



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 1

1st. Session

Number 73

VERBATIM REPORT

FRIDAY, MAY 28, 1976

SPEAKER; THE HONOURABLE GERALD RYAN OTTENHEIMER

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would like to welcome to the gallery on behalf of all hon. members four gentlemen from the People's Republic of China. They are, Mr. Wang, who is counsellor at the Chinese Embassy in Ottawa; Mr. Yao, the third secretary of the Embassy; Mr. Wong, head of the New China News Agency for Canada; and Mr. Chang, member of the staff of the New China News Agency.

As hon. members probably know this is the first visit to the Province of officials of the People's Republic of China, and the gentlemen have visited a number of areas, Labrador City and Wabush, Churchill Falls, Goose Bay, Marystown and Labrador. They have been accompanied and escorted on their visit by Mr. George Lee of the Extension Service of Memorial University.

Hon. members may know as well that a group of approximately twenty Newfoundlanders are going to the People's Republic of China in a couple of week's time or so. Perhaps I will mention for the benefit of our visitors - I mentioned this in private to them - there are, at least to my knowledge, three hon. gentlemen in this House who have visited the People's Republic; the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy, and I myself last year. And I know I speak for all members of the people's House of this Province in welcoming the representatives of the People's Republic of China.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I should like to give the House some information relating to the housing situation in the Province. On numerous occasions in the past several weeks, I suppose, and even months, there have been various press releases issued by my office, and issued by agencies of government and various releases to the radio stations in particular about the housing situation and what the government of this

Mr. Peckford.

Province is trying to do. I thought it appropriate, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to outline in facts and figures for the Hon. House and for members opposite just what we are doing in the Province to indicate that one of the more optimistic things in the economy of the Province right now is the housing field.

Mr. Speaker, there is a Rural Loans Programme in effect, a Federal/Provincial Rural Loans Programme, for the Province which covers just about all the province except sixteen areas which are covered by CMHC for mortgage lending. But all the rest of the Province has this Rural Loans Programme. Now years ago the Rural Loans Programme, as initiated by the federal government at the time and the provincial government at the time, involved in its early days a maximum amount of \$7,000 or \$8,000 to loan for building of new homes. Over the years that maximum has been increased on several occasions going from \$8,000 to \$10,000 to \$12,000, \$14,000 up to \$18,000, and now we loan in rural parts of the Province over \$20,000, sometimes even as high as \$25,000 to individuals who are building homes and have some title to their land. The important thing about the programme is that we try to be flexible and not as stringent as CMHC and other lending institutions, especially as it involves land title. For example, an individual, if he has a bill of sale duly signed by a Justice of the Peace and so on with the proper markings would be sufficient in order for him to obtain a mortgage rather than have to go through all the legal problems of getting a deed or grant or whatever.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They have to prove clear title?

MR. PECKFORD: Clear title, yes. But we try to be flexible in it, especially in the smaller communities.

MR. ROBERTS: Clear legal title.

MR. PECKFORD: Okay, well clear title.

Mr. Peckford.

There is a reduction this year in the number of applications approved under the Rural Loans Programme, because as most hon. members know there is some reluctance on the part of individuals this year because of inflation and the economic situation to get involved in a heavy investment like a new home. The total dollar value up to May is higher, because the loans are higher. The number of loans per se is down. Last year in 1975 at this point in time, we had committed 201 loans under the Rural Loans Programme. So at this point in time this year we have only committed 135.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why?

MR. PECKFORD: Well, I was just giving the reasons why I thought in my preamble. I think people are a little more reluctant to get into investing in homes right now, because of the uncertainty in the higher costs and so on. But the dollar value has increased. The 201 loans last year constituted \$3.4 million. This year the 135 loans constitutes \$3.5 million. So the amount of each loan has gone up which indicates that the price of building a home has escalated substantially over the last year which, of course, we all look upon with some concern. But that is the story on our Rural Loans Programme, Mr. Speaker, and there are other facts and figures there that I will pass on to hon. members.

In the land development field, where we get into land assemblies and so on, where we service, say, a piece of land which the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation has bought or gotten from the Crown over the years, because we have a very active land banking programme that has been into effect for some time, it might be interesting for hon. members to realize that on the land development side in Corner Brook, there are 200 lots now on sale to prospective homeowners. In Arnold's Cove we are in there with 120 lots, and they will be going on sale within the next month. Now the point of Arnold's Cove, of course, a number of years ago, because

Mr. Peckford.

of the Come By Chance oil refinery and other activities in that area we had gone into this land assembly. Of course, now I imagine it is going to be rather difficult to sell all those lots in a given years, and it might take a number of years to do so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Are there land banks in other places within reasonable distance of Come By Chance besides Arnold's Cove?

