



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 24

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, MARCH 7, 1974

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 ten grade XI students from the Integrated Central High School in Bishops Falls with their teachers, Mr. Oliver Rose and Mr. Thomas Hatcher. I would like to welcome thirty-nine grade VI students from St. Peter's Elementary School from Upper Island Cove with their teacher, Mr. Greeley. I trust that your visit here is most informative and interesting.

A few days ago the honourable member for Bell Island rose on what he considered to be a point of personal privilege. I took the whole matter under advisement to rule on it later.

I have read the transcripts of the comments very carefully and sought advice from various sources and the table.

As far as I can gather from Beauchesne and our own Standing Orders, a matter of privilege should be accompanied by a motion. There was really no motion made by the honourable member from Bell Island. However, I have been looking at the transcripts of the remarks very carefully.

It is the ruling of the Chair that it is really not a point of privilege, it is a matter of opinion as to allegations of the facts, a difference of opinion in regards to allegation of facts between two honourable members and thus I cannot accept the motion from the honourable member for Bell Island on this prima-facie case.

MR. E. ROBERTS (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Before the minister speaks, we, with respect, Sir, would like to appeal your ruling. We could do it either now or if the gentleman wishes to make a statement, I assume that is in order. We would like to appeal your ruling on this side, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that the Speaker's ruling be sustained. Those in favour "Aye". Those against "Nay". In my opinion the "Ayes" have it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: On Division.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Those in favour of the motion please rise: The honourable the Premier, the honourable the Minister of Mines and Energy, the honourable the Minister of Industrial Development, the honourable the Minister of Health, the honourable the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, the honourable the Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment, the honourable the Minister of Public Works and Services, the honourable the Minister of Tourism, the honourable Mr. Marshall, the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries, the honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the honourable the Minister of Transportation and Communications, the honourable the Minister of Rural Development,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I rise on a point of order?

Sir, my understanding of the rules of this House is that a member is not permitted to enter or leave this House when the bar is placed down here by the Sergeant-at-Arms, Sir, and a member did actually walk out of this House after the vote started.

Mr. Neary:

My interpretation of the rules, Sir, is that this is not proper.

It is very serious, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Quite honestly, I am not sure whether one is allowed to leave or not but the Chair did not see anybody leave the Chamber, although the honourable member may indeed have noticed somebody.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance left his seat after the vote started and the bar of the House was placed by the Sergeant-at-Arms. The Minister of Finance walked out of the House, Sir.

MR. MARSHALL: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker: I think Standing Order 83 takes care of it on a division: "Every member present in his place in the House, when the question is put, shall be required to vote." I think everybody who was here when the question was put is rising on the division.

MR. ROBERTS: It is quite simple. The question was being put and a number of us saw the gentleman from St. John's West, the Minister of Finance leave the House. Now if Your Honour did not see him, I mean, Your Honour did not see him. Standing Order 83, the one quoted by the gentleman from St. John's East, Sir, does not take care of the matter because the question was being put.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair did not see anybody leave his place after the vote was counted so it is a matter perhaps of opinion of honourable members. It might have happened. Could the motion continue please.

Those in favour of the motion: (Continued)

Mr. Wells, Mr. Stagg, Mr. Aylward, Mr. Brett, Mr. Peckford, Mr. Senior, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Young and Mr. Evans.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against the motion please rise:

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Gillette, Mr. Woodward, Mr. W. N. Rowe, Captain Winsor, Mr. Neary, Mr. Simmons and Mr. Martin.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

HON. J. C. CROSBIE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of personal privilege and a matter of a breach of the privileges of the members of this House. I will move a motion, Mr. Speaker, when

I am finished discussing this matter for a few moments. The matter which I am rising in connection with are statements made in this House last Monday by the Member for Bell Island, who might better be named, of course, the member for Canadian Javelin Limited. There were statements made, Mr. Speaker, when I was forty-five hundred miles away from this House, in Vancouver, and made in breach of every parliamentary tradition that it is possible to conceive of, and of which I had had no notice.

Mr. Speaker, I am not ready today, having just gotten back in the province at 1:30 P.M., to go into these matters in the necessary detail. I will say this, that every word that the Hon. Member for Bell Island uttered last Monday in this very serious matter was completely false and incorrect as were the contributions of his aiders and abettors, the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for White Bay South, who aided and abetted him with his slanders and libels wherever they could.

Mr. Speaker, the point of privilege that I am going to address myself to is a libel on a member of this House; namely, myself, a libel concerning the character and conduct of a member in that capacity; namely, myself, and the libel is based on matters arising in the actual transaction of the business of this House as outlined on page 98, section 108 of Beauchesne:

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with my motion, when I come to it, I intend to give the member for Bell Island the opportunity to withdraw his charges completely and unreservedly. If he withdraws those charges completely and unreservedly, then I will have no need for my motion.

Looking at the transcript of Hansard of the House last March 4, I have not got the correct page numbers but I will refer to three distinct slanders and charges made by the member for Bell Island against myself, aided and abetted by the member for White Bay South. I have not got the page numbers of this transcript but on page four of the pertinent section the member for White Bay South said; "As I understand it, Sir, it is the case of my honourable friend, the member for Bell Island, that the honourable Minister of Finance misled the House or lied to the House. He is attempting to establish that by putting forward the statement that the minister made and as I further understand it, he has documentary evidence to support his allegations that the minister lied to the House or seriously misled the House."

I therefore take it that the honourable member for White Bay South is also involved in these charges and supports the charges, unless he informs the House differently, unless he was just explaining what he thought the member for Bell Island was doing, but if these are statements of his, if he is endorsing these charges and making these charges, then I will expect him to withdraw them completely or else prove them.

In connection with the honourable member for Bell Island, the pertinent parts of what he had to say or as far as I am concerned these libels and slanders that were uttered last Monday, I will come to the page in a moment. Yes, before that the honourable Leader of the Opposition lent himself to the procedure also when he spoke on a point of order and I quote him; "Before he can make the bald statement that the Minister of Finance has misled this House, as it appears he has," this was the Leader of the Opposition, "my colleague has to read the evidence which supports this case. He is quite

prepared to do so, Sir, and he is doing and I shall submit should be allowed to do it, Your Honour, in the normal way."

I therefore take it that the Leader of the Opposition endorses these charges and makes these charges also, or if he does not then I will expect him to say he does not make or support these charges.

Proceeding further in the transcript, the pertinent section, I am quoting now the honourable member for Bell Island, tape no. 565, "Mr. Speaker, what we have before us is ample evidence that the Minister of Finance not only deliberately misled this House but committed, Sir, a very grave conflict of interest in that the minister acted as both the chief officers of the government in negotiating a cancellation of debt to the province, while at the same time, Mr. Speaker, was associated in at least two ways with the purchasing corporation which had most to gain by such cancellation of debt."

The statement of course is quite incorrect. As a matter of fact I have no connection at all with Bison Brewing which is involved in the cancellation of debt.

Further down on the next page he said; "Mr. Speaker, this is barefaced deceit." That is two charges, one conflict of interest, the second is barefaced deceit, that my statement of February 8 in the House of Assembly was barefaced deceit.

Proceeding further in the transcript, "Mr. Speaker, I charge the Minister of Finance, Sir, with deliberately deceiving this honourable House, misleading the people of Newfoundland, Sir, and in view of the seriousness of this matter, I recommend, Mr. Speaker, that appropriate action be taken by this honourable House, that drastic action be taken against the Minister of Finance for abusing the privilege of this honourable House, Sir, for abusing the privilege of his office for his own personal interest and that immediate steps be taken to consider his impeachment." The honourable gentleman has been following

television and radio in the United States I presume with talks of impeachment.

So, Mr. Speaker, from the Hansard of last March 4, I think I have quoted the pertinent parts as I see it. I have been libelled on three particulars and the honourable member for Bell Island has made three, what he calls, charges. The three ways in which I have been libelled is that first that I deliberately misled the House or lied to the House on February 8, 1974. The second charge is that I have abused the privileges of my office in

my own personal interests and thirdly a very grave conflict of interest. These are the three charges.

Now, Mr. Speaker, unless the Member for Bell Island withdraws these charges absolutely and unreservedly today or tomorrow when I propose to proceed with a motion which I will make this afternoon and when I will have full details on the facts in connection with this whole matter, unless he does I will have to proceed with the motion. I will give the honourable Member for Bell Island now an opportunity to say whether he withdraws these charges absolutely and unreservedly or not.

MR. NEARY: Does the honourable minister need a majority now?

MR. CROSBIE: If you wish to say whether or not you will withdraw these charges. The member does not want to withdraw the charges I gather?

AN HON. MEMBER: If the honourable minister will yield the floor I will get up and speak -

MR. CROSBIE: I am not going to yield the floor, Mr. Speaker, until I have dealt with this matter. These are the three charges.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are not the only examples of the technique and tactics of the honourable the Member for Bell Island. It is MacCarthyism at its worst. It is of a pattern with his behaviour in this House for the last two years. He has done the same thing before in connection with the Member for St. John's East Extern. That matter is now before a commission. He did the same thing outside of the House in connection with the Premier and the shares of Canadian Javelin Limited in that he alleged that there were improprieties in connection with shares that the Government of Newfoundland owned and sold to Canadian Javelin Limited. That is a matter now before the court's.

We have heard him practically every day making insinuations about members of the House, the Member for Trinity South, his trucking business, the Member for Port de Grave and the school bus business he had and so on. So this is all of a piece. But his doing it the other day when the member concerned was not even in the

province, was away on government business across the country reaches a new low.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the members of this House should permit this kind of thing to continue any longer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the detailed answer to these alleged charges I would prefer to give tomorrow (I just got back at 1:30 P.M.) when I will have the full facts and copies of documents, I will answer in detail of these false and malicious charges.

I want to move a motion, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon so I can avoid not being in time. If there is a breach of privilege of the House you have to bring it forward at the earliest possible moment and this is the earliest possible moment I have for bringing this forward.

I therefore give notice, Mr. Speaker, that I will on tomorrow move: That the Member for Bell Island be suspended from this honourable House of Assembly for fourteen sitting days because of a breach of privileges of this House and a breach of this House in connection with myself as the Member for St. John's West, namely consisting of a libel on a member of this House, the Member for St. John's West in the following particulars: First the charge that the Member for St. John's West deliberately misled the House or lied to the House or was deceitful to the House or practiced bare-faced deceit in the House. Secondly; the Member for St. John's West, the Minister of Finance, abused the privileges of his office for his own personal interests and thirdly; that the Member for St. John's West, the Minister of Finance was guilty of a very grave conflict of interest. These are the three allegations.

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that motion and a properly drafted copy of it will be presented to Your Honour this afternoon. Since I only reached the House at a quarter to three I have not had time to get it typed up but it will be.

Mr. Speaker, there will probably be not much point in my elaborating on this today because to support this motion I intend to

give the full facts to the House. I will just say this; that if the Member for Bell Island does not withdraw these charges or the Member for White Bay South does not clarify the position as to whether he makes these charges or not, the Leader of the Opposition does not make it clear whether he makes these charges or not, if they do not make it clear then I say this, that they should be men enough to stand in this House and say they will put their seats on the line.

It is the parliamentary tradition. It is the tradition in every parliament that is worth its name as a parliament that when one member makes a charge against another he must put his seat on the line, that if he cannot substantiate those charges that he must resign his seat. I can tell you this,

Mr. Speaker, if these charges were substantiated, I will certainly resign my seat. I make that very clear. If my character and reputation is not established before this House and upheld by the members of this House, I will resign immediately.

MR. S. NEARY: With that majority, put it in the court.

MR. CROSBIE: I will resign immediately, Mr. Speaker and I expect that if there is an ounce of decency or honesty or any public spiritness at all in the Member for Bell Island he will either withdraw these charges now or tell this House that he is prepared to resign his seat unless he can substantiate all three of those charges.

I expect the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for White Bay South, both lawyers, both of whom know something about the procedure in the House and the traditions of parliament, to either say that they are making these charges also or if not to clarify their position. If they are making these charges also to stand and back it up by offering to resign if the charges are not substantiated.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I will have everything ready to deal with these three charges which are false, malicious, completely untrue and incorrect in every possible particular. Mr. Speaker, I have a character and reputation which I intend to uphold. If the members of this House are not prepared to uphold it, are not prepared to support me in having that upheld, I will leave this House without a bit of regret. I have had in this session and everyone else has had all they can take of the malicious insinuations, innuendo, false charges, slander and libel that are emanating from the other side of the House and in particular from the Member from Bell Island, aided and abetted by, as I have said, by the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for White Bay South.

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

HON. E.M. ROBERTS (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, do I understand first of all that there is now a prima-facie question of privilege before the House? This is the normal procedure?

MR SPEAKER: I have to rule on what takes place and take the notice of motion by the minister under advisement.

MR ROBERTS: So we do not know at this stage whether the question is before the House or not. Is that correct? Fine.

