a department of rural development. I move second reading.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, ordinarily I would not say a word on this. It is just another one of those things, one of those bills but since it is apparently the last one and it is such an historic occasion, a word should be said

I suppose to reaffirm what we have already said before, that this, in our estimation, is the most dreadful and scandalous waste of time that was ever perpetrated in this honourable House. Even though the opposition have been very conciliatory on it, even though the opposition has said very little on these particular bills because they are all the same and there is not much meat or substance to them, even in spite of that, we have seen two or three days of this honourable House taken up going through them. We still have more time to come yet which will be spent on them, as we go through committee stage and give these bills their third reading. Let us just say and repeat, Mr. Speaker, that we want to go on the record as saying that this is an indication of this present administration's sense of priority, to waste the time, the talent of their ministers, the talent and time of their officials - well I will not use the word talent so loosely - the time of this honourable House in bringing these bills in, Mr. Speaker. Although we have not voted against them, we have voted for them, it makes no difference if you vote for or against them, they are so insignificant. We do think it is wasteful of time, talent and energy.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as this is the last one of the restructuring bills to be brought before the House, I would like to also say a few words, for the record, before this bill is put through second reading. Once this bill is approved by the honourable House, Sir, then that officially places the government in the hands of the academics at Memorial University. This is their brainwave, Sir, a complete waste of time. It has made nothing but a shambles out of the government and it will do nothing to put bread on people's tables today. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it will make it more difficult for the people of this province to get to see their elected representative. The Premier has sufficiently insulated himself from the people. The ministers have sufficiently insulated themselves from the people. Every day, Sir, there are numerous phone calls, letters and wires pouring into our office here, right outside here

in the opposition office, complaining, people complaining and municipalities, organizations complaining that they are unable to get to see their member or their elected representative or a minister. They call in on the phone, writing and coming in personally, Mr. Speaker. It is a shame, Sir, that we have reached the stage in Newfoundland where the people of this province cannot get to see their elected representative, to discuss a problem. Take a look at the eighth floor, Sir. I think I have said this before, every day is like Good Friday down on the eighth floor. The carpet on the floor there, Sir, is good forever. One time, if you came into Confederation Building and you passed the eighth floor and the elevator doors happened to open, she was blocked. She was blocked, Sir.

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: There were people from all over the province in to see the premier of this province. They got to see him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Visiting day, I presume.

MR. NEARY: Very funny! Very funny, Mr. Speaker, that people of this province cannot get to see their elected representative. I am talking about ministers of the crown and backbenchers, some backbenchers.

AN HON. MEMBER: Name them.

MR. NEARY: Yes I can, if I want to. I am not going to stoop to naming people in this House, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: If the hat fits the honourable member, he can wear it. Sir, this is the last of the restructuring bills, officially putting the government in the hands of the academics over at Memorial University. Now, Sir, what has happened? We now have nineteen ministers. Once this bill is passed, Sir, nineteen ministers will be able to draw their salary from the public treasury - nineteen. The honourable member

for St. John's East who is over there now with a grin on his face, Sir, when he was on this side of the House what did he say about the size of the cabinet? He could not stand it, Sir. How can he stand it now? Nineteen. We almost had twenty, Sir. We almost had twenty. What happened to the so-called Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs? Got shot down in flames. What is to become of that portfolio, Sir? Is there going to be another department created so that we can get the honourable member for St. John's South into the cabinet? That will give them nineteen, two parliamentary assistances, twenty-one, a couple of bouncers down on the eighth floor, apart from nineteen ministers, Sir, that is twenty-one.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I can name them. Bouncers that is all they are, Sir, nothing but bouncers to keep the people away from the Premier. The Premier does not want to be bothered with the people now. This was the great Premier that was going to take the government to the people. Take the government to the people, how are you! You cannot see him, anybody knows that. What is going to happen to the honourable member for St. John's South? Is he going to get a portfolio or is he not, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island is dealing with matters totally unrelated to the Department of Rural Development Act and supplies department to that particular department. He has wandered far afield and it is time for him to get back to the department that is being discussed.

MR. NEARY: With all due respect, Sir, we are dealing with a bill that is restructuring the government, which gives members a pretty broad scope. But, Sir, I do not want to prolong, I have said more than I intended to say on this bill anyway because the whole thing is a pure waste of time, Sir, a waste of the people's money. It will do nothing for the people of Newfoundland, it will not put bread on their table today, it will only make it more difficult for the people to get to see their elected representative.

Sir, I would say that is a backward step.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the only thing that I can say is shame on the lack of enlightenment and perception in the opposition. As far as we are concerned, Mr. Speaker, this is the last bill of restructuring but after hearing the honourable gentleman on the other side maybe there is need for another one and that would be to abolish the opposition. Mr. Speaker, the only thing I can say in reply and I do not think any reply to their statements was intended, is to reiterate what I said yesterday, that everything has improved immeasurably within the past year in government very, very much, very greatly and everyone recognizes it. But the only problem is that each day goes by the quality of the opposition deteriorates and I am afraid that is the only thing that has not, Mr. Speaker, improved since the great change that was wrought last year.

So those few words, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this great, momentous bill.

On motion a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Department of Rural Development," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently: by leave.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Forest Fires Act."

HON. F. MAYNARD (MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND FORESTS): Mr. Speaker, this is not a very tremendous bill. It makes some minor adjustments in the act respecting forest fires and enlarges the regulatory powers of the minister, under the Act. I do not know if there are any questions which they would like to be asked.

Sir, I move second reading, and would answer any questions that the honourable members may have regarding the bill.

MR. P. S. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, this bill would just change some of the regulation powers that the new Minister of Forestry and Agriculture would have. It lays out certain permissions for different regulations pertaining

to our forestry in relation to extinguishers, fires and I would imagine possibly controlling fires within cabins in our forests also. This is all very well and I agree with this, I support this.

There are a couple of points here, Mr. Speaker, if the regulations that are to be drawn up are to control the loggers of our province, our sawmill operators and all other people in our forest who are using chain saws and if these regulations are to control the extinguishers that are needed or are to be on hand or used by these people, then one of the greatest deficiencies in our province is the accessibility of these extinguishers to our people. I would venture to say that outside of the cities of St. John's and Corner Brook you cannot today buy a fire extinguisher. Now this is not the fault of any government, this is possibly the fault of the industries or the retailers in our province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. THOMS: You cannot buy them. You just simply cannot buy them. They are not accessible to our people. If you are planning an operation it takes a month and maybe two months to even get a proper fire extinguisher. Now I am not thinking about a little small thing you have in your kitchen where you just push a little thing, I am thinking about approximately a twenty-five pound -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. THOMS: No they are not sufficient. They are something not sufficient in the forests of Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. THOMS: Well we have had too many forest fires already started by chain saws. The main reason why they started was because the extinguishers that were used at the time were not capable of extinguishing the fires that were started.

Another point, Mr. Speaker, in this regulation I presume we are possibly going to control or set up regulations for the control of say stoves or some kind of eating apparatus in cabins. I would imagine the

regulations would control the spark resistors that would be either on the pipe or the chimneys, I would imagine it would mostly be pipe. Here again I do not believe proper spark resistor screens are available to the public of Newfoundland. Now this is not a serious thing or not as serious as the extinguisher thing is. But here again I think something should be done not necessarily by government but by private enterprise to make sure that these necessities are easily accessible to our people.