MR. PECKFORD: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sunnyside?

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, and Claranville.

Arnold's Cove, 120 lots will go on sale within the next month; Daniel's Harbour, where the new mine is located, lots will go on sale within the next few days. In Daniel's Harbour the fifty-five lot development that we have done there is to assist in housing in Daniel's Harbour. Deer Lake, 28 lots, additional land recently acquired from Bowaters which will provide an extra six lots,

MR. PECKFORD:

and these lots must now be serviced before the area is placed on sale. Windsor, eighty lots, construction now twenty-five per cent complete and construction recommenced this month, in May. Marystown, sixty-two lots and they are to go on sale within the next few months. Springdale, in the great historic district of Green Bay, fifty lots will soon be ready to go on sale, the construction on the full subdivision.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What district was that?

MR. PECKFORD: That is the district of - not Baie Verte - White Bay and not Windsor-Buchans but it is in between there -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Between the two?

MR. PECKFORD: That is right. It is in between the two, yes.

MR. DOODY: Is there a by-election there?

MR. PECKFORD: Is there a by-election there? Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

Corner Brook, phase three of the Elizabeth Street development, there was a contract awarded to Lundrigan's Limited in the amount of \$1.5 million. Port aux Basques, sixty-four lots.

MR. NEARY: Already on sale.

MR. PECKFORD: Lots on sale, right. Wabush, 270 lots we are getting in there in land assembly, following successful negotiations with Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro for takeover of electrical services, contract for subdivision servicing awarded to H.J. O'Connell of Wabush. The amount of the low tender was \$1.6 million. Stephenville, 200 lots, clean-up work now underway, underground electrical servicing to be installed, anticipated lot sales in June. Clarenville, fifty lots, construction now fifty-nine per cent completed. We might as well call it sixty. Lots are anticipated to go on sale in mid Summer.

The proposed land assemblies that we are looking at right now are in Gander, for phase three of the northeast land assembly, 200

MR. PECKFORD:

lots; detailed planning now being completed with field surveys now underway. Anticipated tender call in July. Areas under investigation for more land assemblies, Port Union, St. Anthony, Bonavista, in the Curling area where there is a NIP area there right now and Bishop Falls. We are into some industrial parks which have been started for a number of years. There is difficulty in the industrial park or commercial park field right now because of funding from NPEE and it is difficult to acquire federal funds for some of these developments that were started years ago.

Deer Lake, forty acres and design work is in progress. Clarenville, eighteen acres, a planning concept developed for an area on the north side of the access to the highway. Approval in principle received from the town council. We will be disposing of lands there very shortly. Gander, 100 acres for a large industrial park where commercial firms need big acreage for their kind of development.

In the public housing field we are into Fermeuse with five units. They are completed, with four units occupied. Grand Falls, thirty units, sixty-two per cent completed. Stephenville, thirty units, thirty-one per cent completed. Clarenville, thirty units, fifty-eight per cent completed. Botwood, ten units, fifty per cent completed. Harbour Grace, fifteen units. Site preparation is now underway in Harbour Grace. Deer Lake, six units, forty-five per cent completed. Corner Brook, four units seventy-eight per cent completed, and Labrador City. We hope to be on with the Labrador City public housing project very soon within the next few days.

New projects in the housing. In Corner Brook, twenty-seven row housing and another one of eight row housing. Stephenville, fifty-two row housing. Deer Lake, four semidetached. Lewisporte, four demidetached and one single and six semidetached. Housing under investigation in Port aux Basques, public housing, St. Anthony

MR. PECKFORD:

Windsor and Gander. So, Mr. Speaker, this gives you some idea of the activities that are presently underway in the Province excluding St. John's really here because that is really separate because of the larger, the Newtown and St. John's Housing Corporation and the other agencies that deal with housing in the city. It will give you some idea of the activity that is underway in the Province in relation to housing and hopefully it will help to offset some of the more detrimental effects of inflation in the more restraint times that we find ourselves in.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before the hon. minister sits down could he give us any idea of the grand total amount that may be spent on housing, public money, and how much of it is from Ottawa in this year.