Well, I take it I am allowed to say a word or two with respect to this.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, quite simply, that the Minister of Finance is embarked on a dastardly action in trying to use the legislative majority of this government in tyrannical fashion.

My colleague stood in the House and one can question if one wishes, Sir, his style, his oratorical style, his style of debate, but he presented evidence and I say now he presented it in good faith and he presented it openly and he documented his evidence.

The gist of what he said, in good faith, was that the Minister of Finance had misled this House by saying there was no legally enforceable agreement with respect to the repayment of certain monies alleged and I think in fact owing with respect to Atlantic Brewery and then tracing through a chain of corporate dissent.

The gentleman then went on, the gentleman from Bell Island, and said, again on the evidence, Sir, that in his view there was a prima-facie case that the gentleman from St John's West, the Minister of Finance, thus found himself in the position of conflict of interest.

The matter then led to some heated debate. On both sides there were some points of order. Your Honour recessed the House. In due course Your Honour has come back and has ruled there was no question of privilege, no prima-facie question of privilege.

We appealed Your Honour's ruling but the House did not sustain it. The House sustained Your Honour, and that is that.

What we see now, Sir, is a deliberate plot by the Minister of Finance, aided and abetted by the gentleman from St John's East, who has been saying this publicly for weeks, to stifle those of use on this side of the House, stifle us by using the legislative majority to try to say that if we do not cotton in to them they will suspend us for fourteen days or fourteen hundred days.

Mr. Speaker, the majority rules, but, Sir, the majority in this House is not the majority in Newfoundland, Sir. We will see about that, Sir. We shall see about that. I say, Sir, that I have no intention of withdrawing anything I said in this House and I shall gladly say it outside if the Gentleman from St. John's West would like. I shall gladly say it outside. I have no hesitation there.

Let me say, Sir, and say it quite clearly, my colleague produced evidence and made what we consider and still consider, Sir, to be a prima-facie case. Your Honour has ruled and that is that.

The matter is not a matter of privilege. So be it!

I submit now, Sir, that the gentleman from St. John's West has not made out a prima-facie case of privilege. If my colleague had not made one out and Your Honour has ruled that he has not - Your Honour ruled, as I heard Your Honour's ruling twenty minutes ago, Your Honour ruled that it was a question of difference of opinion of fact between two members and thus does not fall into a question of privilege. I say, Sir, the same thing with respect to the statements made by the Minister of Finance.

He has alleged, he has said that my colleague libelled him. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from St. John's East has been saying for weeks that we are going to be put out of the House. Well, Mr. Speaker, this side can only fight and when the vote is taken, the majority will rule. We shall fight.

But I say, Sir, that this is not a question of privilege. I say that my colleague was acting on information he had come by properly and legitimately and produced honestly and openly. I say, Sir, that the government are not willing to put it to the test.

My colleague was quite prepared and said so a number of times during his presentation, was quite prepared to move the appropriate motion. Your Honour has ruled us out of order. The government can still accept that. The government are not prepared to put the matter to the test. They want to be judge, jury and executioners, Sir. Well, I say to them here and now that I defy them. I say to them here and now that they can put me out for fourteen days if they wish or 1400 days if they wish because they are the majority but they will not silence me, Sir. They shall not silence me. They will not silence anybody on this side.

We are seeing a deliberate attempt, led by the Minister of Finance, a deliberate and conscious and concerted attempt to try to silence the opposition in this House. Well, Sir, they will not

do it. The only way, Sir, in which this opposition shall be silenced is by a general election. If the people of my constituency, Sir, do not wish me to speak in this House, they will take care of it. So will the people who sent each of the forty-two members to this House.

There is a long tradition, Sir, that the opposition have a duty and a right to raise matters affecting the public weal. I submit, Sir, that the evidence presented on Monday by my colleague from Bell Island was such evidence and should so have been presented.

Sir, I submit that there is no question of privilege. I submit that my colleague made allegations in good faith, produced the evidence to support the allegations. Your Honour has now ruled that these allegations are not sufficient, there is not a prima-facie case. So be it!

I say, Sir, the gentleman from St. John's West, the Minister of Finance, has no case at all. It is a vindictive and a tyrannical move by majority. It will not succeed, Sir.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to that. It is Your Honour, the Speaker, who has ruled that the member for Bell Island has not made out a prima-facie case of breach of privilege. I therefore have no way of replying to these scurrilous lies and innuendos, false statements - reply to these charges unless I move my own motion for a breach of privilege in connection with myself. I have no way of answering in this House the charges made falsely last Monday in a cowardly manner when I was out of the province by the member for Bell Island, except by bringing my own motion of privilege which I have done.

The statements made by the member for Bell Island last Monday are definitely libels on a member in the course of his duty. What else can they be?

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us be quite clear. No one is attempting

to silence the opposition nor is it possible to silence the opposition nor does anyone want to silence them. But, Mr. Speaker, the rights of the opposition do not include the right to malign people, to slander people, to libel people, to bring charges against members of this House without giving them notice of the charges, without even contacting them first. It is unheard of, Mr. Speaker, in our system for such grave charges to be brought by a member before this House without even contacting the member he is bringing the charges against or the minister and asking him is there any substance to the charges or what about this or would you explain that. It is unheard of.

Now, the Leader of the Opposition tries to stand up and pretend that he is protecting democratic rights and freedoms. He is protecting nothing of the sort. He is abusing, Mr. Speaker, the privileges and rules of this House in a most despicable manner. The only manner in which I have, Mr. Speaker -

MR. ROBERTS: A point of order. The honourable gentleman from St. John's West apparently is entering into the debate, Sir. If that is in order, so be it, but I understood the only question before the House was whether or not there was now before the House any case. Your Honour has to decide whether or not there is a point of privilege and we are attempting to help Your Honour by bringing forth points. If the honourable gentleman from St. John's West is debating, I would gladly debate with him, Sir; inside or outside.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order. I did not interrupt the Leader of the Opposition. It happens not to be the Leader of the Opposition's character and reputation that is at stake here. So I thank him to let me finish my remarks. He was allowed to make his remarks uninterrupted and I am replying to them. I am pointing out, Mr. Speaker, why this motion that I have proposed today is quite in order.

Is it correct, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition in the House of Assembly has the right to make charges against any member of the House they like, to say he deliberately misleads the House or lies to the House?

In British Columbia, yesterday, the Leader of the Liberal Opposition there, the Liberal Runt, was suspended for a day because he said the Leader of the Government had lied. Yet the three charges made by the honourable member opposed against me; that I deliberately misled the House or lied to the House, that I have abused the privilege of the office for my own personal interest and I had a very grave conflict of interest, and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition now proposes to the members of this House that I cannot bring a motion of privilege on that matter, that I cannot even speak to it because the breach of privilege of privilege proposed spuriously by the member for Bell Island has been found not to be prima-facie -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, if this is not a prima-facie case or breach of privilege then we can forget the privileges of the House entirely and we can forget our character and reputations when we come into this House, they are gone and they are finished.

So, Mr. Speaker, I submit a prima-facie case is being made and that I would like to give notice of this motion which I am prepared to go into in detail and substantiate tomorrow.

HON. L.D. BARRY (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Mr. Speaker, as to whether this question of whether this motion is in order, if I could speak to that point?

MR. SPEAKER: This could lead into a debate and I do not particularly want to get at that state now. I have taken the notice of motion, the comments made by the Minister of Finance under advisement. The Minister of Finance mentioned he was giving the opportunity to either to withdraw, the Member for White Bay South or the Member for Bell Island. The Minister of Finance said that he would give an opportunity to the Member for White Bay South and the Member for Bell Island to withdraw their remarks made, if they so desired.

If they want to rise and speak to that now perhaps that would be in order but I do not want it to get into a full scale debate and I have no intention of doing so.

MR. ROBERTS: May I say a word with respect to the arguments just advanced by the Minister of Finance with respect to whether or not this is a point of privilege?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think I will take the whole matter under advisement. Tomorrow or later today, I will rule on the facts and if it is in order the motion itself will be debated then honourable members shall be given the opportunity to express their comments at that time.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the point I wanted to refer to is the question, carefully not going into the merits of the case but as to whether or not this is a proper motion to be brought. I would like the opportunity to assist Your Honour in reaching his decision, as I think any member is entitled to. Now Your Honour can rule me out of order but I submit that any member is entitled to speak to the question of whether the motion is in order. I would like an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to speak to that and undertaking not to go into the merits of the motion itself, not to debate the motion.

MR. NEARY: The Speaker has made his ruling, has he not?

MR. BARRY: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think this matter has gone far enough I will take the comments made by the honourable members under advisement and rule on it later.

QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Hon. the Premier. Is it correct, Mr. Speaker, will the Premier inform the House that the Premier and the Minister of Finance during their jaunt across Canada in the last couple of days tried to unload the Linerboard Mill at fire sale prices?

HON. F. D. MOORES (PREMIER): It is totally incorrect, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: I am certainly glad to hear that, Sir. Reports came back from -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: British Columbia.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Would the Premier then inform the House what steps his government have taken to make the Bell Island Ferry Service part of the provincial highway system as the Premier promised on Bell Island in 1971?

MR. MOORES: I believe that can be placed on the Order Paper. As far as the Bell Island Ferry is -

concerned, certainly the report that the federal people did, together with the provincial people, as I understand it, the Department of Transportation and Communications are working with the federal people in conjunction with that now. The absolute details of it I do not know but I gladly take notice of the question to find out, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Would the Hon. the Premier inform the House if there has been any correspondence, any discussions with the Government of Canada on this matter since public tenders were called to award a ten year contract to operate that service on the Tickle? Who is going to answer it?

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Minister of Transportation and Communications answer these questions.

MR. SPEAKER: If the Minister of Transportation and Communications wishes to answer the questions, he may. They could be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. T. P. HICKEY (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, I can only confirm that there has been some discussions, that is all at this particular time.

MR. NEARY: Questions: I wonder if the minister could elaborate? What is the nature of these discussions? Is it for the Province to take over the ferry service or is it to be continued by Ottawa? Just what is the nature of the discussions?

MR. T. P. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, that is the exact reason why I am not going to give any further details because the honourable gentleman is like nobody else in reading peoples' minds. I did not say that there was any discussions entered into with regards to the Province taking over the ferry. I just confirmed that there had been discussions. I am not prepared to say anything further on it at this time. When I am in a position to make a statement, I will make a detailed one.

MR. NEARY: A question to the minister: Will the minister be in a position to make a statement before the contract is awarded on the tenders that were just received? I understand that there were two

tenders just received by the Canadian Transport Commission. Will the minister make a statement before the contract is actually awarded because the contract will be for a ten year period and if there is going to be any involvement by the Province, it must be made before then?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to say that I will be in a position to make any kind of detailed statement by that time but there is adequate protection with regards to the tender that is now being called with regards to those discussions. I do not see that it is important that a detailed statement be made before the tender is awarded or before the contract is awarded anyway.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question: Will the minister inform the House if his department intends to put any more money into the Bell Island Transportation System to make possible these extra trips that we had last year? Will these trips be continued again this year?

MR. HICKEY: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not the intention of the government at this time to put any more money into the Bell Island ferry, at least along the lines that we put it in during the past year because it was found to be most uneconomical and in fact the kind of traffic that was on the ferries, that used the ferries, during the extra trips certainly did not warrant that kind of an expenditure. It was only on a trial basis and it was proven to be both uneconomical and in fact warranted to such a degree.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would be prepared to table the information concerning the \$10,000.00 that was spent on the Tickle and the basis for his decision to discontinue these extra trips? Would the minister be prepared to table the information in this honourable House?

MR. HICKEY: I will take that question under advisement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: * Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Industrial Development, Sir, concerning a report that somebody or other has recommended that a steel plant, a new steel plant be built down at Come By Chance. Will the minister inform the House if there is any foundation to this?

If so, would he be prepared to make a statement to the honourable House? Because we just demolished a steel plant and shipped it up to rich Ontario, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Would the minister give us some information on that matter, please?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to know if there is any foundation to the reports, Sir.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Rumors.

MR. NEARY: No, not rumors, reports - public, in the public press, that APEC, I think it was, recommended that a steel plant be built down at Come By Chance near the oil refinery. Is there any foundation to this? Is the government interested in it? Is the government going to do anything about it?

HON. W. DOODY (Minister of Industrial Development): Mr. Speaker, all the information pertinent to this steel mill that the honourable member refers to at Come By Chance is contained in a news letter, the Atlantic Council News Letter, the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council. Some representatives of the Federal Government have been in the Province recently and have been assisted by the department to view various sites and what have you. That is about all the information we have

at the present time but if the honourable member wants to read the newsletter, I will get someone to read it for him. I will certainly make it available.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Would the minister inform the House if all the steel mill down at the Octagon has been dismantled? Is it all shipped out? Is there anything down there we can salvage in case they start up a steel plant in Come-by-Chance or has it all be shipped up to Ontario?