Now the activities within our forests in the past have been limited but these activities will increase as time goes by because we have many more people taking part in the outdoors and enjoying the forests of Newfoundland than we ever had before. I think that somewhere along the line these two vital necessities to enjoy the outdoors of Newfoundland particularly in the months from June to August I think these two necessities should become more accessible to our people. With these two points brought forward. Mr. Speaker, we have no objection in supporting this bill.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, this is an uncontroversial bill, in most respects. I would submit, Sir, an exceedingly controversial bill in one respect. That is this tendency on the part of government, not only this government, we were guilty of it when we formed the administration as well, all government to rule by regulation rather than setting out particularly offences setting them out clearly, unmistakably in the principle act so that lawyers and other people concerned can have ready access to them. I refer particularly, Mr. Speaker, to Clause (5)

Subclause 3 of this bill, "a person who violates any provision of regulations made under subsection (1) is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to imprisonment for a period of not less than two weeks and not exceeding two years or a fine of not less than \$200 and not exceeding \$10,000," Mr. Speaker.

Now I do not know for sure, but I would submit that that penalty of \$10,000 for the breach of a regulation, not the breach of an act, a section of an act clearly set out and delineated in unmistakable terms, but the breach of a regulation, that penalty must be among the highest if it is not the highest, among the highest penalties which can be imposed in this province. I would like to hear the honourable the House Leader on the point and perhaps the member for Placentia East if he cares to say a word about it. Because to me, Mr. Speaker, this is a tendency which should not be encouraged by the administration but should be stopped.

Remember what regulations are. An act is set out, Mr. Speaker, saying that certain things will be done, can be done or should be done and in certain cases, if there is a breach of some of these sections, then a penalty is imposed. But regulations, Mr. Speaker, are made by the government, by the cabinet, in secret session convened, and then they are sent down to the printer and they appear in "The Newfoundland Gazette." I would submit, Sir, that the type of publicity which is normally attendant on an act going through this House, an important act, especially when it has important offences in it, the type of publicity which an act ordinarily receives is not received by regulations which are printed and put in "The

MR. WM. ROWE: Newfoundland Gazette."

I am afraid, Sir, that we are likely to see many people who may be in violation of some of the offences named in the regulations (we do not know what the offences are yet, named in the regulations) either deliberately or negligently but innocent of the law, not knowing what the particular law is, suddenly possibly finding themselves saddled with a fine of up to \$10,000, Mr. Speaker, which is a very high penalty.

I am not saying that any of the offences which the minister might have in mind, respecting our forests, would not deserve a penalty of \$10,000 and even imprisonment. I am not saying that at all. All I am saying is that if anybody is going to be found guilty of a breach of some rules of our society, then those rules should be set out unmistakably in the principal act which is passed by this House, and these regulations should not or authority should not be given to the minister to make regulations in secret sessions convened, then getting very little publicity perhaps and then people breaching them in all innocence or ignorance of the law, even though it might be deliberate or negligent in terms of actually breaching the regulations themselves.

It would be unthinkable for anybody to be convicted of a serious crime, for example under the Criminal Code, by regulation. All the crimes are set out by the Government of Canada and the Parliament of Canada in the Criminal Code of Canada and lawyers have ready access to them. They are normally in effect for a long time and there is lots of publicity attendant on them and people know what is lawful and what is not lawful, by and large.

But to have this sort of a situation with a possible penalty of a \$10,000 for what may in fact be a serious breach but a breach nevertheless of a regulation of the minister, to me violates all the principles which this House should stand for, Mr. Speaker.

There is even this possibility? Under the law, every man and woman is deemed to know the law. Nobody can come into a court of law and say, "I am sorry Your Honour, I did not know what the law was, therefore I am not guilty." The judge would say, "well you are presumed to know the law." It is not because everybody knows every scintilla of law there might be in existence but because if it were otherwise people would be able to slip out from under the law merely by pleading ignorance.

But there is happening in Great Britian these days a tendency on the part of courts to find that when somebody is in breach of a regulation by a government or an administrative body or a board, and this tendency is an ongoing thing, for some courts to find that ignorance of the law in that case is a good excuse. Sometimes they say that if a minister or a government or an administrative body which makes regulations, has not made certain that the person accused of a breach of those regulations did have this regulations brought directly to his attention beforehand or to the group of persons like him who would maybe be coming up against this law, that that person has a good defence by saying that he was ignorant of that particular regulation. Because the courts have seen in Britian, and I am not saying that this is a tendency which is firmly entrenched, it is just a general tendency in administrative law, the courts have said to themselves that it is all very well and good for a person to be considered to have knowledge of the law, when the law is set out clearly and unmistakeably in criminal codes or in acts in the statute books but in order to stretch that presumption of knowledge of the law to regulations made by a minister or a government or an administrative tribunal and can consider that every person in society is supposed to know that law, that is stretching the principle a little too thinly, these judges are saying, and therefore ignorance of the law in that case may be a good excuse.

So all I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that two things are involved - first, as a matter of principle this House should not allow crimes and this is a crime even though we do not have jurisdiction to make crimes, we will call it a quasi-crime or a provincial offence, we should not allow the government to make new crimes by regulation unless they are fully debated in this House. That is the first point, especially when the crimes carry a penalty of \$10,000, which is a very large penalty indeed.

The second point, Sir, is that the minister or the government may well be defeating their own purposes by not coming out with these offences and passing them into law by virtue of a bill. It may be defeating their own purposes because if this tendency is carried too far, we are going to find more and more courts across Canada and in case of juries, for example if jury trials are ever allowed in such cases, we are going to find more and more courts and juries across Canada actually acquitting people who have been in breach of regulations simply because these regulations were not adequately brought to their attention. They will not be considered to have knowledge of the law as is normally the case, the people prosecuting them will have to prove that these people did in fact have knowledge of this regulation or that the minister and government or administrative tribunal took every conceivable step possible to bring these regulations to their attention.

So I am in favour of this bill, Mr. Speaker, on principle. I am against this type of thing, where crimes are made by this House, not by setting them out on paper and debating them but by allowing the minister and his colleagues, in secret session, to come up with these so called crimes and then merely have them gazetted, and people may not know what the laws are, what the regulations are, and may find themselves in innocent breach of them.

I am not saying that there should not be very serious penalties

MR. WM. ROWE: for very serious offences concerning forest fires and the management of our forests and carelessness and deliberate acts, I am not saying that at all. All I am saying is that these offences should be set out clearly in legislation before this House, we should have an opportunity to debate these offences and all attendant publicity which is normally attendant on this House of Assembly and bills and acts that go through it, that publicity should be brought to bear on these types of offences.

I would like to hear the minister's comments on it. I would like to hear any other member legally trained or otherwise to have comments on it. I feel strongly about it. I think that offences should be given all due publicity so that people know about them. I would like to hear other members of the House speak to it, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is a very pernicious principle which we will be adopting today if we go along with this.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, just a few words in response to what the honourable member for White Bay South said, First of all his observations are well taken, to a certain degree, because we should at all times, I think, strive to avoid the situation where regulations, where laws, any law be they in the nature of quasi-criminal laws or what have you are made by the cabinet, by the executive arm of government but should principally be made by the legislature itself.

We have and we are trying to change and turn around to a large extent the tendency which is prevalent in pretty well all western democracies, to delegate more and more power to the executive itself,

However, this does not mean that every function of the executive should be taken

away and given to the legislature itself. The executive arm of government has a very real purpose and real function for existing. With respect to this particular bill and the observations as I say of the hon. member for White Bay South, while they are well taken, when you apply them to general application in this specific instance, there is probably a very, very good and real reason for the purpose of having the regulations the way they are. First of all the sanction of a fine of imprisonment for not less than two weeks and not exceeding two years or a fine of \$200.00 not exceeding \$10,000 are admittedly very high penalties to be imposed. It is also to be pointed out that the regulations which the hon. the minister can make in conjunction with the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council, the type of regulations he is to make are not to be regulations that are made in a vacuum in other words he cannot for the sake of emphasis, by pointing to a ridiculous situation, just cannot say that because a person crosses a road on a hot summers day that he will be fined or imprisoned. The fact of the matter is that he has power to make regulations with respect to the items that are specifically set forth in the act itself and which pertain to one of the most urgent matters with which this province has to deal with, which the government has to deal with in the province during the summer months and that is the danger of forest fires which have in the past robbed our children and our children's children of one of their greatest natural resources.