MR. PECKFORD: The total amount this year in 1976, this is everything, current capital, will be, through the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, approaching \$50 million. A lot of that money, of course, is federal money, a lot of it being loans, of course.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But not through them?

MR. PECKFORD: Through them -

MR. SMALLWOOD: An obstinate group.

MR. PECKFORD: Oh, I do not know. I could not say. It would be more than that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CAPTER: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the House for not having a prepared text of the statement I am going to make concerning the state of the fishing industry, I suppose you would call it, but I do have some very encouraging statistics. I think the House would probably be interested in hearing them.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to inform the House that fish landings are up pretty well all over the Province. If you bear with me I will read some statistics here.

MR. FAPPELL: You are doing a great job.

MR. W. CARTER: The figures I am quoting, Mr. Speaker, are compared with figures released for the same period last year. In the LaScie area last year there were no fish landings. This year, 144,526 pounds. Twillingate area, the area of my hon. friend, last year landings were nil, to date 500,000 pounds. Valleyfield area, last year, 215,000 pounds, this year, 900,000 pounds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: The Milde area, it has been pretty well steady there. Last year, 1 million pounds, this year, the same quantity, 1 million. Hant's Harbour, landings are up by 25,000 pounds. Bay de Verde area, last year, nil, this year, 250,000 to date. In that great and historic and traditional fishing district of St. Mary's-The Capes, last year, 74,000, this year, 1,648,000 pounds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, fishermen in many areas of the Province are landing from 7,000 pounds to a high of 22,000 pounds per day. I do not have reports from all over the Province. We are getting them in but certainly I will submit them to the House as they come in. But for my hon. friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), he is going to be very happy to learn that landings in his area are up by forty per cent over last year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: Fishermen in his area are having an excellent year. In salmon fishing, for example, they landing 1,500 to 2,500 pounds a week and they are getting \$1.30 a pound. So it appears to be a prosperous year.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: What about Grand Falls.

MR. W. CARTER: Grand Falls? We are waiting on a report from Grand Falls and Gander. Mr. Speaker, seriously it is quite obvious that we are shaping up to be a bumper year in fisheries this year, an excellent year. I think mainly because of the intensified effort maybe more people are getting back into the boats.

MR. NEARY: Can the plants handle all of that?

MR. W. CARTER: The plants to date have been able to handle all the fish, yes.

MR. NEARY: We are not going to have to dump any fish?

MR. W. CARTER: I doubt it very much if we will.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Can the minister compare these figures now with the figures of the year before last. Last year there were no fish because the whole coast was blocked with ice.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: No, it was the year before.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Was it?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Yes, 1974, That was the year I lost the election mainly because of the ice.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the figures for 1974. But last year was an ice-free year pretty well. I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, to announce as well that the U.S. market for fish product is good. The prices are up considerably over last year. The catches of herring, for example, I am told by Ocean Harvesters that they are having a bumper crop in herring. I can speak for the St. Mary's district. The situation is similar down there. The fishermen there are getting a lot of herring. Bay of Islands are, the same way pretty well.

So, Mr. Speaker, to sum up I think this will be an excellent year in fisheries. I think this is very important because 1976 probably more than any other year, it is important that our fishermen do well because of some of the setbacks that have occurred. No doubt a good year this year, as I am sure it will be, will encourage others to get back in the boats next year. So I am very happy to bring this little report to the House and I am sure that my colleagues will welcome it as I have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and, of course, all of us on this side, Mr. Speaker, welcome the news given us by the Minister of Fisheries. What is good for the Fisheries Department, to paraphrase the old statement, "What is good for the fisheries is good for Newfoundland and Labrador." And all I need say, I think, Mr. Speaker, is that we welcome it. We hope that the minister's prediction of a bumper year at the fisheries proves to be a correct prediction. All of us devoutly and deeply wish that, no matter what side we sit or no matter what our political feelings and our political associations. The fishery is of such importance to so many parts of this Province that a good fishery cannot but have the effect of helping every single part of this Province. I am particularly pleased that the North East Coast seems to be coming along so well, although as yet there has been little fishing activity north of the LaSalle plant area. Port au Choix, I would say, for the benefit of the minister is doing extremely well and that is having the benefit of helping St. Anthony and the plant there is open earlier than it has been in the last three or four years. We all hope that this trend will continue. We all hope that the fishery will continue to prosper, and we all hope, Sir, that governments will take some action to make it so, because I think it is fair to say that what has happened so far this year, the good news that the minister reports to us, the welcomed good news, is not the result of any action that he has taken or that even the Government at Ottawa have taken, it is the result -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Politics! Nothing but politics!