MR. DOODY: If I may, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Bell Island has been "steel mill happy" for the past three or four days. He seems to have some sort of a fixation about the steel mill operation that was once at the Octagon. The type of mill that the federal government are now commissioning Stelco to look at for the Atlantic Provinces is a type of mill that would have an initial 4 million ton capacity of either pellets or concentrates and has absolutely no more resemblance to the old derelict, obsolete, inefficient, uneconomical, unfeasible mill that was out at the Octagon than a motor scooter has to a cadillac. They are entirely two different operations.

Another point is that the mill that the federal government are talking about now would be on tidewater which seems like a more reasonable place to situate a mill which is going to be in the export market than the ill-advised mill some economic genius put out at the Octagon some years ago, probably guided by the expertise of the Hon. Member for Bell Island, which was miles away from tidewater and the scrap that had to be brought in had to be trucked there and when the product was finished, it had to be trucked again to the wharf. The total capacity of the mill was too small to ever make it economically feasible. We had to import something like eighty per cent of the scrap to manufacture anything there and had to export eighty per cent of these products because the market was not the island for it. There is no relation to the two mills at all.

Now as to what is going on out there now at the Octagon, most of the interior of the mill that was sold to Planet Steel has

been removed. I understand that it is being reassembled, parts of it are being reassembled. They have had to scrap some of it and they are trying to find somebody to take the furnace off their hands because it does not work, it is no good. The concast that they bought is also useless, it is too small and no good. What they ended up with was very little for the money they paid.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, these pieces of it that are usable are being reassembled at Barrie, Ontario, which is in a market where scrap is available and where the sales market is also available. I do not know what else I can say about the various steel mills but I hope I have made the member somewhat happier than he has been.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: I would assume that the minister is aware of the fact that Barrie, Ontario is not on tidewater either, where they are reassembling this plant.

MR. DOODY: No, it is in the heart of the industrial -

MR. NEARY: Yes, but it is not on tidewater.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what I want to ask the minister is this: If he would undertake to get some detailed information concerning this steel plant proposal for Come-by-Chance because it could, Mr. Speaker, have a very great bearing on my own district because they would use pellets and concentrates; in other words, iron,ore. The iron,ore on Bell Island could be used for this steel plant.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: What was that?

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, DOSCO proved a fifteen year 's supply before they pulled out, a fifteen year's supply. I said, no such thing. Mr. Speaker, what I want to do is ask the minister if he would undertake to get all the information he can concerning ..?

MR. DOODY: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Okay?

MR. DOODY: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, when can we expect the minister to give us -

MR. DOODY: When the minister gets it. That is simple enough for the honourable member.

MR. NEARY: Would it be within two weeks? Would the minister undertake to get the information within two weeks?

MR. DOODY: I will get it when it is available.

MR. NEARY: Does Planning and Priorities have to deal with it?

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: They could not even see two months ahead for the steel mill down at the Octagon.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. DOODY: Sit down and relax!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

The Address in Reply: I think the Hon. Member for Placentia East adjourned the debate the last day.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate I was dealing with the problems of the province as raised by the members of the opposition. I think the longer one sits here, one is compelled to conclude that the biggest problem really we have in Newfoundland today is ourselves, right here in this House of Assembly. It is scandalous, it is ridiculous, to think that forty-two Newfoundlanders could be elected

by the people of Newfoundland really to govern the country, forty-two. I really feel everyone came here dedicated, concerned and wanting to do the best he could for Newfoundland but this particular session we are here now, as I mentioned the last day, over a month Mr. Speaker, and we have not passed not one bill. We have not even voted on a motion of confidence and this is what we are debating now. The Parliament in Ottawa opened about six or seven days ago, and so far, and there 265 members in that Commons and they have so far voted twice on motions of non-confidence in the government. But what happened here? Just what, Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland are asking themselves just what has gone wrong with the House of Assembly, and when they say the House of Assembly of course they say, "What has happened?" What has happened? Why has it happened? What are we going to do about it?

Mr. Speaker, I think everyone in Newfoundland knows that the House right now has sunk to the lowest level that one can remember, certainly that I can recall, and I was on the staff of the House here for some years. I am not saying, Mr. Speaker, that this all started this year or last year but I do not believe we wasted as much time anytime as has been wasted this particular session.

Here, Mr. Speaker, forty-two of us, what can we say we have done for Newfoundland? What? I would say, Mr. Speaker, if you were to contact any nursery school teacher or any kindergarten school teacher and ask them what has happened in kindergarten or nursery school since Christmas. I bet they would give you better results and accomplishments than what has happened here.

Mr. Speaker, how can we be expected to govern the province if we cannot govern and behave ourselves? How? This House of Assembly is worse than open line. It is worse, because mind you on open line at least there is only one radio station and one moderator and I suppose not all the news media is covering it, but here you have an open season, every day every member of the press, every member of the television station, they are all here, and members continue to

slander and libel each other and what do we do?

No, Mr. Speaker, until we get some respect for ourselves I think the people of Newfoundland, anyone you speak to, I bet any member of this House who moves around, gets out to speak to anyone, they will ask you, "What are you doing in there?" What do you say? What can you say?

It is a farce, Mr. Speaker, it is a farce, it is a farce. You can understand of course in the heat of debate some member saying something about another member but surely if what that member says affects the character of the other individual, as we have seen happen here recently, the least that can be expected of him is to get up and retract it, I say, Mr. Speaker, I say this, that really that that is not enough; that the damage is done once the words are uttered and it is broadcast over all the various news media.

You know the story is told about the individual who had maligned another and after some serious thought he felt a bit bad about it and he went to his confessor and he told him. He said, "I said something about a neighbour of mine that was not

true. I have some second thoughts about it. I mean, what can I do? What can I do to repay that man or to get back his character? In a wise and prudent way he was told, he said, "Take a bag of feathers, take a bag of feathers and throw them to the wind and then go pick up every feather. Pick up every feather and when you have picked up every last feather you have begun, you have just begun to repair the damage that you have done."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. AYLWARD: "You have just begun." It is so easy, Mr. Speaker, it is so easy to get up and slander and slaughter each other. What does it accomplish? Mr. Speaker, we are doing Newfoundland a disservice. Regardless of what political party; N.D.P., Liberal, Conservative, whatever you are as long as there is a Newfoundland I hope we will have elected members, elected by the people to come and govern the country.

Who? Who in his right, sane senses, who, Mr. Speaker, in Newfoundland who has any idea what happened here, unless the man is mad or he is foolish or he is looking for a job, who would be bothered? Who? Ask yourself who. What are we going to end up with? We will be responsible, Mr. Speaker. We will be responsible.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, we all have an obligation and I suppose we have to ask ourselves; what do we do? As far as the rules are concerned I suppose we could start by every one of us learning the rules because let us face it, there is nobody here who really knows, is any expert on parliamentary procedure. Nobody.

An honourable member will get up to a point of order and a point of privilege and a point of this and a point of that and if he talks long and loud enough and you are in the right mood or the Speaker himself, he is permitted to question.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. AYLWARD: No, Mr. Speaker, I think we all have to learn the rules and we must see that the rules are enforced. If we find, as apparently we have found, that the rules just do not work, what do you do? If

the rules do not work you change the rules. You change the rules. If we find that this House of Assembly cannot function and obviously, Mr. Speaker, regardless of what you say, any honest individual who will look at our record since we have been in this House of Assembly he is compelled to conclude that we have not done anything. The government can do nothing right. Nothing, according to the opposition, nothing. Nothing right.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was mentioning about the rules; we seem to feel here that if an honourable member is here for a session before us and he gets up, he knows something about it and they get up on points of privilege and points of order. Mr. Speaker, before we really concern ourselves with the privileges we have rights as well. Talk about privileges, even the rights of honourable members are being abused in this particular House. Why? Mr. Speaker, Because we are taking liberties and we are not respecting the Chair and also, Mr. Speaker, - just look at the question period alone.

In this House of Assembly for years and years and years there was not an oral question, now we spend half the day answering a few questions because some honourable member will want to get his name in the paper, or raise some question to - the rule is being flaunted, Mr. Speaker. The whole purpose of that was to enable the opposition to ask the members of the government questions respecting urgent and public matters. That is not what is happening here. That is not what is happening here.

Any matter that is felt to be a noteworthy thing and somebody can get his name in the paper will get up and ask about it. No, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the existing rules are being abused and we must change the rules. If I were the House Leader, Mr. Speaker, what I would do is forget all the other orders of business. We have on the Order Paper some suggested changes to the rules of the House of Assembly and this would be a good start

and who in Newfoundland could accuse us, Mr. Speaker, of forcing rules or limiting the time of debate? Who, after they have listened for a period of a month or more to us? No, Mr. Speaker, I think these rules should be changed and should be changed immediately.

Also, Mr. Speaker, if we find that that age old and historic right given members of the assembly, that they can without fear of being open to a civil suit say things that outside of the House of Assembly we would be responsible for that - then, if we abuse that, we should change it. Let us remove that immunity from members. Whatever they do elsewhere, if we find in this assembly that people are abusing it, well then we change it.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for Bonavista South said I think in his concluding remarks only a day or so ago that unless something were done, he was not going to come back to this honourable House. He did not feel that he was doing the district, the province or himself any good. Mr. Speaker, he had a very, very significant and important point because what really are we doing? We are doing absolutely nothing only wasting time when we should be getting on with the business of the province.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose really one big answer would be if we could only enlist the support of the press because how powerful they are, how powerful the press really is! If the press really reported, if they felt that any member was here and he talked for an hour and a half or two hours and he wasted that much time, tell the people the honourable member wasted an hour and a half or two hours today. Give the people the facts. If the people really knew - do not let us talk, talk, talk. If they see that an honourable member - they are not stupid men, God help them! they must be great to be able to retain their sanity and stay up there and listen to this day in and day out and try to get enough to report.

I say to them, Mr. Speaker, if they see and hear honourable members

talk and talk and talk and talk and waste time, that is enough, that is the headline. If they see headline seekers and that is what they are doing, report that. That will bring a big stop to it. That will bring a big stop to it and it will probably go further than a lot of our ideas that we may have with respect to the rules themselves.

Can you imagine being compelled by a statute to have fourteen here every day to listen to it and then someone will strike up this ingenious idea if there are only thirteen to go outside and ask Your Honour to ring the bell and call for a quorum to get fourteen in. Now, why are they here? Just to keep it open and to keep it going?

I really feel, Mr. Speaker, that something must be done and must be done quickly. As I said a good start would be to get at the rules themselves.

The degree of frustration, Mr. Speaker, is something terrible. My honourable friend here - I hope he will not mind me saying it - a day or so ago when we were debating the important of forestry legislation, going on and on and on some honourable member - he said to me, "My God, if they do not soon shut up, I will go burn the forests." That was an example of the frustration of anybody to just sit down and listen. Not once, twice but ten times a person will say the same thing over and over. If you would only enforce, Mr. Speaker, the rule of relevancy and repetition.

You know, if your children got on with it in school, if there is any other area or arena of society where people can get up and talk and talk and talk and say the same thing fifty times - well, that is what happens here. As I said before, this honourable and learned gentleman said, "My God, if they do not soon shut up, I will go out and burn the forests. At least they will have nothing to talk about." That, Mr. Speaker, while it may be funny, I think it makes a very, very important point.

So, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can and will get down to business here.

I am going to make a start because I will not use the hour and a half that is allocated to me and I will indicate to the House Leader that if he wants to get on with the business of the House, I will certainly forfeit some of my time and presumably twice a year, we as private members get a chance to get up and tell the people of the province, and the people of our district, of the great problems that confront the area.

So in fairness to my constituents, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down I intend to touch briefly on those. But I would like to just speak generally on this particular debate, this debate now. We are debating a motion, brought in by the honourable member for Fogo concerning what really amounts to a vote of nonconfidence in the government, that we have not done enough to create more employment and we have not cut down the cost of living and all these items.

MR. WM. ROWE: There is no quorum.

MR. AYLWARD: Now, Mr. Speaker, this is another ingenious piece. Now we will wait five minutes while you will get fourteen.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): We have a quorum.

MR. AYLWARD: Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had this debate going on for some days and the honourable member for Bonavista South, his big criticism, he says about the government that they are not doing anything. Really what is wrong with the Minister of Finance is that this is a big argument, that we are running the country like a business, you cannot run the government like a business, that is what they are saying. If only the Minister of Finance, if only he could say to the people of Newfoundland, "I am going to leave the portfolio of Finance and I am going to ask the honourable gentleman from Bonavista North to come down and take over the Treasury." I would like to ask the people of Newfoundland, who they would rather have on the Treasury benches of the province today, the present Minister of Finance or the honourable gentleman from Bonavista North.

He says that is all is wrong with Newfoundland, is that this crowd over here, they are running this like you should run a business. Now, Mr. Speaker, the main object of a business is to make money. If you are in business at all and you want to succeed, you try to stay alive and if you want to stay alive you stay alive by making money, by making money.

Now I do not really think that we are that successful or certainly our predecessors. We were over, what was it, a billion, two hundred million, and our debt today is around a billion, four hundred million. We borrowed two hundred million last year, another two hundred million the year before, and probably have to borrow more this year. It is only reasonable to think within the next three to four years we will probably hit the two billion dollar mark. In other words the national debt of the province will be two billion.