For instance the minister has power and can only make regulations in one case for prohibiting the lighting of fires outdoors during any period specified in the regulations, for specifying conditions under which people operate in the woods, loggers operate in the woods, for prohibiting at certain times the use of power saws in the woods, for restricting the passage through forests. Now obviously you cannot make specific regulations to apply to every instance for every year because

the requirements vary from time to time and from year to year and season to season and certainly from year to year as to when the urgency is greatest. The minister only has power as I say and has to have the necessary flexibility to make the regulations in order to protect the province to the utmost degree and he has only power to make regulations with respect to the items that are specifically set forth in the act itself.

Furthermore the people, generally speaking, who are affected by these regulations should well know that regulations and laws of this type are in existence and be they professional loggers or just transients in the woods themselves they owe a duty certainly to the rest of the people in the province to acquaint themselves with the regulations which pertain from time to time. For example, it is not going to do the wealth of this country any good for somebody to be able to turn around and say afterwards that I did not know I was not supposed to be in such an area after the place is burnt down. Obviously we cannot make rules and regulations in the act now to say that John Jones or John Smith will not be allowed in the woods from the period of June 1 to the end of September in each year, because this will vary from season to season.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the observations of the member for White Bay South are very well taken when they apply to general application but when it applies to this particular act, when you consider the danger to the province by careless users of the forests and when you consider the fact that the requirements vary from year to year and when you further consider the fact that with great painstaking precision and after a great deal of thought the hon. the minister and his officials have defined the instances where regulations may be made, and they may not make regulations unless they come within their authority under this act, I can see really no other alternative than to provide it and it is very necessary and beneficial in this specific instance.

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

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, just a comment. First of all I am not familiar with the shortage of fire extinguishers in the province or other fire protection devices. It is certainly something which I will have investigated as it was my understanding that these were available from various locations. However, that I think is a problem that can be solved certainly.

In relation to the comments of the hon. member for White Bay South regarding regulations, I find that it would be very difficult to actually pinpoint all the offences in an act because an act is something that you cannot change to suit the situation every day or every week or whatever and to anticipate all the violations of a certain law or all the things that could be classed as a violation at this particular time would be probably almost impossible. Therefore I think it is only possible to put very general terms in the act and create the specifics by regulations. There are some problems to it and there are some arguments to be made against it but in general it is the way that we have to operate.

I think the most important thing here is the fact that we should possibly make the public more aware of the regulations, rules and laws that we have in effect. My hon. colleague stated that the public has the responsibility to make themselves aware but I think we should have more public information in this regard and I fully intend to do that especially in the case of forest fires, because it is a very serious situation. The fines that were mentioned by the hon. member for White Bay South, no doubt they are large and very harsh disciplinary measures but I think we are dealing with a very important aspect of the economy of the province and the disciplinary measures to be taken against offenders would have to be suited to the particular things.

I therefore move second reading.

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

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Expropriation Act."

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, in moving this act the amendment is a very simple and straightforward one which is fully explained in the accompanying explanatory note to the act. The purpose of this amendment is simply to require the publication or furnishing to interested persons of a plan of the land concerned when notice of expropriation of the land is published under the provisions of the act. It is straightforward insofar as the plan must be published or provided to interested persons.

I move the second reading of this act.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): For our part, Mr. Speaker, we think this is a excellent bill. Anything that can be of interest to people who are having land expropriated from under them or who have some claim to land certainly should have as much documentation and plans and this sort of thing available to them for their own study. We commend the minister for bringing this amendment into the House and we fully support it.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Expropriation 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 Newfoundland Medical Care Insurance Act."

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the intent of this bill is to just regularize payments to people who employ doctors such as corporations such as the International Grenfell Association, the Twillingate Hospital Board and various other non-government and government hospitals who employ doctors on their staff. Essentially under the previous act the monies had to be paid direct to the physician himself and this amends the act to the effect that the monies can be paid to the body or corporation hiring the doctor and they will then relay the fee to the doctor. It is an amendment to that effect.

On motion a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Newfoundland Medical Care Insurance Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act To Clarify The Manner In Which The Provisions Of The Statutes Amendment Act, 1971 And The Statutes Amendment Act, 1972 Are To Be Implemented."

HON. T. ALEXANDER HICKMAN: (MINISTER OF JUSTICE): Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple, straightforward bill. The explanatory note says that the reasons for the content of the bill are set forth in the recitals appearing therein. Any careful reading of the recitals should serve to confuse all honourable members but what the bill is designed to do and will do, if this honourable House sees to fit to pass it, is to correct certain defects and to validate the revision of the Statutes of Newfoundland, which revision was completed this year after ten years of very strenuous and tedious work, with very efficient work by a committee under the chairmanship of Mr. E. J. Phelan Q.C. I move second reading of the bill.

On motion a bill, "An Act To Clarify The Manner In Which The Provisions Of The Statutes Amendment Act, 1971 And The Statutes Amendment Act, 1972 Are To Be Implemented," 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 Co-operative Societies Act."

HON. WILLIAN W. MARSHALL: (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the honourable the minister this is a bill which is a relevantly routine bill which would amend the original Co-operative Societies Act and requires, with respect to the membership of persons under the age of majority, which is under the age of nineteen, that there are certain provisions here preventing the exercise of voting privileges in the society, in the co-operative society, if in fact a person is under the age of sixteen. One has the right to vote between the ages sixteen to nineteen. It is a beneficial act that is necessary really in order to

further encourage the co-operative movement in this province and I have pleasure in moving second reading.

On motion a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Co-operative Societies Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Northern Labrador (Social Services And Rehabilitation) Act."

On motion second reading of bill adjourned.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation Act."

MR. MARSHALL: Again it is in the nature of a routine act which would really change the year end when the Municipal Finance Corporation is required. This is the bill of the honourable Minister of Finance who is not here right now. It would change the year end to March 31st, have the effect of making it March 31st to comply with the provincial year. I move second reading.

On motion a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to honourable members of the House. I understood my bill would be called later. I was out attending to a matter and it in no way suggests that I have belittled the House. If it be, in any way, I am sorry for it.

This bill, "An Act To Amend The Northern Labrador Social Services and Rehabilitation Act," is essentially a consolidation bill. The Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation had within it a unit called The Northern Labrador Services Division which, by federal agreement signed some years ago, the federal government pays ninety percent of the cost of maintenance of operation and current expenditures of the Indian and Eskimo settlements from North West River north to Cape Chidley. The payments are such that the government, the provincial government is responsible for the first one third of any current or capital expenditures and the federal government then shares in the final two thirds to ninety

percent to a maximum of \$1,000,000 so that the Northern Labrador Services Division is functioning as a unit within the larger department. In addition by some quirk of fate the Labrador entities in government ended up in my department in the restructuring of government and we also have under our sphere now the Department of Labrador Affairs as it existed previously. The programmes that were the responsibility of that department have now been also included within the realm of my department. So, rather than have two different divisions functioning, the Division of Northern Labrador Services and the Department of Labrador Affairs, we have decided that we would like to have it drawn together into one division which we call now the Division of Labrador Services.

The 1927 Privy Council decision defined Labrador as Coastal Labrador and all the islands thereto. This amendment is necessary in that now we will make the term Labrador to include all of Labrador so all the services that are peculiar to Labrador, within the sphere of government, will now be administered through the Division of Labrador Services which will be in the Rehabilitation half of the Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill because this is a concept that I developed when I was Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation when the Northern Labrador Services came under that department. I did, Sir. It is in the files. The honourable minister can go and check the files. It is in the files. He can laugh at it if he wants to but it is there.