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Stop talking politics.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: - Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has reported good news, and we are pleased to hear it, but I would like to hear still better news, Sir, and I still think there are actions which government can take to improve the fishery, and I would say to the minister

Mr. Roberts.

that while his news is welcomed, it would be infinitely more welcomed, Sir, if he could stand and announce that this government were going to take some positive steps, Sir, to help the fisheries and the fishermen of this Province. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the hon. Premier on his selection of Minister of Fisheries.

We have the evidence now today that it was an excellent choice, the best Minister of Fisheries we have had since the former one, the present Minister of Mines and Energy, and I congratulate the minister. It is good work. This is good news - lots of fish in Bonavista Harbour, and Cape St. Mary's pays for all. It seems like lots of fish, it seems like good price, it seems like good market. I wonder though if the minister can tell us if he has any indication yet as to what proportions? Is there any change this year in the proportions of the fish that will be salted and will be frozen? Is there any indication of that? Perhaps I do not know whether I should wait for questions to ask him for the answer, but just as down through our 150 years of our history, a good seal hunt started the year off with a bang, and put life and spirit and encouragement in people's hearts, so now this kind of news of good fish, good catch, good price, good market, should put heart in thousands of our people, and we can all feel quite pleased and happy about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, if I can answer the questions put to me. I think there will be more fish salted this year, because the price has gone up, I think for one grade of fish from thirty-three cents a pound to thirty-seven cents.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The proportions.

MR. W. CARTER: I think the proportions - there will be more salt fish proportionately this year than last year, yes. The price is much higher this year, too.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. ROBERT: Is there another election coming up or what.?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, this is the do-nothing government, you know.

As hon. members may or may not know, Mr. Speaker, we have had some problems with utilization of the abattoir up in Corner Brook, and we have been trying to find some way in which we could provide for a greater utilization of the abattoir. As hon. members will note in the budget there is an amount of a grant in there for a little over \$2 million towards Farm Products. We would hope that both the operation in Corner Brook and in St. John's would some day become self-sufficient. So today I am pleased to announce a one year agreement between Newfoundland Farm Products and Island Meat Packers of Prince Edward Island for the importation and slaughtering and marketing of beef cattle at the Corner Brook abattoir. This agreement will increase the utilization of this facility and is based as much as possible on a cost recovery of the slaughtering operations. Principals of Island Meat Packers have advised us that this company is prepared to encourage the production of beef cattle on the West Coast of Newfoundland by purchasing local products and providing a marketing service. Because market development is a prior requirement for private investment by local producers, it is felt that importation is a natural first step. This will not be to the detriment of the local producer, but rather to his advantage in the long run. And indeed we have a clear and unequivocal and unmistakable understanding with these people that when the markets are established, and they will do the marketing themselves, that indeed they will encourage the production of beef in the Province, and where the beef is available in the Province, it will be purchased here and slaughtered here and marketed here, and not imported. But until such time as they have to provide the marketing ability, they will be bringing some in. But any that are available they will certainly buy on the West Coast.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You mean it will be slaughtered and then ship it out?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, no, market it and sell it, the market here in the Province.

Over the years numerous policies have been introduced by various governments to encourage the upgrading of livestock through such means as bull bonuses, artificial insemination, community pastures and land clearing. The evaluation of these programmes has been limited to cattle shows at local exhibitions. The abattoirs at St. John's and Corner Brook, operated under Agriculture of Canada, Health of Animals Branch Standards, have given us for the first time the opportunity to determine the true value of livestock improvement policies. The result of this initiative should be to encourage local cattle raising through the provision of professional slaughtering and marketing. I am optimistic about this agreement, and over the next year will be monitoring its progress with much interest. It is a one year agreement only. We want to see what it is like. The gentleman is coming in really on a fire, because once he sets up the markets and we decide not to continue for another year, well the market is still there for our own use in the Province. So we are very pleased that this will be done, both from the issue of the utilization of the abattoir in Corner Brook, the utilization of our own product, the stimulus I hope to the raising of beef, especially on the West Coast, and the supply here in our own Province of our own market.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here listening to the third of these ministerial statements, and I was thinking what name we could put on them, and I guess the only real name would be the Friday morning follies, because we have now had a half hour taken up with statements, Mr. Speaker, although I think they are getting better, because the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture has at least told us something that we did not know, and could not have