Now I would like to know what type of business could last very long going at that rate. But they say, "Oh no, this is the problem, you are running it like a business." How ridiculous, Mr. Speaker! Then the big quarrel is that the government is not creating more jobs. Now if you create more jobs people will only work if they are paid, if they are paid. If you are going to pay people it costs money. Where is the money going to come from, Mr. Speaker? Where is the money going to come from? It is all very well to talk about these great programmes and there should be more on education and there should be more on roads and there should be more for the university and there should be more to keep down the cost of living but ask ourselves, Mr. Speaker, and we must as sensible men, just where in Newfoundland are these dollars going to come from? Where? Are we going to increase the sales tax, the gasoline tax, the liquor tax? Where? Where?

Then, Mr. Speaker, the big question if you borrow you borrow too much. You are borrowing too much. The honourable member who spoke on education, the honourable member for St. Barbe North, he really

had the answer, he really had the answer to all of the problems of the Minister of Education. They were very, very simple. He said, "The school boards are looking for more money," he says. "They want to build more schools." Everybody with any common sense in Newfoundland knows today that the biggest thing we need, one of our big needs is education, Mr. Speaker, and spend all the money you can on it. That is not debatable. Everybody agreed with that.

But he says, "You are not spending it. You are not borrowing enough." But then he says in the next breath, "Look what you borrowed the year before, if the previous government had to borrow at the same rate you borrowed per year, \$200 million for twenty years, we would be over \$ 2 billion."

Now what do you do with that? Mr. Speaker, that is the reasoning, that is the reasoning. One man gets up and says, "What is wrong?" It is a very simple question. "You are running the country like a business. Forget business. Go on. Borrow away. Get all you can." What happened to Newfoundland when we did it? What is our history?

There are members in the gallery, members who are much older than any of us here who can remember it. I bet the honourable gentleman from Red Island, if he could only speak, if he could only get up and stand up and speak here, he could tell us what happened in the thirties. He could tell us. These older people who are listening to the nonsense that we are getting on with here in this House of Assembly, 'borrow more money.'

Mr. Speaker, that would not be so sad, it would not be as sad but the Leader of the Opposition gets up and he is a very learned and intelligent man and you sit down and you listen to that man, and you see these men they know the problems, they sat in the ministry, they realize what it is to try to govern this province. They know. But he gets up and he points to the wonderful theory brought forth by the honourable gentleman from Bonavista North, that

the whole trouble with the Minister of Finance is that he is trying to run the country like a business. How ridiculous Mr. Speaker, and as I said before, what was his answer? It is no trouble in education. He talked around and I sat there listening because I found his statistics and a lot of what he said very, very interesting and informative and I listened intently to his suggestion as to how we get more money and this was it. He said just incorporate a school corporation, just incorporate a crown corporation and then, Mr. Speaker, it was a simple thing, you just go out and you borrow for twenty years and the government guarantees it. You get all the money you like. You build all the schools you like.

Now that is just like saying to you, Mr. Speaker

You go down to your bank and you borrow \$10,000.00, \$20,000.00 or perhaps you do not borrow at all but assuming that you are one of us who do borrow now and then and he smiles, perhaps he does not borrow but assuming that that gentleman goes down to the bank and he wants \$20,000.00 and he gets twenty and he goes down next month and he wants \$5,000.00 more and he gets that. He goes down the next month and he gets \$5,000.00 more but after a while, as nice looking as he is, the bank will say, "Well, now I think that we have to have a serious look at this." You know, how far can you go and he will say, "Oh, yes, that is all right, I will guarantee it and he guarantees it but the times comes when they say, "Look, we really believe that this honourable gentleman, even with his good job, he cannot pay it back if we give him any more."

So, he has reached his capacity but the answer for him is then - he does not go down as Fred Stagg, he just says Fred Stagg Limited, and there is no more trouble then. He just goes in and says, "Here, now I will pay this back in twenty years". Because Mr. Speaker, what the honourable gentleman said is that we just get this crown corporation and go borrow the money.

Now, the same thing could be done for water and sewerage. I have in Placentia, in Placentia, Mr. Speaker.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: ... do not have water and sewerage....(inaudible)

MR. AYLWARD: I know what is done. I know the Municipal Development Corporation. You do not tell me. I know what is done.

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

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: ...built their highways...(inaudible)

MR. AYLWARD: I will finish that. I will deal with that. The Attorney General is stealing my thunder here.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. AYLWARD: No. Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak till the people of Newfoundland get the idea that what is wrong here - that we are not spending enough money, obviously. Everything that the people are supposed to vote against the government for - We are not doing it because why? We do not have the money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if it were as simple as that all one would do is just go out and you just borrow all the money and build all the schools and as I said before, for water and sewerage. The people in Placentia, the doctors there have told me that they themselves will not drink the water in the wells in Placentia. It is contaminated or they feel that it is a potential health hazard. We have ninety per cent of the wells tested in Southern Harbour and the honourable Minister of Health is leaving now but he accompanied me to meet the Minister of Municipal Affairs and he fortified that a potential health hazard exists in that community.

In Fox Harbour, I have a report here, Mr. Speaker, it says again a very serious potential health hazard exists in that community because of the sewerage and drinking water. Now, if the simple answer to that is to tell the Municipal Development Corporation instead of borrowing \$10 million, borrow \$50 million or \$100 million, we would all be very very happy, Mr. Speaker, everyone, everyone would. Surely I would because it is one of the greatest needs in that area. It is the same way with highroads in the district of Placentia East. We have the Cape Shore Road which I am almost fed up talking about here, Mr. Speaker. We have eighteen miles of road, the worst road in the Province. Nothing has been done on it since 1949, except maintenance. That is all that has been done on that particular piece of road.

Now, the answer to that would be just as simple. We will get another corporation and borrow for twenty years and build all these roads but everybody knows, Mr. Speaker, that it is just not that simple because your capacity to borrow money is predicated upon your ability to repay it. Anybody who loans anyone money, even a province, they expect to get that money back. It is easy enough, I suppose, for any individual, who has never borrowed any money, to go down and borrow his first loan but do you borrow, borrow, borrow? If you do, Mr. Speaker, just what would be the end of it?

Mr. Speaker, I say, anyone who is at all familiar with the

financial position of this Province and they see that last year alone, on current account, we had \$448 million to spend on current account, \$448 million and of that \$448 million, Mr. Speaker, \$401 million was already committed. There was nothing any government could do about it, with the programme the previous administration or even this administration had entered into. They had ninety per cent of the money they had on current account to run the Province already committed.

Now, if any of you who are on salary and ninety per cent of your money is already committed, now what do you do? How much can be done? Just a quote, Mr. Speaker, "Of the projected current account expenditure of \$448.3 million in 1973, \$401.9 million or about ninety per cent is committed to major government programmes. The remaining \$46 million can for all intents and purposes be considered as being committed to other existing programmes." So that is what is left.

Now, if you do not have the money, Mr. Speaker, you can only borrow it or raise taxes and no one, Mr. Speaker, no one on the other side of the honourable House has even suggested that the taxes be raised.

So, I say, Mr. Speaker, this great answer to education, if it were as simple as that, the same answer could be applied to highways, the same thing could be applied to roads but it is not that simple. The other honourable gentleman, the member for Hermitage, he spoke in the debate and it was his first time. I listened very intently. I was very, very, like other members here are, anxious to listen to the gentleman for the first time. I thought that he made some very, very excellent points on the rural development but he again on the \$4 million that this honourable gentleman, the honourable the Minister of Rural Development, had distributed throughout the Province, he was not saying, "Oh, you did not spend enough" but he was very, very smart. He said that you were spending it in the wrong places, you should spend it where you are spending it but you should go on out into rural Newfoundland and he gave us his own definition of rural Newfoundland but that

upon analysis meant one thing, Mr. Speaker, more money, more money. He did not say, "Cut him off ' but give more to the other areas." Now, where is the money? Where is the money going to come from? What does the honourable gentleman from Labrador who entered the debate, Mr. Speaker - this was really, this took the cake, this took the cake. This man got up and he said it makes him sick, it makes him sick. He said that he cannot understand how the honourable Minister of Finance, he almost hates Labrador, he hates, and that is why Fred Rowe cannot get ahead because the Minister of Finance hates the people in BRINCO. He said, "We could have developed the Lower Churchill".

Mr. Speaker, if we never develop the Lower Churchill, I say it would be better than to develop it on the same basis that we developed the Upper Churchill. I am so glad to see him return to the chamber because here he is a very, very, good successful businessman, Mr. Speaker.

MR. M. WOODWARD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Has the honourable member referred to

Hansard? I did not state that the Hon. Minister of Finance hated BRINCO. I said that there was a passionate hatred for the honourable minister by the people of Labrador. I would like for him to retract that statement.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to retract anything I said that was wrong, unreservedly, if I said anything about any one or I misinterpreted what they said. It was quite clear, there is no mistake about this, Mr. Speaker, whatever he said or did not say, he said this that the only reason why the Lower Churchill was not developed was because the Minister of Finance would not let BRINCO do with the Lower Churchill what they did with the Upper Churchill. Now that is it! Will he deny that? Will he deny that he gave a clear and distinct impression that the thing that is hanging up BRINCO is the Minister of Finance with his conditions.

MR. WOODWARD: (Inaudible).

MR. AYLWARD: The honourable member may feel free to interrupt me. I would be very, very glad. Now, Mr. Speaker, when we think of this wonderful resource, the biggest hydro potential, the only undeveloped one I suppose, certainly in Newfoundland and Labrador, what are we asked to do? We are asked to give it to BRINCO. Give it to BRINCO, like we did, on the same terms and conditions? What did the Minister of Finance say, Mr. Speaker, when he dealt with this matter so frequently and so often? He said that we are very, very anxious to develop this.

When the press carried, only the last week of when the Premier and the Minister of Finance and other ministers were off throughout Canada discussing this whole matter - what were they trying to do, Mr. Speaker? They were trying to get a better deal so we can get more money; we can get better returns. What are we getting from BRINCO today? The figure that we are losing,

Mr. Speaker, the Province of Quebec is getting in revenue because they are able to buy the power that is developed on the Upper Churchill so cheap. It is costing the Province of Newfoundland - if we had the same return that Quebec is receiving, about \$165 million a year, it would do a lot with schools; it would do a lot with education. Now are we going to do the same thing? Do the people of Newfoundland want this government to say to BRINCO: "Yes, take the Lower Churchill, the last we got left." Well, Mr. Speaker, if everybody in Labrador, if every man, woman and child in Labrador, I doubt if they had the facts put before them that they would agree with that.

What did the minister say? Mr. Speaker, we were losing money, if it can be believed. This province was actually losing money. "Since the agreements entered into with CFLCo. by the previous administration provided that the Government of Newfoundland must pay over to CFLCo. fifty per cent of all the corporation income tax paid by CFLCo. to Ottawa and rebated by Ottawa to Newfoundland, this provision in the new equalization formula would have resulted in the province losing revenue." We would be losing money. The net effect on the treasury would have been that the province would lose one and one-half dollars of revenue for every dollar it received from Ottawa relating to corporation tax paid by CFLCo. For every dollar and fifty that they paid, we lost one dollar. We are not losing enough money? We are not losing enough money, Mr. Speaker. We should give it to them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he continues: "We have made it clear that the returns from the province from any further development on the Churchill River will have to be substantially greater than the returns from the Upper Churchill development." These conditions, Mr. Speaker, which were attached, which were non-negotiable, are excellent conditions and I hope and pray that not alone will they not be departed from but if at possible that improvements can

be made to make a better deal. It says: "The province will not grant any exemption from the provincial sales tax." We are not prepared to give BRINCO the same concessions, pay no sales tax, pay no gasoline tax nor no rebate on your income tax. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, what this honourable gentleman should be so interested in: "The province also insists that there must be constructed as part of the capital cost of the development of the Gull Island site a transmission line from Gull Island to Happy Valley."

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are the conditions that are not negotiable and I think, Mr. Speaker, that every member of this House, no matter what side he is on, should stand up and support the Minister of Finance and tell him what a wonderful job he is doing and give him what support and help we can. To hear anyone say, "this is criminal"- Mr. Speaker, it is the same with the forestry policy that is brought in.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great new policy to bring the management and control of the forests of the province under the management and control of the province. That is considered a fraud! That is a fraud!

Mr. Speaker, I think there are a lot of problems facing Newfoundland. The big problem is that of money. If we are to succeed and to provide the public services to which our people are entitled, we need every cent we can get. The only way we can get these monies, Mr. Speaker, is to see to it that the undeveloped resources that are left in the province, that the returns are the best possible that can be expected for the province. We must create - I think that this is what the government are seeking to do, not in an atmosphere of great statements, propaganda, fanfare, but trying quietly, slowly, soberly and deliberately to lay a good, sound, economic base that will provide a climate in which the people of Newfoundland can themselves be productive, create jobs and employment and as a result more monies will be brought in to the treasury of the province in different forms

of taxation and, of course, the returns from the people who develop our resources will be a lot better.