What I had planned on doing, Sir, was to extend the branch of the Northern Labrador Services to include Southern Labrador. I do not know if it is necessary to go as far as the honourable minister has gone and include all of Labrador because that takes in Labrador West too. I am sure that in the affluent district of Labrador West they do not need the services of the Northern Labrador Services Division. I beg your pardon? The alleged affluence? Well, Sir, I think the

statistics could probably prove otherwise. I think most people in Labrador would rather live in Labrador West than live in Black Tickle as the honourable Leader of the Opposition has pointed out.

Talking about Black Tickle, Sir, this was the whole purpose of extending the branch of the Northern Labrador Services Division, to carry out a pilot project in Black Tickle. Black Tickle, as honourable members of this House may or may not know, is a community in Southern Labrador that is probably or at least in my opinion - the honourable member for Labrador South can probably confirm or deny this - is probably an example of how a community in Newfoundland has been neglected in this province since Confederation. The honourable member nods his head in approval because that is a true statement, Sir.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, I would say that

If there are a people in Newfoundland who have been neglected since Confederation, they are in Southern Labrador. If anybody is discriminated against in this province, Mr. Speaker, it is not the Indians and Eskimos of Northern Labrador, it is the people of Southern Labrador. The honourable minister agrees with me and the hon. member for Labrador South agrees with me. I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker. The Government of Canada, under a special agreement with the Province of Newfoundland, provide ninety per cent of the cost of providing services to six communities, I think, in Northern Labrador. I am not sure if it is six or seven. I will count them: Northwest River, Postville, David's Inlet, Makkovik, Hopedale and Nain. Did I leave one out?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. NEARY: No, I did not leave one out.

AN HON. MEMBER: Rigolet.

MR. NEARY: We took Rigolet in about three years ago, Sir. Rigolet was not included because it is in the District of Labrador South. The ironical part about it, Sir, is that Rigolet is in Labrador North, geographically. Electorally, it is in the District of Labrador South.

AN HON. MEMBER: Gerrymandering!

MR. NEARY: Gerrymandering, call it what you like. That is the way it is. So, Mr. Speaker, here was Rigolet sticking out there like a sore thumb. All the communities around were getting the services of NLSD, paid for by the Government of Canada. They were not getting any housing. They were not getting any power generated by the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation. They were not getting any warehouses, buildings or stores provided by the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation, so we took in Rigolet. Since then a number of houses have been built in Rigolet. Warehouses have been built. Fishermen have been helped. Although the standards are

not the best, Sir, Rigolet is gradually getting there, catching up with some of the other communities. The other communities have had a head start, right from Nain right on down to Northwest River.

Now, Sir, I claim that the people in Labrador South have been discriminated against. They do not get assistance from the Government of Canada. They cannot prove Indian or Eskimo blood.

MR. WINSOR: There is.

MR. NEARY: As my honourable colleague here, who knows Labrador so well, points out, Sir, there is Eskimo blood in Labrador South. It is a job to prove it. So these people did not get the same privilege that the people of Labrador North received under this special arrangement with the Government of Canada. I would say that they were discriminated against. What I wanted to do, Mr. Speaker, was to take in the whole of Labrador South and carry out a pilot project in Black Tickle, build houses, create a fish plant there, if it were feasible, a bait supply unit -

MR. WINSOR: A bait depot.

MR. NEARY: A bait depot and build houses, if necessary build a warehouse, put oil storage tanks in there and try to turn Black Tickle into a viable community. They do have access, Sir, to some pretty rich fishing grounds. But I was flung out, Mr. Speaker, before I had a chance to carry out that project which was one of the dreams that I had for that department. Now the hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation is going to do it. I am glad he is going to do it, Sir, because it is badly needed. The only difficulty the honourable minister is going to have, Sir, is arranging with the Government of Canada to get the finances to do the same work, to provide the same services in Southern Labrador as we are providing in Northern Labrador to the Indians and Eskimos. I do not know if the honourable minister has approached Ottawa yet. I did make some preliminary approaches to Ottawa when I was minister of that department, Sir. I did not get a very good response up to the time I left. It is badly needed. I personally think that the only

way Southern Labrador can be developed is for the government to take the bull by the horns, go in there, pour the money in there, build fish plants, put in bait depots, fish collection units, develop the tourist industry, open up the roads, build schools, generate electricity. The only way it can be done, Sir, is for the government to pour massive sums of money in there. When the Royal Commission on Labrador write their report, Sir, if they ever do (If they ever stop travelling around the world long enough to sit down and write a report) then you will discover, Sir, that this is what they will recommend. People there have been neglected long enough.

In Northern Labrador, Sir, one of the things that I was able to do when I was minister of that department, something that I am quite proud of (The hon. member for Labrador South may not be aware of this) was to take on my staff a very good friend of his, as a matter of fact, Mr. Ian Strachan, as a consultant. Ian Strachan was the gentleman who developed the Arctic char when he was on the staff of the College of Fisheries.

MR. WINSOR: The curing of the Arctic char.

MR. NEARY: The curing of the Arctic char, Sir, which is in such great demand all across North America. Mr. Strachan went out in business for himself and I took him on the staff as a consultant, sent him into Nain to look at the possibility of establishing a fish plant in Nain. Well Mr. Strachan was worth his weight in gold, Sir. I think we only paid him \$4,000 or \$5,000 but we did manage to establish a fish plant in Nain, Mr. Speaker. It did not get burnt in the fire, although it was very near the store that was burned in Nain. I do not think it was damaged. The first year that we had that fish plant in operation, Mr. Speaker, there was no unemployment in Nain - no unemployment. Even the women were

working, Mr. Speaker, and they were working for equal wages, equal pay for equal work. They were getting paid the same as the men in Nain. They got in enough time to get their unemployment insurance stamps and they got their unemployment insurance during the winter. During the winter, we carried out a number of other projects and a lot of them went to work on other projects. That was a lot better than welfare, Mr. Speaker, a lot better than welfare.

Nain, that year (I do not know what happened last year. Perhaps the honourable minister can tell us when he is winding up this debate) little Nain, way up there in Northern Labrador, a little community that people had not even heard tell of, was one of the most prosperous little communities in Newfoundland. They tripled their salmon production, Sir, and the production of Arctic char. That is what the previous administration did for Nain - that old whipping boy, the previous administration, turned Nain into a viable community, Sir, made it one of the most prosperous communities in Newfoundland, not only in Northern Labrador - the shining light of Northern Labrador, Sir. I do not know what happened last year, Sir. Perhaps the honourable minister can tell us when he is winding up this debate how the plant made out last year. Did they increase their production? Was their full employment in Nain? If not, why not? We certainly laid the foundation. What I had intended to do, Mr. Speaker, was to take Mr. Strachan back on as a consultant, the following year and send him into Makkovik and duplicate maybe on a smaller scale what we had done in Nain in Makkovik. I was flung out before I got a chance to do it, Sir. If we had been able to establish a fish plant in Makkovik and one in Nain, a big one in Nain, then the people on either side would be able to feed their fish, salmon, Arctic char and trout into these two fish plants.

Then we had built a number of handicraft centres in these communities, Sir. We were building log cabins to develop the tourist industry.

We were doing all sorts of things, Mr. Speaker, to create employment, to make work for the people of Northern Labrador. We were building houses, Sir, putting in water and sewerage. I remember the great battle that I had to try to get a front-end loader, a back-ditcher for Northern Labrador. What a battle I had with the Treasury Board over that, Sir - a little old back-ditcher - because the majority of members of the Treasury Board did not know what it was all about. They did not know there were not any roads, any water and sewerage in Northern Labrador.

all I wanted to do was get a back ditcher to send in there so that during the summer months down there, and my colleague here who represented that district at the time worked with me, hounded me, kept the pressure on me night and day to get this. Finally I got approval to send a back ditcher, a front end loader into Northern Labrador so we could put in a few water lines down there and build a few roads.