Mr. Roberts.

found out. And so I congratulate him on that. To turn to the substance of his statement, Sir, of course, it is welcome news. The abattoir at Corner Brook, which is a project, I believe, of the Liberal administration with substantial help from DREE, that abattoir, Sir, has consumed a large number of public dollars. And while the Minister of Mines and Energy, I think, said it was a disaster, well I do not think that is correct, Sir.

MR. CROSBIE: It has been a financial disaster.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister mutters again that it has been a financial disaster. I do not think that is correct either, but I am not allowed to debate it nor is the minister. All I will say, Mr. Speaker, is that the abattoir has consumed a large number of dollars, and any steps which can be taken to increase the put-through of cattle on one end and the output of meat products on the other end are welcome, and it is particularly welcome if any steps can be taken to encourage the long struggling local beef industry. I suppose we should regret in a sense that we have to bring in a Prince Edward Island firm to slaughter meat. They are not doing anything here except providing a service, a catalyst in a chemical compound to make the reaction work. All they will be doing is the slaughtering and the marketing, but if nobody in the Province will take up the challenge and do this then, of course, we must turn to P.E.I. I hope that the P.E.I. firm's stay here will be short, but happy. I hope they will have a very successful stay. I hope it will be a very brief stay, because somebody local will take it up, and why cannot somebody local import the beef from P.E.I. and, you know, make a deal with the abattoir and have the beef slaughtered and then marketed here.

Mr. Speaker, the only other comment I would make on this is the minister, I think - and I noted down the words as I heard them across the House - said something like, and he went very quickly in reading this part of his statement - I have the statement, the clerk has just brought it to me now and, yes, the words are there "The agreement

Mr. Roberts.

will increase the utilization of this facility. The minister went very slowly in reading that part of it. Then went very quickly when he came to the words which said, "And is based as much as possible on a cost recovery of the slaughtering operation." Now that is _____

Mr. Roberts:

a polite way, a public relations way, a roundabout way of saying that there is going to be an element of subsidy, that the amounts to be recovered will not meet the costs. That is what I read in to the minister's statement. And I would make my comment in the form of a question, the minister, you know, has the opportunity when the leader of the other party here has said what he wishes to say, the minister has the opportunity under our rules to say a word or two. I would ask him if he would tell us exactly what is involved in this, whether there will be a subsidy or not. I am not necessarily objecting to it. I think the position we would take would depend upon the full facts. But I merely point out that is an unusual way to put it, it does not say it is based on a cost recovery. What it says is it is based as much as possible on a cost recovery, and of course that could mean everything or it could mean nothing. And so I ask the minister if he would expand upon it in that light.

Other than that, Sir, the agreement is welcome, and I would congratulate the minister because really his statement is by far and away the best of the three which we have had this morning. I think this habit the ministry have developed of consuming large amounts of time on Friday morning in an attempt to hit the weekend press with these statements should be recognized for what it is. But the minister to his credit, unlike his colleagues, the minister to his credit has told us something that we did not know, and could not have known, and so I think he should be congratulated, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. J. R. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, what the minister has announced is all right, it is fine. There is nothing wrong with it. I hope it will lead to something even better. I hope that what is an experiment will succeed. I am all for it. I know nothing that I can think of to say against it. And I am not sure that I would say it if I did think of it, because I am all for it.

But while I am at it would the minister listen intently and even more important perhaps, and he will not be offended when I say

Mr. Smallwood:

this, would the Premier listen. The Premier is the leader of the government, he is the leader of the Administration, and there is a charge to be laid against the government, against his Administration, and that is their failure, to do something about the equivalent establishment that is here in St. John's down at Fort Pepperrell. Now the former administration built a monument, a great monument in Corner Brook; unfortunately the use that has been made of it is very, very inadequate, and it is probably the case that it is losing money as a going concern because it is not going enough or big enough. Now this may help to remedy it. But down at Fort Pepperrell we have an equivalent plant which with a slight improvement will be of tremendous help to the farmers on the Avalon Peninsula. Is the Premier aware of the fact, as his minister is, is he aware of the fact that there are people now who have to slow down in the production of pork on this Peninsula, slow down in the production of broilers on this Peninsula, slow down in the production of beef and mutton and lamb, not because the plant down there cannot handle it, the plant can. The trouble down there is there is not enough cold storage, because a concomitant of a plant of that kind is cold storage. The beef or the mutton or what have you must go, and the pork, into cold storage at controlled temperature. And there is not enough of controlled temperature facility down there to handle what the plant can handle. Therefore the farmers have to produce less than they are capable of doing, produce less than the market will absorb. It is a scandalous thing. It is not less than scandalous. The Province is trying so desperately, especially these younger ministers who are out trying desperately to increase production, get men employed, strengthen the economy with the basic resources of the Province, and while that is going on on the one hand, on the other the hog raisers, the broiler raisers, the beef cattle raisers, the sheep raisers, the pork raisers are all forced to raise less than they are quite capable of raising and anxious to raise. The market is here.

Mr. Smallwood:

They have the facilities. The killing facilities are down there. There is just one bottleneck, not enough cold storage.

Now I understand from the minister, and I am happy to hear it, that the government plan to duplicate the Corner Brook establishment with a new establishment somewhere here on the East Coast. Good! That may be two or three years from now. By time the money is voted for it, and the contract is let, and the building is constructed, you are talking about a couple or three years off. Two or three years more of the farmers forced to produce less than they are capable of producing, less than they are anxious to produce, less than the market will take, all for the sake of a bit of cold storage. I appeal to the Premier; he can help greatly by finding the money, asking his Minister of Finance to find the couple or three hundred thousand dollars that are needed for this basic requirement of agriculture in Newfoundland.

But in the meantime I do congratulate the minister, and the government on this announcement that he has made today.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. J. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, just to reply to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. There is no subsidy involved. Why we say "as much as possible here" is that there is an agreement between Farm Products and the company, to the best of our ability we will recover the cost, and that is why it is just a short term. We have estimated what the cost will be, and I will be prepared by the way to table the agreement in the House, there is no problem there. The only reason we say that is because we can only estimate what the cost will be because there will be a production, and that is the only way that should be read in any part of not getting our money back.

And for the hon. member for Twillingate, I did not announce that we would have a new abattoir, I said the government was aware of the problems we had at the facility here in St. John's and consideration would have to be given over the next few years to

Mr. Rousseau:

improving it in a way. I have not announced a new abattoir. I would love to, and hopefully in the next number of years we will. But we are aware of the problems down there, and certainly we have to work to try and -

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a somewhat distant solution.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the meantime there is a plant,

MR. ROUSSEAU: Right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And what about the plants cold storage?

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition signed by seventy-five residents of the community of Woodstock. And having heard the glowing and encouraging fishery statistics given to us by the minister this morning, maybe it is a good time to present a petition related to the fishery.

The residents of Woodstock are asking that as soon as reasonably and financially possible that a community stage be constructed in the community of Woodstock so that the fishermen will have a facility, which they do not have now, to land their fish so it can be held there, and in some cases salted there, but held there so it can be transported in good quality to the fish plant in LaScie.

I think, Sir, this petition underlies what I have been trying to say in this House in the past couple of speeches, that we have to get away from the concept on the Baie Verte Peninsula that there is nothing related to the economy of that area only mining. There are a number of people in Woodstock who have been fishermen for the past number of years. And there are many, many more over the past couple of years who have gone back to the fishery. I believe that is encouraging, Sir, and I think we as a government should encourage that further, and if we are going to do that, one of the most concrete ways we can do it is to provide proper facilities

Mr. Rideout:

for them to land and process their fish.

Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition. I ask that it be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

HON. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly take the prayer of the petition in consideration, and I can assure the member and the House that we will do what we can to see to their request.

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

HON. E. M. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may say just a word or two in support of the petition presented by my friend and colleague the member for Baie Verte-White Bay. As he says the area is a fishing area, although we often tend to think of the Burlington Peninsula whatever - is it the Baie Verte Peninsula it is called now?

MR. RIDEOUT: The Baie Verte Peninsula, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: It used to be called the Burlington Peninsula, Sir, how things change. But the Baie Verte Peninsula then, to put that name on it, is often thought of as being a mining area only, and while it is certainly a significant mining area, and while the communities around Baie Verte, you know, prosper on the mining industry, there are nonetheless substantial fishing communities in the area, and the Woodstock-Pacquet area from which this petition comes in one of those areas.