Mr. Speaker, I will not continue for any great length other than just to say this that today in Newfoundland, we need the best efforts of the best people that we can muster to run our affairs. There are a lot of problems facing and confronting Newfoundland. We are elected to get on and try to do that. The quicker, Mr. Speaker, we get down to business in this House of Assembly and let the government get on with their work, I think we will be doing a good job for the province. Mr. Speaker, I promise not to spend my whole hour and one-half - the House Leader is looking at me.

AN HON. MEMBER: Move the adjournment.

MR. AYLWARD: I will move, rather than lose a few moments, at my discretion, I think there is some legislation he wants to get through

so I will just move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion debate adjourned.

Motion, second reading of a bill; "An Act Further To Amend The Co-operative Societies Act." Bill no. (7).

HON. W.G.DAWE (Minister of Provincial Affairs): We have several amendments to this bill. Perhaps the most important one is that at the present time our legislation does not provide for a Deputy Registrar of Co-operative Societies. It is important to have such a person because in cases where the registrar is out of the province or out of his office, for one reason or another there is nobody to sign certain important documents and orders.

This amendment would establish a post of assistant registrar. Under section (29c) it would propose to broaden this particular section to ensure that logging and sawmill operations are included as forms of manufacturing. A new section which will be provided deals with negotiable bills of exchange. At the present time there is nothing in the Act whatsoever to deal with this and we have two societies in the province who provide this form of service to their patrons.

This is a sort of a chequing account whereby cheques can be drawn on the accounts of individuals in these societies. We have two in the province, the Teachers' Credit Society and Terra Nova Credit.

Also we would propose to provide the minister with authority under the act to make certain rules governing the use of negotiable bills. At the present time the act stipulates that returns on monies which are invested in societies, I think it is six per cent at the present time, and the societies are having difficulty in acquiring the necessary investments because six per cent today is not attractive when they can receive much higher, something like nine per cent in other private industry. We propose to change the rate to nine per cent per annum.

We would also like to have some say in the amount of and system of bonding of officers and employees of co-operative Societies. There is a section in the bill which will deal with this and will give the registrar authority to ensure that the bonding is suitable for the purpose desired.

One other section which is dealt with here would provide for the administrator when he is appointed, to administrate or manage a co-operative society with the power to sell or borrow on the security of property under his administration. There are instances where credit societies and co-operatives find it necessary to place the operation under an administrator who would be appointed under the act. At the present time he does not have enough leeway under the act as it is presently constituted. That is the summary, Sir, of the various amendments which we have proposed for this act.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for White Bay South:

MR. W.N. ROWE: There is nothing very lengthy to be said on this. It is in line with the other legislation before the House, of a very minor nature, procedural in nature, nothing substantive at all in the bill before the House, nothing needs to be said on it. The minister has given an explanation of it. It is just a very minor piece of legislation as in keeping with the other eighteen or twenty pieces of legislation before the House. We have no objection, Sir, to what the minister proposes and I would assume we can have a vote on it immediately.

On motion, bill read a second time ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion, second reading of a bill; "An Act Further To Amend The Maintenance Act." Bill no, (9).

MR. W.W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Social Services I would like to present this bill. The gist of this bill is to provide, to broaden the kind of officer that a person has

to report to when being ordered by a judge to make maintenance payments. Previously it was only a welfare officer or probation officer and now the court can order the Court Clerk or any other officer of a court of a judge as defined by paragraph - that is the judge, the Family Court Judge or the Magistrate, direct.

It also, Mr. Speaker, dispenses if in the judge's discretion thought necessary, for the reporting to anybody. Under the present legislation a judge must order that the person against whom a maintenance order has gone must report to a certain officer, be it a welfare officer or what you. This is not always deemed to be necessary and so it gives the judge a discretion to dispense with the necessity of reporting to any person but in addition broadens the people that one has to report to in instances such as this, if a judge deems it necessary for a report to be made at all.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the minister has not given a satisfactory explanation for the introduction of this bill, Sir. He has merely read the explanatory notes and the various sections of the bill, Sir, and I am going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, because this is a matter that I want to put a number of questions to the Minister of Social Services on when he resumes his seat in this honourable House. I am going to suggest, Sir, that this bill be deferred until we can get somebody

in the House and who know what they are talking about in connection with this bill.

MR. MARSHALL: If that is all of the contribution the honourable member can make to the debate, I will give him the explanation. The explanation is here, it is a bill for the purpose of enlarging the numbers of people that a person may report against, for whom an order has been made and also it allows the judge to dispense with making any such order. I do not really see that there is any necessity for any further explanation. It has been explained properly and I would move second reading.

On motion, bill read a second time ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion: a bill, "An Act To Amend The Pesticides Control Act."

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): The Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment.

HON. W. G. DAWE (MINISTER OF PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT): Mr. Speaker, in moving this amendment I would just like to say this is merely another bit of housekeeping to straighten out the Pesticides Control Act and to bring the penalty clauses in line with the "Waste Material Disposal Act of 1973."

MR. SPEAKER: (MR. STAGG): The honourable the Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is the P.C. bill, Pesticides and Control. Sir, it is not the most important bill to come before this honourable House but while we are on the matter of pesticides I wonder if the minister would tell us in winding up the debate if he knows anything at all about the conference that is going to take place in St. John's later on this month concerning tropical flies that carry tropical diseases? I would image this would come under this bill, Mr. Speaker, and I would like for the minister to give an explanation to the House of just what this conference is all about.

Sir, we have no objection to this particular bill. I do not know if it will put any bread on the tables of the ordinary citizen of this province or not, Sir, I doubt it very much.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I think the convention or meeting whatever it is that the honourable member mentioned is being conducted by the Memorial University. I have not been informed of it officially, I do not know all that much about it but I would imagine that the Pesticides Control Board would perhaps know something of it and would probably be participating.

On motion, bill read a second time ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion: a bill, "An Act To Amend The Insurance Adjusters Act."

MR. DAWE: This bill presently provides that the fees be set under a schedule requiring that each time the fees are changed there must be an amendment to this bill. All this amendment does is to authorize these fees to be set by regulation.

MR. W. N. ROWE: The minister, Mr. Speaker, rises in his place blandly states that, oh, all this does is takes away the power of this House of Assembly to do certain things and reposes it in the government, the cabinet who can make up their minds as to what the fees are going to be, in secret session convened, in a secret meeting without any chance to debate or to enquire into the propriety of raising or lowering fees as the case might be.

Mr. Speaker, I think the minister owes it to the House to give some reason besides the bland statement he made a minute ago to give some reason why the House, why the government require that this be done. If the government have nothing to fear or to hide or to tremble at with regards to a fees structure then they should not have any problem with bringing it into the House and having the thing passed in two or three minutes in this House. It is not going to take anybody's time. If on the other hand this is an example of the consistent attempts shown by this government to arrogate unto itself as much power as possible and to try and wear away, fritter away and gnaw away at the authority of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has diverted away from the bill in question, I will ask him to remain relevant.

MR. ROWE, W. N. I would like for Your Honour to explain to me how I am diverting from the bill here, I would be most pleased to hear it because I will know how to conduct myself in the debate, Mr. Speaker.

Your Honour, I am saying that this is an example -

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): The honourable member is citing an example of - some type of an affair of that nature, I consider that irrelevant and ask the honourable member to direct himself to the bill in question.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Thank you, I see now what Your Honour is getting at. I suppose I could be straying outside of the strict relevancy of the principle of a bill although it is the first time Your Honour has been known to leap to his feet in such a manner.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat again that the minister should, unless other people wish to speak on this bill which should be a very small and minor piece of legislation. It is like the other bills before the House as I said, mere housekeeping, minor procedural stuff, no substance at all before the House in the way of legislation. It is offensive especially for this particular minister to come in here, Mr. Speaker, and to say, "Oh, all that this is, oh, this is nothing, this is merely a bill which will amend the Insurance Adjusters Act to authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council," Now that is the cabinet, Mr. Speaker, the cabinet consisting of partisan individuals banded together in a conspiracy, probably a conspiracy in the best sense, secretly to govern this province by Order-in-Council.

Now normally one does not mind the responsible government having certain powers in certain minor matters, in important matters if one wants to have the thing debated fully and widely as possible in a House of Assembly, in this kind of a forum. So I would ask the minister not to be quite so insulting when he is introducing this kind of a bill. Why does the government want this power?

Why does the government wish to fix the fees payable in respect of the issue or renewal of licenses to insurance adjusters by themselves in secret session convened rather than having the fees set out in the act, which act can be amended simply and easily in a couple of minutes in this House of Assembly? Why does he want to do that?

I submitted, Sir, earlier when Your Honour drew me to order, that this bill - I do not think I am out of order or irrelevant - that this bill is part of the design of this government arrogantly to arrogate unto itself power that should be left in this House of Assembly. I am not saying that this is the most important thing in the world but, Sir, it is sort of in a picture made from certain points, little points on an overall picture. After a while the picture itself emerges, a picture of the way that this province or this government is attempting to govern this province.

I would ask the minister - unless somebody else wants to speak - to give a little more of an explanation, Mr. Speaker. Tell us why he is using the majority of this House, is using the big stick in this House to take away from this House certain powers, minor as they might be. Why is he doing it? What does he fear from public debate of this matter even if it is a minor matter? Why is he doing it? Why is the government doing it?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my colleague is absolutely right, Sir, in requesting that the minister give a better explanation than he gave when he introduced this bill. The minister merely read, Sir, from the explanatory notes. I followed him very closely, Sir. My colleague pointed out, this is like a jigsaw puzzle, Sir, it is just another little piece that they are fitting in. They are gradually chipping away at the authority of this honourable House, Sir. They cannot stand debate.

Sir, if this is a good amendment, it will stand up to debate in this honourable House. The minister should give us a proper and thorough explanation of why the minister wants to put the authority

in the cabinet to fix the fees payable in respect of the issue of renewal licenses? Why? Is there something gone wrong with the old system? Was it slow? Did it get bogged down in bureaucratic red tape? Why does the minister want this right? Is it because they want to fix fees for some and not fix fees for others? It could be abused, Mr. Speaker. It could be highly abused. We have seen this honourable crowd abuse privileges before. Mr. Speaker, the people of this province do not trust this honourable crowd to do anything.

So, Sir, I agree with my colleague that the minister should state clearly and concisely, simply why he wants this authority put in the hands of the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council which really is the Premier and the cabinet.

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I think what they are getting on with is ridiculous, absolutely. What are we going to do? Are we going to price the adjusters out of the province now or are we going to soak them \$1,000 for a license or something? Do you think that would be sensible for anybody, even a lunatic would not do it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why do you not take it before the House?

MR. DAWE: Yes. Under this present act every time the fees are changed, even if it is one cent, it has to come before this House. That is ridiculous. It is a waste of time to the House. There is no need for it at all. It is only a routine thing. It is not that important to get so upset about at all. It is not necessary, Sir. It is a mere routine of my department and all they want is the authority to be able to access the fees properly and have them set through an Order-in-Council.

On motion a Bill, An Act To Amend The Insurance Adjusters Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion second reading of a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The

Adoption Of Children Act."

MR. PARSHALL: Again, Mr. Speaker, this is an act standing in the name of the Minister of Social Services who is out of the House and will be out of the House for a little while yet.

The purpose of this act - there are two or three purposes. First of all, it broadens the bill. Previously it stipulated that a father or a mother who without the prior consent of the director of child welfare gave the child into adoption was guilty of an offense and punishable by a fine not exceeding \$100. This broadens the bill to beyond mother or father to or any other person. It will include grandparents. It will include anybody that puts a child up for adoption without going through the procedures as set down in the act through the director.

It also increases the fine from a maximum fine of \$100 to a maximum of \$2,000 as it is felt that this would be a very, very serious offense and that such a fine is more in line with what should be now at this stage of the game.

Section 3 of the bill also extends the limitation period. Previously the period for bringing in action was one year. Now, the period is extended to an unlimited time apparently. It may be instituted at any time.

I might indicate that the procedures in this bill are very rarely implemented, very rarely used but it is necessary for this provision to be there to put some teeth in the bill. The situation in Newfoundland is rather unique because it really fully protects the child. In other jurisdictions, the process of adoption is rather involved because, as the member for Bell Island is aware, the services of lawyers are rather expensive and the services of a lawyer are rather necessary in other jurisdictions. Whereas here in Newfoundland there are no expenses involved in adoption because it is all within the province of the director of child welfare and the procedure has worked very well.

This amendment to the Adoption of Children Act is one to broaden the scope of operation of the director and it is very necessary.