Then there was the matter of storage tanks, I do not know if honourable members are aware of it or not but I got the shock of my life the first time I stepped ashore in these Northern Labrador communities when I saw all the gasoline and all the stove oil and furnace oil in barrels on the wharf and tourists going ashore down there, Sir, flicking matches and cigarette butts all over the place and there were the gasoline barrels around. I said to my colleague who is now representing the District of Fogo, "What can we do about this?" He said: "Put storage tanks down there." "Well," I said, "is this possible?" He said, "yes, you should put storage tanks there." I said, "All right, well let us see what we can do." Then I discovered if we put the storage tanks there, there is no tanker to fill up the tanks. I even went as far, Mr. Speaker, as to call tenders in the newspaper and I asked all the big oil companies if they would tender on supplying oil and gasoline to Northern Labrador. Not one, not one of these great oil companies was prepared to put up storage tanks and to get a tanker to fill up the tanks a couple of times a year.

Now I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, there is another one of my ideas being implemented because my colleague the honourable member for Labrador North has bought an oil tanker and I would say, God Bless him, and the people of Northern and Southern Labrador and the South Coast of this Island, Sir, will bless him, the people who do not have enough oil in the wintertime to keep their stoves going, to keep the house warm. Most members of this honourable House who are well-to-do lawyers and millionaires in St. John's do not understand all of this, Mr. Speaker, I understand it. I grew up in a house where you had to wait until the fire was lit in the

morning so the pan of water could thaw out so you could get enough water to wash. That is what is happening in Labrador today, Sir, not only in Labrador it is happening in a good many places in this island. I would say my honourable colleague has shown a lot of foresight in buying that tanker. He does not know the good that he is going to do for the people of this province though he may make a few dollars from it. More power to him I would say. But one storage tanker, Sir, established in all these smaller communities, in the isolated areas, in the isolated parts of Newfoundland, then the roads can get clogged up with snow or the ice can come in at least people will have enough stove and furnace oil to keep them warm. The people of Northern and Southern Labrador will have enough gasoline to keep their skidoos going so that they can get into the woods and so they can do a little hunting which is so necessary to provide them with some food.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say that this is a good move. It is a good move. If the Government of Canada is not prepared to co-operate with the honourable minister or his government then I would say the province should pour the money into Southern Labrador. That experiment, that pilot project that I had planned for Black Tickle should go ahead. Has anybody ever seen the houses in Black Tickle? My honourable friend from Labrador South have seen them. I have seen them. I have been in them, it would almost make you ashamed that you are a Newfoundlander.

I strongly urge the honourable minister if he gets bogged down with long drawn out negotiations with the Government of Canada, that he use some of the \$24 million that Ottawa just passed over to this government, handed over to him, windfall, use some of that money to develop Southern Labrador, never mind waiting for the royal commission to make its report. There is enough information available on Southern Labrador, never mind waiting for them. By the time they get back from Norway and Iceland and half way around the world, Sir, it is too late. The people down there need the help now. They need water and sewerage systems. They need roads. They need industry. They need housing. They need it now. Do not wait for Mr. Snowdon to run up a bill of a half or three quarters of a million and a

couple or three years to do it. This summer something should be done in Southern Labrador. If the Government of Canada are not prepared to co-operate because there are no Indians or Eskimos there, then I would say then this government should go ahead on its own, go ahead on its own, Sir.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation at all in supporting this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Labrador South.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I view this bill with mixed reactions I am afraid. I have great pleasure in being able to stand here today and say a few things that I have been trying to get a captive audience to say it to for many years.

There are not many times when I am in complete agreement with my colleague, the honourable member for Bell Island, but I must say that the words he has spoken this afternoon I agree with completely. There is no doubt about it that the division of that department as it has operated in the past has been discrimination, or discriminating against that other section of Labrador.

We have bent over backwards trying to do things for the native populations the easily identifiable native populations in Northern Labrador, the Indians and the Eskimos, and we have felt that we were doing a great deed for humanity, I think. But sooner or later somewhere, someone is going to have to decide who is an Indian and who is an Eskimo and who is not.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is a human being?

MR. MARTIN: Absolutely, Sir.

If that is the case then are you going to stop at the Straits of Belle? Are you going to then come on north and extend the services of this division on down through? Because until you do, I am afraid you are still practicing discrimination.

It has been all very well to say that we can give water and sewerage and storage depots and all the rest to the Indians and Eskimos of Labrador

if you pinpoint those two or three different communities on the Northern Coast. But there is hardly a family, Sir, in Coastal Labrador which does not have Indian or Eskimo blood mixed with white blood of the European founders who came over. As for my part, I can boast that I have all three. So in this respect I applaud this bill. I think it is a move in the right direction. But I would caution you, Sir, that while the concept is a good one it has some inherent dangers in that you are passing over to bureaucrats in government the responsibility of running the lives, every aspect of the lives of the people in those communities. While I am certain that civil servants charged with the responsibility of running these various services are doing so in good faith and with all good intentions, because they are bureaucrats and they are tied down to red tape there are very great dangers that things go astray.

My honourable friend for Bell Island referred to the char fishery. I can say, Sir, that Mr. Ian Strachan did a commendable job in putting that plan in and making it work. I can also say that Mr. Ian Strachan was a victim of a witch hunt of civil servants who wanted him out for their own reasons. That is a great shame on this government.

Let me tell you a few things that happened with that char after it came out of there. Before that plant was put in, for honourable members who do not understand the char fishery, there are three different grades it has to do with the colour of the flesh of the char. Since there was no easy market for the pale char, the white char, when these were bought in to the government depots they were dumped and the bottom of the harbour at Nain at times was white with these fish and the loss was stood by the fishermen not by the government.

After the plant was put in a very, very high quality of product was turned out and put on the market. Labrador produces in excess, far in excess, I do not have the exact figures of all of the other production across Canada of Artic Char and there is a very, very good market. That char was sent down here to be marketed out of St. John's. It lay on the dock on the

Southside for a number of months. There was a question of jurisdiction of who had to market it. It was passed over by the Division of Labrador Services to the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation who looked around and found that it was not under their jurisdiction either and they passed it over to another agency. I am not sure the name of it, something called the Fresh Water Fish Marketing

Corporation or something to that effect. At any rate it was the agency who was charged with the responsibility of marketing the produce from the fresh-water fisheries. They looked it over and decided at length, some great length that they could not operate east of Quebec so it was passed back to the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation. Meanwhile this char, a highly perishable product, was lying in the heat, in the shade but in the heat in a warehouse in St. John's and not one official of the department had the time or perhaps was instructed to go over and turn those boxes over. The result was that when they were finally put on the market they were found to be of very, very inferior quality and that was then blamed on Mr. Strachan who was subsequently ousted from his government post.

AN HON. MEMBER: What year was that?

MR. MARTIN: This was three years ago. This is an indication of the kind of thing that can happen when bureaucracy becomes misguided. The people of Black Tickle do indeed have a lot going for them. They are situated right on the very most prolific inshore fishing ground in this province and they have had for all their lives to live in hovels not because they wanted to but because they have had no choice. I think that it is a commendable idea that a government agency get into the development of these communities. But I wonder what is going to happen when government takes over the whole responsibility of providing community services because what we have found happen in the North is that when that responsibility has been taken over by somebody paid out of the public purse, that the remainder of the community, the people whose leadership we should be trying to develop give the whole thing over to the official agent and there is a subsequent loss of initiative.