MR. NEARY: MR. Speaker, in my opinion this amendment to an Act Further To Amend The Adoption Of Children Act, 1972 puts too much power in the hands of the director. As far as I can see, Sir, the amendment is unconstitutional, undemocratic and could encroach on peoples' human rights, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, it is the right of any mother or any father to determine who is going to look after his child, not the government, not the director of child welfare. It is the right of the mother, the right of the father, Sir. What this bill is doing is forcing - what they are trying to do is force the illegitimate mother to give up her child because the director can say no, you are not putting your child in with you parents. You are not putting your child in with you uncle or your grandmother

or your grandfather. As the minister said, the director will decide in whose home the child will be placed. The director could decide to put the child in a foster home. The director could decide to put the child up for adoption. It is undemocratic, Sir, what they are trying to do in this piece of legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could understand and from my experience as minister of that department, Sir, I can understand there are extenuating circumstances. There are cases when a girl would have a baby out of wedlock and out of desperation she may have no choice if she wants to keep the child but put it in, say, a home of her drunken father. In these cases, Sir, I would agree that the director should be able to step in and say; "No in the best interest of that child that environment is not conducive to raising that child in a good, healthy atmosphere. We say no, we will find a home for the child."

That is not what they are saying here, Sir. They want a blank cheque so that every child that is born in Newfoundland, after this amendment passes, out of wedlock the director, just imagine, the director decides what is going to happen to that child. The director could be a sadist, he could be unstable, he could be a homosexual for that matter, he could be anything but to put the authority into the hands of one individual, Sir, in my opinion is wrong.

Again we have a minister introducing a bill in this honourable House who has no background, does not know the reason for bringing in this amendment, did no research on it. The minister is sick. It is not his fault, he is in hospital but, Sir, this is a very, very important piece of legislation and I think it should be held over until the minister resumes his seat in this honourable House so that I can put some questions to him about this bill. I am not prepared to go along with it on the explanation the minister just gave.

It is a dangerous piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, very dangerous. God, we have seen what is happening in Newfoundland over the last two years, Sir. We are developing into a police state. This is just another move to restrict people's activities. It is a piece of restrictive, very, very restrictive legislation, Mr. Speaker. It restricts people human rights and it should not be entertained in this House, Sir. I would suggest that unless the minister is prepared to give us a more satisfactory explanation, that this bill be held over until the Minister of Social Services resumes his seat in this honourable House.

There is no - Mr. Speaker, my colleague just pointed out, and I was going to mention that, nothing in this bill, Sir, in this act, gives the person, the individual the right of appeal. This is the honourable crowd that are there that are talking so much about people's democratic rights and about setting up committees so that you can appeal this and appeal that. Sir, there is no evidence of it here. An arbitrary decision on the part of the director of Child Welfare to do what he wants with a child. Send it down to the United States if he wants to. Send it to Timbuktu.

I would like to ask the Minister of Social Services a few questions about the adoption programme, Sir, because I happen to be very familiar with it. More familiar than anybody in this honourable House. I would like to have a little more discussion on this bill, Sir, before it is rammed through this honourable House. What is the hurry? We have not dealt with a significant piece of legislation so far this session and now today debate is cut off on the vote of non-confidence and the minister wants to ram through some legislation. What is the minister trying to prove to the province? That we are doing some work for a change. That we passed a bit of legislation. Well, Sir, not this kind of legislation.

This is restrictive, Sir, and it encroaches on people's human rights. We should not entertain it in this honourable House.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I must say the Member for Bell Island has raised one or two points. I must confess myself that when I first read the bill I did not feel quite so strongly about it as he did but that merely be a function of my lack of experience and ignorance about what goes on in these matters. The Member for Bell Island was Minister of Welfare and had great experience in adoptions and other programmes affecting child welfare. He even received an encomium from the Minister of Social Services one of the very few times he has ever done that in respect of the Member for Bell Island.

He has raised one or two points. I do not know if I feel as strongly about it as he does but as I say, that may be because I do not know anything about it. The bill itself has no provision for an appeal from a decision of the director. I am wondering if the main act which this bill is merely amending has a provision for appeal from the director's decision? I do not know if the Minister without Portfolio, the Government House Leader is not prepared to give us that assurance and I would agree with my honourable friend the Member for Bell Island that the bill should be held over until the minister is back in his chair, again, the Minister of Social Services.

This is a great deal of power to give to a civil servant, a public servant no matter how valuable, how good a public servant he might be, unless there is some provision for an appeal and an easy process for an appeal by anybody who feels aggrieved under this legislation. I would like to hear the Minister without Portfolio on that particular point. If he cannot assure the House or some other minister knowledgeable in this cannot assure the House that there is an appeal to somebody else, either to the court or to the - and I am not talking about the general residual rights of appeal in an administrative law of matters - I am talking about a

specifically set up appeal systems which can be taken from some kind of an administrative decision taken by the Director of Child Welfare.

So, Mr. Speaker, I feel exactly the same as the member for Bell Island. If there is no appeal from this then I think we should let it stand over, let the Minister of Social Services come into the House when he is able and give us some explanation, perhaps an amendment might be in order. If there is an appeal and a good type of an appeal, an appeal which is easy of access to anybody who might be aggrieved and inexpensive to the aggrieved person, the person who feels aggrieved, then, although you might have some reservations about this kind of a bill. Well, I do not feel as strongly as I would if there is no right of appeal and if an aggrieved person cannot easily, inexpensively make sure that she or he is not being done in by a director unfairly and unconstitutionally perhaps or even illegally or unlawfully. Would the minister give us some information on that point?

MR. MARSHALL: First of all, Mr. Speaker, this bill really does not change the present situation. The Director of Child Welfare always had this power, certainly has had this power in recent times. All it does is extend. What we are talking about, what we are talking about in this particular situation, prior to it, a father or a mother who without the prior written consent of the Director allows or agrees to allow a child to be taken into another person's home or otherwise gives up or agrees to give up the care and custody of a child, was guilty of an offense. This was the law. This is the way in which we operate in adoption matters. We have given it over to the Director of Child Welfare and it is proven to be successful.

Now, all that this bill does in that area is extend and prevent a loophole arising whereby somebody can get around the operation of that law. Previously, if a mother or a father had put the child out without the consent of the Director of Child Welfare, then, action could be taken under this particular section. Now, the way it obviously could be

circumvented would be the mother's family, the grandparents, a friend, a relative could take the child and get around the operation of the act that way.

The purpose of this amendment is to make it all embracive to do what the act really originally intended and to give a penalty to anybody who does that because it is under the act and under the law vested in the Director of Child Welfare. It imposes a penalty of \$2,000.00 and because there is a penalty of \$2000.00 my understanding is that if a penalty of that nature, if you create an offense of that nature and a penalty is imposed by the court, there obviously would be an appeal to a superior court against it.

Now, with respect to the other, I dealt with the honourable member with a couple of the points there, particularly this one that this is a grave bill putting authority in the hands of a director and it was wrong. It does not really because a director always had the power. It is for the purpose of the efficient administration of the act and to prevent loopholes.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, with respect to the whole adoption programme, this is a bill amending the adoption act and I have explained what is involved in it. The Minister of Social Welfare is ill. He will not be attending the House for a few weeks, anyway for a little while. I would suspect he will be here at the time when estimates come up and I am quite sure at that time he would only be too delighted to entertain questions with respect to the government's programme concerning adoption of children coming from the honourable member from Bell Island or from anybody on the other side of the House.

This bill then, my remarks then relate merely to this bill. This bill does not really throw up the question of the whole adoption programme. There are other times and other kinds available to ask questions with respect to this. So, Mr. Speaker, I think I have given an adequate explanation and I would move second reading.

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

Second Reading of a Bill: "An Act To Amend The Department Of Provincial Affairs And Environment Act, 1973." (No. 19).

MR. DANP: Under the amendments proposed for this, the act, we propose to outline some additional consumer affairs responsibilities contained in legislation coming within the administrative field of the department. This legislation is listed in Schedule A of the Department of Provincial Affairs and Environment Act. The act will be amended to the effect, deleting the rent control legislation which has been repealed and will be replaced by the Residential Tenancies Board.

There are other matters defined, relating to the Corporate Affairs Division and the responsibility of the department's division of Corporate Affairs. The main section of this amendment, Mr. Speaker, will be to adjust the numbers of people who may be appointed to the Advisory Commission on Environment Quality. At the present time, the act provides twenty-five, as high as twenty-five people may be

appointed to this advisory committee and my officials feel that this would be an unwieldy number of people. It is more like setting up a convention than anything else and they feel that when so many people get together it would be difficult to come up with certain decisions and so on.

Sir, this amendment proposes to limit the number of people appointed to that advisory committee to fifteen, not less than eight and not more than fifteen. It will also provide that on this advisory committee, officials of the Department of Provincial Affairs and Environment may be included, which is not provided for under the old act.

The only other thing is that this amendment would delete reference in schedule "A" to the Rent Restrictions Act by substituting The Landlord and Tenant Residential Tenancies Act, 1973.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not have too much to say about this bill except that again we, I do not know if it is because the minister is not familiar with the bill but, Sir, the explanation that he gave was inconsistent. We could not follow the honourable minister. I am afraid, I tried, Mr. Speaker, I tried as hard as I could to follow what the minister was saying but it just did not make sense, Sir. It did not make sense. It is impossible to follow the minister, Sir. The minister cannot state his case in this honourable House.

They are bringing in legislation, Sir, obviously without doing their homework. We just had another example now when the minister introduced this bill. But, Sir, there is one aspect of this bill that I would like to ask the minister about and that is the Landlord and Tenant Act, which was passed in this honourable House in 1973.

At the time, Mr. Speaker, I asked the honourable House, I asked the minister who was piloting the bill through the House if this act applied to the St. John's Housing Authority and to the

Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation and the St. John's Housing Corporation and I was assured, Mr. Speaker, by the minister that it did. Well, Sir, I think we have had two rental increases in the apartments that come under the jurisdiction of the St. John's Housing Corporation and the St. John's Housing Authority since the Act was passed and these two increases were decided arbitrarily by the St. John's Housing Corporation, Sir. There was no prior consultation with the tenants who lived in these apartments over here at Churchill Square and I believe Your Honour lives in one down at Pleasantville. Your Honour's rent was increased not by five per cent, by twenty-seven or twenty-eight per cent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we have before us here in the city today is private enterprise, Omega over here asking for a rental increase which is being objected to by the tenants in Omega apartments and we see the member for St. John's North, and the member for St. John's East Extern, the Minister of Transportation and Communications, out crusading the cause of these tenants, Sir, and here we have a government controlled agency, arbitrarily making a decision to increase the rent and not one honourable member on that side of the House, Sir, raises a finger. Nobody else fighting for their rights.

The Minister of Transportation and Communications went over to Omega, set up a tenants committee over there, committee of the tenants, so that they could negotiate with Omega, Mr. Craig Dobbin, and then criticize Mr. Dobbin and Omega, criticized them heavily Sir, both inside and outside of this House, for not sitting down and bargaining in good faith and eventually Mr. Dobbin did.

Now we find them at it again, up to the same old tricks again, one is to their advantage, Sir, when it is to their advantage they will line themselves up with the tenant, when it is not to their advantage, Mr. Speaker, they show no interest at all in the tenants and we see this now with the proposed increases by the St. John's Housing Corporation and by the St. John's Housing Authority, not one honourable member over there has raised an objection to it. Bulldoze

it through like they do with everything else. We are well aware of the bulldozer tactics of this honourable crowd over here, Sir. You see it in the House again.

I do not think it is fair, Mr. Speaker. I think the minister should tell us why there was no prior consultation with the tenants who live in these apartments. Why, when the minister's own colleagues insist that there be prior consultation when it involves private enterprise? Are the St. John's Housing Corporation and the St. John's Housing Authority exempt from the Landlord and Tenant Act? Are they exempt from it? The minister who brought the bill into the House indicated that they were not.

My information, Sir, leads me to believe that since this act went through the House that they were exempted and I want the minister to tell us now if that is so. Did they go behind our backs after we passed this piece of legislation in the House? Did they go behind our backs and then exempt the St. John's Housing Corporation and the St. John's Housing Authority?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The lights are not flashing behind my back, in front of my face on that side of the House. But, Sir, I am sharpening the sabers too. The Minister of Mines need not worry about that.

Mr. Speaker, all this legislation, this is an amendment to a bill that was passed in 1973, that was supposed to perform wonders, Sir, wonders. We have not seen too many results from that bill. I saw a gentleman on television a couple of times trying to promote for instance the Department of Consumer Affairs, a branch of his department, the minister's department, Consumer Affairs Branch, and I heard the gentleman who was representing the minister's department state that they were disappointed with the response that they had been getting so far and he was trying to drum up a

little business. The gentleman obviously was trying to build himself up with a little empire, trying to drum up a little business. "Not enough complaints," the gentleman said. When he was asked by the moderator, "Well, why are you not getting more complaints? Do not people have complaints under the Consumer Affairs Act or under the Real Estate Trading Direct Sellers Act and hockers and peddlers and so forth?"