I think, Sir, that government has very little to do with this. It is the whole system of bureaucracy over which we have no control, I am not even referring to any specific people in the civil service it is

just the system that we are up against and I do not think that it is going to work. If it is going to work it has to work under very, very strict scrutiny and control.

I do not want to take up any more of the time of this hon. House this afternoon developing my theories on this subject as I would like to reserve my time on that for when we go into the committee stage. I would just like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. minister should be aware of these dangers inherent in this kind of a concept through development and I think that if he proceeds cautiously that it can be a very great success.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to occupy too much time of the House to belabour this subject but having represented the District of Labrador North for fifteen years I know a little of the background of the Northern Labrador Services. If we were to go back to the beginning - the beginning was with the Moravian Missions who came over and established in Northern Labrador away back in 1752. They operated a trading operations and supplied the northern settlement with provisions and bought their furs, mostly furs, as there was not too much fish at that time. However, they in turn found that it was not financially sound for them and during the First World War it was very difficult for the Moravian Missions to get funds out of Germany because that is where the Moravian Missions originated, originated in Germany and not in England as a lot of people think. So then the operation was passed over to the Hudson Bay Company.

The Hudson Bay Company operated a service on a barter system, using their own ships and the last one they used was quite familiar to the people around St. John's at that time, the old "Harmony" who used to bring supplies from England and take them up along the coast and discharge them, collect their furs and fish and what have you and take it to the West Indies and bring back molasses etc., not too much

rum as the Moravian Missions did not deal in rum, however they used to bring back molasses and supplies and distribute it along the coast and then at the end of the season bring back the catch of cod fish or salmon or what have you to St. John's and very often, I can remember in my days when there was always a load of fish to be bid on or auctioned from the Moravian Mission ship "Harmony."

However in 1942 the Hudson Bay Company, they saw that they could not make ends meet and they were going fast into bankruptcy so they just notified the government of the day, and the government of that day was the Commission of Government, they notified the government of that day that they no longer could supply the settlements of Northern Labrador. The Commission of Government had no choice in the matter whether they wanted to or not they were forced to take over the operations of the Northern Labrador Services. So the Commission of Government were not too anxious and they felt around and they inquired and asked for tenders but no business operation in Newfoundland was interested enough only on one condition and that was if the government would subsidize the operation. Then, of course, you had firms such as Boverings, such as Baine Johnston and one or two others who might be attracted to going in there and carrying out the operation.

So it was in 1942 the Commission of Government established, under the Department of Natural Resources, if my memory serves me correct, and provided to take over the operations of Northern Labrador. At that time they took over the Hudson Bay depot at Makkovik, Postville, Hopedale, Davis Inlet, Nain and at that time it was Nutak and Hebron, Nutak and Hebron, of course Hebron being the further and most northern settlement of all, about 200 miles north of Nain. So the government found themselves operating all of that stretch of coast from Makkovik all the way down to Hebron and summertime during the char fishery beyond that up as far as Nakavik and Nakavik is about 180 miles this side of

Chidley. I have gone there quite a few times to take supplies into the summer fishermen there catching char.

So they did the best they could with what they had at that particular time. They were dealing with some of the most primitive people that we had in Newfoundland and perhaps in Canada and that was the section of the Eskimo settlement of Nutak and Hebron, Hebron more especially. The Eskimo of Hebron were more primitive than any other class of people that I knew or had read of in North America. So the government started to try to develop some kind of industry apart from the artic char because at that time the artic char was caught up at Nakavik and it was pickled and sold, as my colleague the member for Labrador South says, pickled in barrels and the catch ranged from 1,000 barrels (200 pound barrels) up to 1,600 barrels. I recall a day while master of a vessel we served that operation and we brought 1,600 barrels of artic char here to St. John's to be sold to foreign markets.

So then of course the service was extended to North West River in 1958, I think, an Indian agent was appointed in North West River and in 1964 a depot was established in North West River to supply the Indians. Here, Mr. Speaker, was a precarious position because on one side of North West River you had the government supplying the Indians with food commodities much cheaper than they could buy from the Hudson Bay Store on the other side so there was a clash between one side of the river and the other. That service carried on until two years ago, I believe, when the service was extended to Rigolet. Now having extended this service to Rigolet of course it was always very difficult to determine who was an Indian and Eskimo or as we sometimes classify them, a native. So this is where the problem of determining how far the government could go in Southern

Labrador and as my colleague here to my right stated, we discussed this when he was Minister of Welfare, on many occasions. However, he decided to take the gamble and extend services of the Northern Labrador Service south to Rigolet, with the hope, as he stated, that it would be continued on into Black Tickle and other places.

But, Sir, there was a problem there because of the federal financial assistance, because in 1957 when Mr. Diefendbaker was Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Diefendbaker allowed or granted to the operations of Northern Labrador for housing, school and what not - \$200,000. But the next year Mr. Diefendbaker cancelled the \$200,000 and it was not before Mr. Pearson got back in a minority government in 1958 or 1959 when that allocation was again renewed and increased to ninety - ten, to \$1 million.

Sir, since then very great strides have been made. Housing, I recall in Davis Inlet and in Northwest River, I witnessed the Indians living in canvas tents, thirty below zero. I do not have to tell the honourable minister how cold it can get in that part of Labrador, I am sure he is fully aware of it. But, Sir, from canvas tents to sleeping on green boughs I saw the Indian and the Eskimo progress to where at least they could live in a wooden shack provided by the efforts of the federal government and the provincial government. There is no Indian today living in a canvas tent, only by choice. Now you cannot stop them from going in the country and taking a canvas tent.

MR. MURPHY: Do you not think it is time for them to be getting adjusted to homes at that time?

MR. WINSOR: Well the Indian way of life, you know the Indian is an outdoor man and he was happiest at that time, of course, he was happier living in a canvas tent than in a wooden house.

However the houses were built all along the coast in every community. Schools - we have in Northern Labrador some of the nicest school that we find anywhere in the rural areas of Newfoundland, all built through the generosity of the Liberal Government at Ottawa and the foresight and the determination and the interest in those people by the Provincial Liberal Government and I happened to be the member for that district and I took great pride in boasting about what had been done during my term in Northern Labrador.

Now this bill, I agree with the minister to extend the facilities that the Northern Labrador people enjoy through to Southern Labrador, but I warn him now that he is going to have a problem and the problem is this - that he is going to have to convince the federal authorities that this service should be extended, on what grounds I do not know, because our present agreement between the provincial and the federal government spells out very clearly that the assistance can only be provided to Indian and Eskimo. This to me is very unfair. It has been unfair. But nevertheless I am very happy to see the honourable minister take the necessary action and at least bring in legislation to try to provide the services to the Southern Labrador. They are badly in need of it.

Certain section of Southern Labrador are very depressing, almost as depressing as Northern Labrador was fifteen years ago, until I became the member for that district.

But, Sir, we must realize and we must face up to the facts,

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WINSOR: I will repeat at some other time.

They must face up to the fact, that we have people in Southern Labrador who are gravely in need of assistance because they are scattered, especially during the summer fishing, they are scattered in places such as Snug Harbour, Comfort Bite, Occasional Harbour, all

over the place and unless you can find first of all some way to centralize those people and then focus on the centralization. This is what has to be done in Southern Labrador, Mr. Speaker. You have to centralize the people who are living in the settlements along the coast. You have many of them and you cannot provide the services to a population that is scattered all over the place. So, Sir, without taking too much more time of the House, I certainly support the bill and I wish the minister good luck. Now that the Liberals are still in power in Ottawa, there may not be too much difficulty in getting a sympathetic hearing from them.

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

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, like everybody else I will say I am not going to take up too much time of the House. But I feel that due to the fact that I had the honour for a few short months to be Minister of the famous Department of Labrador Affairs, which in my opinion was the greatest political football and the greatest farce was ever perpetrated on any civilized people.

I served as minister of that department, Sir, for some time, a few months, and I was amazed, quite frankly amazed at what was happening in Labrador. I had a long hard look at it in my early days there and not wishing to be the same as the member for Bell Island, I decided to do this, or I decided to do that, I never heard such expressions before as: "Don't you do as I do but you do what I am saying to do," and the intentions were so wonderful, what they were all going to do with Labrador.

But I went in there and I had a long, hard look at what was happening, I was also Minister of Provincial Affairs and I figured that Provincial Affairs was basically Labrador Affairs because never in my mind can anybody persuade me that a resident of Labrador is any less a Newfoundlander or a native of this province than I am. I feel they are all Newfoundlanders. It arose in this honourable

MR. MURPHY: House where some of us at that time were sitting on the other side, where in the name of political expediency the former Premier of this Province pulled this out of his head and said: "this will be the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador." We suggested that it could be the Province of Newfoundland and Corner Brook or Newfoundland and Bell Island. It was so silly, the whole thing. But this Department of Labrador Affairs cost this province many thousands of dollars in administration. We had the federal government working in Northern Labrador and I think I mentioned in the House the other day, speaking on something else, where at one time in Goose Bay I had a deputation of eight people come to me, speaking of discrimination because they were not Indian or Eskimo, they were getting nothing. I have made the statement many times in reviewing the amounts of money that were expended in Northern Labrador and are still being expended in Northern Labrador, that if we spoke of resettlement we could quite easily put a lot of these families in Florida, let them live permanently down there and be so much better off. But then the former government would not have had the great political schemes that they worked on the poor innocent victims in Labrador.

Now, as I say, I was there a few short months when I had a long look at the thing and anybody knows, and this is not new, that we have three areas of Labrador, we have the Coastal Area, which includes north and south, we had the Goose Bay - Happy Valley Area which depended almost exclusively on the American base in that area and then we had the great industrial area of Churchill Falls - Wabush and Labrador City.

I had some meetings with my staff at that time, and I suggested that we would immediately prepare to create not the Department of Northern Labrador Affairs, but the Department of Coastal Affairs which would take in Labrador South and Labrador

MR. MUPPHY: North. I suggested at the time that what we needed was one or two good young men who would act as ambassadors, if you like, or business agents whatever name you would give them, to travel these areas, who would be known to the people, would know the needs of the people and that a central organization be set up in the Town of Happy Valley. I might say here that at that time the council in Happy Valley were speaking of putting up a public building which I thought was an excellent idea, where departments of our government could rent guaranteed leases at Happy Valley rather than be helter skelter all over Happy Valley as we are now situated.

The first name that came to my mind for Southern Labrador as the ideal, perhaps the ultimate in a representative for that area, would be the present member for Labrador South who had just been defeated in an election. As a matter of fact, I held some preliminary talks with the gentleman about this thing, asking him what his thoughts were on the thing, he is a native of Cartwright as far as I can understand, knows the area very well indeed and we have heard talk of all the great schemes that were carried out. We have heard of all the areas of Southern Labrador and I agree

Mr. Murphy.

one hundred per cent. The people of Black Tickle, I suppose, are the most progressive group that you could get. They have their own community council formed there. Subsequently in the latter months there was an Anglican clergyman who came there. I was very much in contact with him, very close in contact with. He created eight or nine community groups such as they had in Black Tickle, with a view to developing Southern Labrador. After all the years that the former government were in power, (I say this with all their talk about char, fish plants and everything else) the people of Labrador were almost completely ignored. They were set apart from many other areas of this province. Naturally, they were to feel that they were not a part of Newfoundland. They were treated like the old coloured people used to be in the Southern States many, many years ago. But now the minister has brought forward something that will be to the betterment of Labrador. I cannot see anything but the fullest support for that. I may say again, with my few short months of experience, that the people of Labrador will thank this government very sincerely. The member for Bell Island has said that if the federal government do not help - pour millions in there - pour millions in there. Such a stupid, stupid remark! Pour millions in there? Where do you think the millions will come from? We are lucky to get hundreds after your twenty-three years, not talk about millions.

MR. NEARY: Twenty-four million from Ottawa.

MR. MURPHY: That is spoken for now - building supplies.

MR. NEARY: How about swimming pools.

MR. MURPHY: Swimming pools, too, are a very important part. I paid for mine, thank God, honestly earned.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is debatable.

MR. MURPHY: Do you want to make that statement? It is debatable, if I paid for my own property? Is that a proper parliamentary remark, may I ask? I would not expect any better from the honourable gentleman, quite frankly.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY: The honourable member gets up on the floor of this House with all the talk about this, that and what he would do and what someone else would do and when he was on this side, he had a three-ply muzzle, not one. They were afraid to open their mouths on anything. We were there, three or four of us on the other side, fighting for many things.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MURPHY: I am just speaking now of the facts. We are speaking on this bill and the remarks of the hon. member for Bell Island, when he stood to speak on this bill. I think it will happen, Mr. Speaker, on this particular bill that when this bill does pass, when the policy is formulated, I am sure, Sir, that all people concerned, anybody who can add to the knowledge that this department has, will be consulted on it, and I can only see brighter days ahead for Southern Labrador and also for all the coastal areas of Labrador. Sir, I have very, very much pleasure in supporting this bill.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The honourable minister is going to speak twofold; onefold as the M.H.A. for Labrador West and twofold as the minister.

AN HON. MEMBER: With a forked-tongue.

MR. ROUSSEAU: With a forked-tongue. I must say that I even enjoyed the remarks of the hon. member for Bell Island and maybe sometime during my tenure of office, I will do something that did not originate with him.

MR. NEARY: Something original.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I look forward to that.

First of all I would like to address a few remarks to the hon. member for Fogo, who suggested that we are extending the services - I suggested in my opening remarks that actually what we are doing is consolidating a division of a previous department as well as another department, together. The services will be extended insofar as we can have them extended

Mr. Rousseau.

with the federal government. It does not mean ipso facto that these services will be extended. I think that government have stated its policy with regard to centralization. This government have

no intention of moving people from any number of communities to a central community unless the people in these communities so desire it. It has to come from the people and I think this government is on record with that policy.

My friend from Labrador South mentions bureaucracy and I could not agree with him more but I think that he would agree with me if I suggested that a certain amount of bureaucracy is certainly necessary, that there has to be some safeguards built in as well because, when you are dealing with public money it is not always what you want to do, it is sometimes, more often what you can do within the ambit of the laws and regulations under which you are functioning. While I agree that at times bureaucracy certainly will hold many things up in government, it serves a purpose too as a safeguard.

I mentioned that last year we had a lot more luck with the char. We left the Salt Fish Corporation as I remember and went to Montreal because the prices there were better. I just had a meeting with the Salt Fish Corporation, again they are looking for the catch and they are welcome to the catch if they can pay the price. We will go to sell the fish where we can get the best price, whether it be with the Salt Fish Corporation or any other body. We certainly would like to sell it to the Salt Fish Corporation in Newfoundland but we have to make sure that the people get the best price possible for this fish.

We are now discussing, my colleague the honourable Minister of Fisheries and myself, transferring a gentleman from his department to my division who would be responsible for the action regarding fisheries on the Coast. That would be a full-time position. The gentleman has been up there at various times looking over the area. (I think last summer he was up for awhile) We intend to make this a full-time position which will give us a full-time fisheries officer available to the people on the Coast.

The honourable member from Bell Island mentioned the affluent

West. I have lived in Labrador West for eleven years and affluent West gets on my nerves now as much as it did eleven years ago and as much as it does on the nerves of the people there now. I suggested that it was the alleged affluence. I do not accept that from my colleagues on this side of the House and much less will I accept it from members on the other side of the House.