The answer - I cannot quote the civil servant verbatim - but the answer, Sir, that he gave was that the whole thing had not been given enough publicity, not enough PR work done by the department. What I could gather from the gentleman, that the bill itself, Sir, was not really all that effective.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of amendments that I would have liked to have seen brought in to the Landlord and Tenant Legislation that was passed under this Act and that is what is being amended here. When we did finally pass that bill, Mr. Speaker, honourable members in this House who are learned gentlemen immediately started to point out the loopholes, went down defending landlords, pointing out the loopholes in the Landlord, Tenant Legislation, Sir. They should be ashamed of themselves. Mr. Speaker, they knew when this bill went through this honourable House that it was full of loopholes.

So, they see an opportunity again to make a quick dollar by going down, after sitting in this honourable House, Mr. Speaker - how hypocritical in saying what a wonderful piece of legislation this is. This is going to cure all problems of the landlords and tenants in this province. Then go out - Mr. Speaker, you talk about conflict of interest - then go out and defend landlords and go down before public hearings and in the courts of this province pointing out the loopholes in that piece of legislation. Why did they not do it in this honourable House, Sir? Why? I would like to know why. It does not make sense to me unless they saw the opportunity to make a fast dollar, Sir.

That is not the purpose of putting legislation through this honourable House, Your Honour. That is not the reason. The reason for bringing in this kind of legislation is to protect the public, not to find ways to get around it. Are we wasting our time in this honourable House, Sir, just beating our heads on a stone wall? Are we going to bring in legislation with some teeth in it?

Sir, there is another bill that comes under the minister's department, Attachment of Wages. I have had examples in the last few months, Sir, that indicate to me that the Attachment of Wages Act in this province is being abused.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The honourable member is now dealing with a matter that is not under discussion, another bill. I would suggest that the honourable member choose the appropriate time for that.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, I point out to Your Honour that the Attachment of Wages is mentioned in this bill, Sir, in section 2, Mr. Speaker. All the bills are covered there including Attachment of Wages, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Very good.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour.

I have been told, Mr. Speaker, and I have no way of proving this, that this matter of Attachment of Wages has been abused. Mr. Speaker, there are men and women in this province today who will not go to work because they know the moment that they go to work their wages are going to be attached and not in accordance with the bill, with the legislation. What it is? I think you are allowed to attach ten per cent. What is the amount you can attach? Does the minister know or does he know?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, I think it is more than that. But whatever the amount is, Mr. Speaker, the Attachment of Wages Legislation, the spirit of that legislation is not being lived up to. We have numbers, scores of men and women in this province today who will not go to work. My

honourable friends on the opposite side probably know some men and women who will not go to work, who would prefer to stay on welfare because they know the moment they go to work, bang, they are going to lose about fifty or sixty or seventy per cent of their wages.

I would suggest to the minister that he do a little PR work with some of the magistrates in this province, point out to them that we do have Attachment of Wages Legislation. There is a limit to what they can take out of a man's pay. They have to leave him enough, Mr. Speaker, to support his wife and family.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: This administration does not interfere with the courts.

MR. NEARY: This administration does not interfere with the courts. Well, you better talk to the Minister of Justice about that. We saw a classic example recently, a classic example. I could go into that in more detail and I will at a future date. Interference with the courts, the Minister of Justice knows all about that. We will deal with that later.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Honourable members may be getting bored or whatever as the evening progresses and certainly may have gone into irrelevant debate. I

take the steps to nip this in its infancy so I ask the honourable member to return to the principle under discussion.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it is a good thing or a bad thing this advisory commission. To this committee I would say is a committee of three, one dead, one with one foot in the grave and the other one active. Sir, when the government brought this bill into the House, Mr. Speaker, they asked for an advisory commission on environmental quality of twenty-five people now they want to cut it down to fifteen. In my opinion, Sir, even that is too many.

MR. ROWE, W.N. They could not find twenty-five Tories in the province.

MR. NEARY: They got all the Tories now appointed to commissions and agencies and what have you, Sir, they are probably running out of flunkies, party hacks to appoint.

Sir, would the minister when he is winding up this debate could he tell us a little more about this environmental advisory commission. What is it going to do? How much will they be paid? Will they be paid by the meeting? How many meetings will they have? Will they be meeting once a month? Will they be truly representative of the whole province? Or, Mr. Speaker, will they all be concentrated just in one part of the province? What will be the duration of their appointment, Sir?

We would also like to know, Mr. Speaker, about the branch of the minister's department, the environmental branch. What about it? Last year, Sir, it was in complete disarray, disorganized, we had officials resigning right, left and centre. Have they been replaced? Is it effective? Are they doing a good job? What about the environmental branch? Could the minister tell us about that before he starts setting up advisory commissions? What are they doing? Are they justifying their existence? We want more information, Mr. Speaker, before we agree to go along with this piece of legislation.

I could go on and on, Sir, because there are quite a number of bills mentioned in this amendment. I could go on and on but I am not going to, Sir. I have made my point and I hope that the minister will give this honourable House more information before they ram railroad

this piece of legislation through the House. Why does not the minister get up and show us that he has done his homework, that he has researched this matter, that he is just not parroting some of his officials, trying to remember what they told him about the bill? Let the minister get up and tell us what he knows about it and some of the things that I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of prate about nothing really. For the first time this province has a piece of legislation which protects both the tenant and the landlord. We had nothing before only a hodge-podge of emptiness. He talks about loopholes, well, the piece of legislation we just abolished, we repealed last year was like a colander, it was full of holes, nothing but holes. It served no usefulness at all whatsoever during the past twenty-three years that the honourable the Member for Bell Island whose government he supported for such a long time and whose government he served as a cabinet minister for a few years. What did he do about it then? Nothing.

This is an excellent piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, I am not saying it does not have any loopholes. I do not think there is a piece of legislation in existence that does not have a loophole. Please God we will block the loopholes as we find them. Legislation has to be in operation for a certain length of time before you discover and determine the loopholes. There is no possibly way of knowing what the loopholes are, not all of them, before the legislation is enacted. If there are loopholes we will be taking a good close look at them and we will do something about them.

As far as the St. John's Housing Authority is concerned my officials at the present time feel quite satisfied that this legislation does cover these authorities. The legislation has been given as much publicity as we possible could give it. My officials travelled throughout the province on several different occasions. They catered to open line shows. We have had advertising. We have promoted the thing as much

as we possibly could.

If people do not wish to take advantage of the provisions of this legislation, this bill, then we are not to blame for it. If they feel that they are being wronged all they have to do is contact the Chairman of the Regional Tenancies Board in his area, make an official complaint and I am sure the board will deal with it expediently. The boards are there, they are there for the purpose of helping both the landlord and the tenant but the boards cannot go out and solicit people to come to them with complaints. They are there to do a job and they are doing an excellent job, Sir.

As far as the Environment Advisory Commission is concerned I think we will have to wait and see how that operates before I could comment on it. We certainly need to cut the numbers down. We do not necessarily have to have fifteen people on the commission, we could start off with eight and if we discover that we need more we can always get more up to fifteen. The commission itself will be made up from industry, various government departments and even from perhaps some man in the street who is interested in the environment of this province. Perhaps we will get somebody from Bell Island who will suggest that we will do away with their member or something or other, slap some sort of controls on him.

I move the adoption of this amendment.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Provincial Affairs And Environment Act, 1973," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Maintenance Orders (Enforcement) Act:"

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this is not a routine act, none of our acts are routine but it is probably less important than some of the weightier measures that went through today. It is simply an act to allow enforcement of foreign maintenance orders providing for periodic payments of alimony or maintenance amounts. Apparently, there was some question as to whether or not the courts here had jurisdiction to reciprocally enforce such maintenance orders unless they provided for lump sum payments.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to this bill, Sir. It strikes me, Sir, as being rather peculiar that down through the years, as the minister expressed in his introductory remarks, that the courts had no jurisdiction over this particular matter. Sir, I am surprised to hear that. It seems, Mr. Speaker, that here lately the matter of the jurisdiction of the magistrates' courts seems to be popping up all over the place, Sir. Does the minister mean, Mr. Speaker, that all the decisions that have been taken in the last twenty-five years, all the agreements, all the contacts with the courts and so forth, have all been illegal? Is that what the minister is saying up to now?

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: He is not saying that. Well then the minister just made that statement. The only impression I could get from what the minister said was that he wanted to make sure that the courts had the jurisdiction. Did they not have the jurisdiction up to the present time? Okay, all I am trying to do is to find out from the minister.

MR. MARSHALL: The honourable member is obviously suffering from the disease of softness of the craniotomy or whatever they call it.

Mr. Speaker, I did not at any time make any allusion to the fact that the courts did not have any jurisdiction. I just merely, simply said - of course, the honourable member was outside the Chamber, he was not listening. Had he been in the Chamber and been listening, I am quite sure the same result would have occurred. What I said was this: Under the provisions of this particular act, The Maintenance Orders (Enforcement) Act, relating to reciprocal enforcement of judgements in foreign jurisdictions - now perhaps the Hon. Member for Bell Island would like to spell it and then I will explain it to him. The fact of the matter is that under the previous legislation, it was doubtful whether or not the courts had jurisdiction to enforce a maintenance order from British Columbia, from Ontario, from Quebec, from Panama, from Florida or from what have you and all of these illustrious places.

MR. W. N. ROWE: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: The Hon. Member for White Bay South said Carbonear.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Carbonear.

MR. MARSHALL: I do not think he has been practicing that long because we are talking about reciprocal enforcement of foreign judgements. A maintenance order in Carbonear would be within this province. Carbonear is not outside the province. The fact of the matter is -

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): Order please!

The honourable minister has the right to be heard in silence. I ask the honourable members to please observe that courtesy.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We can forgive the honourable members, they are a little bit shaky today.

The fact of the matter is that it was doubtful, Mr. Speaker, whether or not orders for payment of maintenance by one spouse to another for the benefit of the children, if they were provided to be in lump sum payments, they could be enforced. If they were provided in

periodic payments, some doubt was cast as to whether or not they could be. It is for this reason that the bill is amended. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the jurisdiction of the court or lack of jurisdiction of the court. It is merely just there to make the law more certain.

I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, that this is a case of dual opinion. I think the Hon. Member for White Bay South said, no questions. I would just like to draw this to the attention of the records. The Hon. Member for Bell Island then came in with his great gems of wisdom. In any event, it is a simple matter and I move second reading.

On motion a bill, "An Act To Amend The Maintenance Orders (Enforcement) Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The City of St. John's Act."

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, in moving the amendment to this bill, I do not think there is anything of a very contentious nature in these amendments. They are pretty straightforward. They are just to clarify the bill to a great extent. There is an amendment in inserting a definition of the development or subdivision of land, which is strictly a definition of development or subdivision of land. There is another section which repeals section 357, which states that no official or employee shall be entitled to receive a pension

unless he has been for a period of at least ten years continuously in the employ of the city. The reason for this amendment is that the City of St. John's has recently adopted a new pension plan which is now a contributory pension plan. Heretofore, it was not a contributory pension plan. It now is and of course, employees who contribute would be entitled to draw the benefits even though they are not employed for ten years consecutively. This is the reason for the amendment.

There is a further amendment. "Inserting provisions respecting the making by the city of maintenance and occupancy regulations for commercial property, respecting the enforcement of such regulations and respecting a development appeal board to hear appeals from the repair and maintenance requirements of the city."

This is related strictly to commercial property. There are already maintenance and occupancy regulations having to do with residential properties but it is felt by the City of St. John's that this should be extended to cover commercial property. I think the need of that is obvious to anybody. There should be regulations for the occupancy and maintenance of commercial properties. This would cover all types of commercial activities within the city. They have asked us that we put in this provision. I therefore move the second reading of this bill.

On motion, a bill; "An Act Further To Amend The City Of St. John's Act." read a second time ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion, a bill; "An Act To Empower The St. John's Municipal Council To Raise A Loan For Municipal Purposes By The Issue Of Bonds." Bill no. (22).

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

MR. H.R.V. EARLE: Here again, Mr. Speaker, this is a straightforward

amendment to the this bill which enables the City of St. John's, the City Council to raise a loan of \$6 million by the issue and sale of bonds. Of course they have to receive the approval of the minister. If this is issued in partial issues, if they go out and issue \$1,500,000 or \$500,000 or whatever the case may be, in each case they come back to the minister as required by law to have approval for that particular borrowing. This does set a limit at the moment of \$6 million of borrowing for the City of St. John's.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, just as a matter of curiosity I wonder if the minister could tell us if the City of St. John's provides the minister with specific details of why they are borrowing this \$6 million? Is it for housekeeping purposes or is it for new projects? Did the minister ask for a list of do they just come and say; "Look we want to borrow \$6 million period, or do they provide any details to the minister? If so, would the minister be prepared to table the information in the House?

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

MR. EARLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the City of St. John's does provide me with details. If they want it for particular city services or anything of that nature they outline the services which they require. Sometimes it is very general in nature. They do not come and detail every specific item that is required. I think it might be difficult to table every item because the city's capital works programme as anybody would understand, is a fairly wide-ranging thing in which they intend to do certain works. I think all they would give me at the time is a general outline of what they intend to do. I would have no hesitation whatsoever in bringing this detail to the House if the House so requires.