We, and I say we, I am talking for some fifteen to seventeen thousand people who do not accept that. Whatever level of living we have reached it is not enough because we have reached what somebody determines to be a standard of living far above anything else in the island. Does that suggest that we stop there now and wait for everybody else to catch us? It does not suggest that, we are still without very many things and I do not think I have ever stood up in the House or stood up on any news media in this province and ever pointed at the previous administration but I am going to do so today and suggest that we have seen nothing in Labrador West and indeed in all of Labrador to a great extent but neglect, for twenty-three years.

I think that the on-going process will certainly create a certain amount of improvement in any area regardless of the government that is there but we have a feeling now, whether that is right or wrong, the feeling is there of neglect. There are instances up there where the gentlemen across the House were involved. In the last few years the park. Before last October's election they sent one man up there with a couple of stakes digging around. As soon as the election was over, out he went. The hole in the ground that was the provincial building, the hospital that is falling apart up there, the roads that have never been done, the promises that have been made, promise after promise, broken promise after broken promise, Labrador was neglected for twenty-three years and the honourable member stands up and gives a litany of what the previous administration did. The previous administration did little if anything for Labrador.

SOME HON MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

There are number of things happening. I am willing to say that the previous administration played some small part in it but I say here and now on my feet that Labrador has been neglected for twenty-three years. I for one am pleased with the reaction of my colleagues during the past twelve months especially since I have been in cabinet. They recognize I think the problems of Labrador very well. They have been extremely sympathetic and for that I am most grateful and I am sure that the people of Labrador share it. Now, it is not going to happen over night but it is not going to take twenty-three years either because I will not stand for twenty-three years of this type of thing. Something has to happen in Labrador or else we are going to be in trouble. There is no question about it, if Labrador is treated in the next few years the way it has been treated in the last twenty-three years, I could see many problems arising.

Certainly, my situation and this I want to point out, is only one aspect of my ministry. There are other aspects as well that I am as concerned with within my department but I am also concerned about Labrador as I represent Labrador in cabinet and the views of it.

I think that the honourable member from Labrador South will, I hope will agree that we have shown every co-operation possible. At least since I have been minister and I am sure since his election that there has not been any great monuments built down there in all truthfulness but nevertheless the little things that could be done

in the instances where the government could extend some help to Southern Labrador, the government has done so with as much speed and with as much dollars as were at its disposal. Now, co-operation is a byword. The co-operation has also been extended to the member for Labrador North who I am sorry is not here today and this co-operation will continue as dollars become available and I think that we can foresee many developments in Labrador.

There are many developments planned, of course, which are not within my sphere to speak about but I stand here knowing that within a

short period of time that marked improvement will be shown in Labrador.

Now, when it comes to the question of money, the federal government if they do not pour it in the provincial government should pour it in. That to me and the fact that Southern Labrador has not been included in the plan that exists in Northern Labrador is an indictment by the honourable member from Bell Island against the Federal-Liberal Government.

The Federal-Liberal Government has not poured anything into Southern Labrador. The Federal-Liberal Government has not poured anything into Western Labrador and the only reason that the Federal-Liberal Government has poured anything into Northern Labrador is because of the fact that there are Indians and Eskimos there and they are caught in the same situation in many other parts of Canada. It is no show of magnanimity on the part of the federal government that this is done. This is law and regulation of the land and it is the responsibility of the federal government and a right of the people to collect this money. So, I do not accept magnanimity of the Federal-Liberal Government for what money is going into Northern Labrador. The same money is going into various areas of Canada where the native peoples are found. So, there is no great magnanimity in the Federal-Liberal Government in their help to the people of Northern Labrador. If there were any way that the Federal-Liberal Government could get out of helping Northern Labrador, I have no doubt that they would. So they are there now because they have to be there and we intend to go to them. Let us just see. I will give a report to the House when the day comes. We will go to the Federal-Liberal Government.

I went to the Federal-Liberal Government a couple of weeks ago. We talked and I wrote a letter. I discussed it with the honourable member from Labrador North, with the honourable member from Labrador South and myself. We decided to write them and find out why we were not in the freight subsidies. So, I wrote the initial letter. I got a letter back. I am not going to report the letter because I would like the other members to see it first but you know it is not the kind of

co-operation I am going to get with regard to extending financial assistance by the federal government in Labrador South and I would say to the honourable member from Labrador South, "do not hold your breath until you get federal government involvement in that area."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: INAUDIBLE.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well, you know, maybe we will. I hope we will. We will stand and wait and hope and if we do, I am the first one to stand up and give due credit to the federal government for it. I say here and now that as far as I am concerned that the money that is going there is going there not by choice but by need because of the regulations and the rules under which they are charged.

Now, the hour being late we can discuss it, I presume at estimate time. The hour being late and some bills wanting to get through, I will clue up the debate, with the urgings of my honourable colleagues here on this side of the House, by moving second reading of the bill.

On motion a bill, "An Act To Amend The Northern Labrador (Social Services And Rehabilitation) Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

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

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Legislative Disabilities Act."

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment to implement; as was indicated in the House when the bill was going through second reading, paragraph 2 should read as follows, paragraphs (c) and (d) of subsection (1) so we have to include in the first line the words, "and (d)." Then on the third line the word "are" should be substituted for the word "is." Then subclause (c) is divided into subclauses (c) and (d) to read as follows: "(1) the Parliamentary Assistant to the Premier; (ii) a Special Assistant to the Premier; or (d) the recognized position of (i) Opposition House Leader, (ii) Chief Government Whip, (iii) Chief Opposition Whip in the House of Assembly." I move the amendment accordingly.

On motion clause 2 as amended, carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause (3) is to be amended to comply with the amendment in clause 2, Mr. Chairman. The amendment will read: (e) (i) the Parliamentary Assistant to the Premier, (ii) the Opposition House Leader, (iii) a Special Assistant to the Premier; or (f) the recognized position of (i) Opposition House Leader, (ii) Chief Government Whip, or (iii) Chief Opposition Whip in the House of Assembly. That is the amendment to clause 3.

On motion clause 3 as amended, carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, there is a further amendment, clause 4 shall be added, "This act shall be deemed to come into force on the first day of January, 1973."

On motion clause 4, carried.

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

A bill; "An Act Further To Amend The Department Of Education And Youth Act."

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

A bill; "An Act Respecting The Department Of Transportation And Communications."

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, with the leave of the Committee I would move that clauses (16) to (72) inclusive carry. There are no amendments.

On motion, clauses (16) to (72) inclusive, with leave, carried.

A Bill; "An Act respecting The Department Of Transportation And Communications."

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

A bill; "An Act Respecting The Department Of Rehabilitation And Recreation."

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, with the leave of the Committee I move that clauses (2) to (40) carry.

On motion, clauses (2) to (40), with leave, carried.

A bill; "An Act Respecting The Department Of Rehabilitation And Recreation."

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

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Forestry And Agriculture."

Motion, that the committee reports having passed the bill without amendments, carried.

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Rural Development."

On motion, Clauses 1 through 7, carried.

MR. HICKMAN: On Clause 8, Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment. 8(4) after the word "assist" in the first line I move it to include the words, "the minister to carry out,".

On motion, Clause 8 as amended, carried.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report progress.

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

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report bills no. 31, 26, 29, and 30 without amendment and bills no. 34 and 55 with amendment and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the committee of the whole reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and have directed him to report bills 34 and 55 with some amendments.

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.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the committee of the whole reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and have directed him to report bills 30, 29, 26 and 31 without amendments.

On motion, report received and adopted.

On motion, bills ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I do move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday at 3:00 P.M. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, March 9, 1973 at 3:00 P.M.