MR. NEARY: Could we have this tomorrow?

MR. EARLE: Have this tomorrow? If I can find it tomorrow I can have it in.

On motion, a bill; "An Act To Empower The St. John's Municipal Council To Raise A Loan For Municipal Purposes By The Issue Of Bonds," read a second time ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Address in Reply: I believe the honourable Member For Placentia East adjourned the debate. He seems to be

having some difficulty in finding his notes.

MR. W.N. ROWE: What is going on?

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I had some remarks I wanted to make with respect to the district itself. I realize that there is another opportunity which will afford itself, when we speak on the Address in Reply. I understand that - I have not been speaking with him but if this honourable gentleman wants to proceed now I would certainly be prepared to give him the floor. Did the honourable gentleman want to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would be very, very remiss if I did not these first two talks get back to the problems of the district itself. I want to refer in particular to the great need throughout the area for water and sewerage. As I mentioned in my few remarks earlier this afternoon, the problem that we have confronting the Town of Placentia itself, the Town of Fox Harbour and the District of Southern Harbour, is really a very, very serious matter. I can only again bring it to the attention of the ministers concerned and I sincerely trust that this year the Department of Municipal Affairs will see fit to provide funds in Placentia to finish the water and sewerage, to complete their water and sewerage system.

The problem is this, Mr. Speaker, they have a supply of water in the town but they take it from across the gut. This pipe has to go across this very, very tricky stretch of water and that is continually interrupted and as a result, of course, there is very, very low pressure in the lines. In fact, the people who use the facilities there find that they cannot for example use an automatic washer or they do not have any pressure whatsoever.

In addition they have a sewerage system that consists of just septic pools and septic tanks. Mr. Speaker, there is a very, very serious problem in that doctors in the area have indicated that it is quite conceivable and possible that the water supply itself

will be contaminated. If it does of course, this means a very, very serious epidemic in the community itself. I implore the Minister of Municipal Affairs when he is preparing his list of priorities to see to it that the Town of Placentia receives funds which enable it to provide water and sewerage to Southeast Placentia and to Placentia Proper.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I think special concern should be given to the Communities of Arnold's Cove and Southern Harbour because these are two communities that have received all these fishermen or a great number of the fishermen who left the islands in Placentia Bay and came in there with the hope of building a better future for themselves and their families. What did they find, Mr. Speaker? They find now, a great number of them, that they are worse off than they were before. Because as I mentioned earlier, in Southern Harbour itself you have approximately seven hundred persons without any water supply at all.

There are two problems there, Mr. Speaker. One is that there is a lack of water. It is very, very difficult to get water and when they do find water the wells themselves are contaminated. You have there now, Mr. Speaker, all these

people are - about I think, ninety per cent of the wells that were tested by the officials of the Department of Health, it was found that they were not suitable for human consumption.

They have all these men, women and children drinking that water and you can imagine, Mr. Speaker, what this means. They are not boiling their water. The Minister of Health was requested and did in fact inform the council in the area to instruct to either bring in a new source of water or to boil their water. It is a very, very, very serious situation and it calls for immediate action. My only hope is that with the strong case that that community has made for financial assistance, the Minister of Municipal Affairs will see fit to include it in his submissions to DREE.

Now, the schools in the area - we have, Mr. Speaker, you may have read it in the press, the school in Come By Chance itself. The parents have taken their children from the school. I visited that school a week or two ago and also present on that occasion was the honourable Minister of Rural Development. We both saw at first hand the terrible conditions under which these children - the condition of that school is just unbelievable.

Now, I do not subscribe to the idea, Mr. Speaker, that people take the law in their own hands and close these schools. I do not think any honourable member here could condone that type of conduct unless of course the situation is very grave and serious. I am not going to question the wisdom of the parents who have decided that. I am not aware myself of what success they have had in trying to resolve the matter with the school board.

This is only further evidence, Mr. Speaker, of the terrible and deplorable conditions that exist in some parts of the province. I refer in particular to the plight of the people who are resettled in the district of Placentia East. I do feel that they did not receive nor are they yet receiving the consideration which they deserve because,

Mr. Speaker, when they left these islands the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland really were entitled and did in fact stop providing certain services. Now, funds were saved because money was not spent. This money I submit, Mr. Speaker, should be spent to improve the services for the people in these two communities.

So, I beseech the Minister of Municipal Affairs in particular to do what he can to assist Southern Harbour, Fox Harbour, Placentia and Southeast Placentia with water and sewerage.

Now, the health facilities, Mr. Speaker, we have a hospital at Placentia which is serving approximately 20,000 people. That is practically falling down around the ears of the doctors out there. In fact, I have been told by the doctors at Placentia that unless something is done, practically forthwith it will be almost impossible for to retain medical staff at that hospital. The Minister of Health is quite aware of this. The doctors at the hospital, or at least the senior doctor there met with the minister and departmental officials only a week or so ago. I was present at that meeting. He brought it home to the minister what these problems were.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this is not something new. It did not happen in the last year or the last two years. It happened and has been happening for the past twenty years. It is all very well for honourable gentlemen to say that they support it and do this and do that but the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that here is a very, very necessary and needed facility that is practically collapsing

and it is impossible to expect doctors to come and practice under conditions which they are expected to tolerate in Placentia itself.

Also, Mr. Speaker, in the field of the fisheries they need a great deal of encouragement and assistance because we have in that bay some of the best fishermen that Newfoundland ever produced. They left the Islands of Placentia Bay to settle in Arnold's Cove and Southern Harbour and Placentia and now find themselves returning to these settlements to carry on their former occupation.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable Minister of DREE announced a year or so ago that they were going to provide funds to these fishermen or to some organization to assist these fishermen so that the facilities on these islands could be retained. You see, Mr. Speaker, what is happening is this, they are all going back there year in and year out, in fact, I am told that there were over one hundred fishermen in one of these communities last year fishing with practically no facilities whatsoever.

Unless these fishing establishments are maintained then, Mr. Speaker, in a year or two years time we will have all kinds of petitions and everyone clamouring to have wharves built in these communities. If the fishing funds were allocated now these existing premises could be maintained. In that respect, Mr. Speaker, it is not a large amount of money requested. The Placentia Area Development Committee for example has done an excellent job out there and if these people were given only a small grant they could help the fishermen who returned to these islands to get proper facilities somewhere to continue fishing.

It is not a large amount of money but even if they were given a grant of twenty-five thousand dollars a year which is practically nothing they could go a long way in helping the fishermen help themselves. These are very, very independent men and they

need help and they need encouragement.

I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Fisheries informs me that he can and does soon expect this Tanker Route Committee to report. I may say myself that I am disappointed that the chairman of this committee or the committee itself did not feel that they could or should hold public hearings in these communities. I always felt that anybody who was asked to answer certain questions and advise the government should go to the people concerned and get their ideas. As far as that committee is concerned I have no doubt that they are approaching their task with diligence but this is becoming a very, very pressing matter and we have now two very large tankers in that bay waiting to unload. We have the tankers going back and forth and it is very important that the fishermen know as promptly as possible what the results of the findings of that committee are.

It is very, very unfortunate that the study was not undertaken earlier, in fact, even before the refinery itself was started. Now a committee is studying the question and I say, Mr. Speaker, that the quicker that committee makes it report the better for the fishermen concerned. Because the fishermen want to know just what the future holds. I have always maintained that the people who should benefit from that development at Come by Chance are the people who are likely to be affected the most. The people, I respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, who could be

most drastically effected by that refinery itself, not as far as employment is concerned but their own needs are the people who use these shores to fish, and if they are going to be disrupted or however they are going to be detrimentally affected, if they are Mr. Speaker, they should be compensated and fully compensated and that is why it is so important to know as promptly as possible just what effect these movements of these large tankers and even the smaller tankers in and out of that bay are going to have on the fishermen, particularly up in the bottom of the bay near the refinery itself.

Once again I hope that this committee will file its report as promptly as possible and that the government will see fit to publish the report and if necessary, since public hearings were not held in the areas before, public hearings can then be held so that the fishermen themselves can come in and make submissions to the committee or to officials of government or whoever is given the task of further investigating the matter. So, Mr. Speaker, this is very, very important and I sincerely trust that the committee will report as promptly as possible.

Another very, very big need, Mr. Speaker, in my district that I mentioned earlier was a question for roads itself and there are two roads in particular and I referred to one this afternoon and that was the Cape Shore Road and the other one, Mr. Speaker, is a very, very short piece of road between Fox Harbour and Ship Harbour. They are only small communities but it is very, very important that the people be given some encouragement to stay there, Mr. Speaker, because they have their homes there. They need about five miles of paved road from Fox Harbour to Ship Harbour.

The Parish Priest at Fox Harbour, Father Power, has spoken to me on several occasions concerning that road. The medical doctors and nurses who have had occasion to use the road, the parents of the children who send their children from Ship Harbour to Placentia find it very, very dangerous to have their children in busses going back and forth over that road and in fact sometimes the road itself is

completely closed. So, I think, Mr. Speaker, they need some funds to upgrade and I hope eventually pave that particular piece of road.

While I am speaking about that Area of Ship Harbour, I am sorry the Minister of Tourism is not here because I think in that area, Mr. Speaker, it has potential for a specific and historic development because just off Ship Harbour itself the Atlantic Charter was signed. I think a matter of such international significance as the Atlantic Charter itself, should require recognition by the Historic Sites and Monuments Organization and I am pleased to inform the House that they have communicated with me that the local association made representation to the national body and they have now decided that at some time certain funds will be allocated and a proper notation will be made somewhere in the Placentia Area to commemorate the signing of the Atlantic Charter.

This matter, when the historic sites opened the Castle Hill Park a year or so ago the Attorney General was there and he also made that point, and after I contacted myself Dr. Harris and Dr. Harris made a strong case and as I said now, funds are going

to be allocated to I hope in the near future prepare some suitable commemoration in the area. We have in that very, very small community, Mr. Speaker, about three or four individuals who concern themselves with this project. It is amazing to see what some dedicated interested Newfoundlanders can with some help from the government do. This whole idea is motivated by three or four individuals in Ship Harbour and I sincerely trust that they will receive the co-operation of government.

We have still some wonderful people in this island, Mr. Speaker, and this gives you great faith in humanity really when you run into them. Only last Saturday I had a call from an individual in St. Brides, a very small community out on the Cape Shore. He told me about a small businessman who had lost everything he had in this world the night before, he had a small business in that community, not small I suppose, Mr. Speaker, large by any standards of a small outport. This man had a building, he had his home and his shop, he was building a new store and what happened, I could tell the honourable members, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is a very, very sad story, it will only take one moment.

The father he had three sons and these were working in the business with him - he had eight children and one of his oldest sons brought home a load of gas and was filling up a tank about twelve o'clock in the night, he put the hose in the ground and he got back in the truck it was cold and while he was back in the truck the nozzle came out of the pipe and all the gas went over the ground, when he got out here the place was saturated with gasoline. He called his father and before he got up stairs the whole place went up in flames.

Here, Mr. Speaker, you had a man, a father of eight children who lost everything he had in this world, everything he had that was valued at approximately \$200,000. That man never had one cent, not one penny and he came out of his house with his children, in their pyjamas and himself and his wife - there was one child that they had to go back for and as luck should have it the child was asleep but they got it awake and took it.

Here was a man, Mr. Speaker, who had practically \$200,000 worth of property and he lost it all, lost everything he had and someone rang me and said, "Could we do anything to help that man - what about welfare?" When I called that man, he said, "No, no, under no circumstances." Here was a man as I said before, Mr. Speaker, with everything he had in the world gone. Now it would not make headlines because there was no loss of life or anything like that, I suppose hardly anyone in Newfoundland knows about it. Here is a man who worked, had all of his sons, everything he had in life was in that business and it was all gone within five minutes. I said, did you want the welfare officer to give you an order, and he said, "No, no," Mr. Speaker, this is the type of men we need in Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: Will the honourable member adjourn the debate.

MR. AYLWARD: I will promise this time when I adjourn, it will only be a minute or so the next time. Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

But the man of that gentleman, Mr. Speaker, I think you should know this because -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. AYLWARD: No, no, I think we should all learn a lesson from this Mr. Speaker, I am very serious about that - because if we had in Newfoundland about 10,000 men like that we would not have to worry too much about our country. The name of that gentleman, Mr. Speaker, was Mr. Walter Manning from St. Brides.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder would the honourable member not permit me to call it 6:00 P.M. for a couple of minutes, I want to make a ruling on this motion.

I have looked at the notice of motion given by the Hon. the Minister of Finance and I find the motion itself to be in order. It will appear on tomorrow's Order Paper. I want to make it very clear of course that I am ruling on the structure of the motion and it does appear to be in order and the House will decide naturally on the content of the motion.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Inaudible.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday at 3:00 P.M. in the afternoon. This House do now adjourn.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 8 at 3:00 P.M.