The request I think is a reasonable one. The amount of money involved should not be very large. I do not know what the going rate for community stages is, but I do not think it is a great deal of money in the overall scheme of things. And if it will help these fishermen, Sir, the better to process their catch, and thus to get a better price, then I think their request should be given consideration and favourable consideration.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that we are seeing happen now in the fishing industry something which I think is very welcome, and the Minister of Fisheries I think is doing

MR. ROBERTS:

his part towards helping it, and the Minister of Fisheries at Ottawa and the Government of Canada are certainly doing their part, and that is efforts to try to improve quality, because we are more and more realizing that one of the problems we do have in the marketing of our fish is that it is not always of the quality which it could be or which it should be. One of the steps which has been taken, as Your Honour representing the Maritime district of Waterford-Kenmount is doubtless intimately aware, is that the Government of Canada have brought in increasingly strict regulations about quality control and these come back to increasingly strict requirements about the type of facilities in which fish is processed.

If I am not mistaken no fish for sale for human consumption can be processed now in this Province - at least lawfully processed - unless it is done in a facility that has a concrete floor and it has fresh running water and has other desirable features. Well, Sir, that is good and it should be encouraged. It should be a cardinal point of public policy. But, Mr. Speaker, that requirement must be met by enabling fishermen to have access to these facilities. They cannot provide them themselves.

The day of a stage, as we knew it, is gone. The day of a man going and cutting some lumber and having it sawn up, and cutting a few longers and making himself a stage, that day is gone. I do not suppose one per cent of the fish of Newfoundland today is processed in stages. And certainly every encouragement is to be given to processing it in community stages as opposed to the old-fashioned individual stage. The day will come when the Minister of Tourism will have to build a couple of fishing stages in the Heritage Village or somewhere just to show what they are like so that people coming to the Province, or even our own people, will know what they are.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess we have come away from the community stage in Woodstock. The community stage in Woodstock, Sir,

MR. ROBERTS:

is the coming thing in the fishery sense and I hope the government, Sir, will treat this petition with the merit-or treat it on the merit. I think it has a very great deal of merit and I would hope that the Minister of Fisheries is able to pry out of his tight-fisted but amiable the Minister of Finance, sufficient money to give the people of Woodstock this facility this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Fear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by all of the residents of Admiral's Beach, O'Donnells in St. Joseph's which of course is in the district of St. Mary's-The Capes.

MR. DOODY: Any Doodys in it?

MR. W. CARTER: Lots of Doodys here. The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is that the road from Admiral's Beach to St. Joseph's be paved. Admiral's Beach is now the site of a very important fisheries experiment having to do with quality control, as my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, mentioned a moment ago. There are a lot of fish being caught in Admiral's Beach. Last year I think around 5 million pounds. No doubt this year that figure will be greatly increased.

To have to haul that fish over twelve or fourteen miles of unpaved road, Mr. Speaker, does very little to add to its quality. I commend this petition to my colleague, the Minister of Transportation. I know that he will be very happy to do what he can accede to its prayer. So, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to table this petition and have it referred to the department to which it relates.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of my colleague, the member for Fogo (Capt. Winsor) who normally speaks for us on fisheries matters - but he is away from the House because he is

MR. ROBERTS:

currently in the district of Fogo and I have no doubt getting some first-hand knowledge of the fishing commissions there at this time - let me say a word or two in support of the petition presented by the Minister of Fisheries in his capacity as the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. W. Carter). The prayer of the petition speaks for itself, Sir, and I think the case is well made. There are similar cases in very many parts of Newfoundland and Labrador. The Northern Peninsula is a classic example, because fish there is more and more being trucked to the fish plants in Port au Choix or at St. Anthony, long distances over dusty roads. Certainly I would not want to eat some of the fish that has been moved in a hot sun under a tarpaulin after five or six hours of sitting on a wharf and another three or four hours in a truck over the bumpy roads and the dusty roads.

So, we should pave the roads. And the Minister of Transportation and Communications, who is conspicuous by his absence again today as he has been all week - I do not know where he is.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is here!

MR. ROBERTS: Was he? Oh, I am sorry. I have done the minister a disservice and I hope he will be back. But the Minister of Transportation and Communications would do well, Sir, in drawing up his programme for the year for submission to the Cabinet, and in considering the priorities that should be attached to them, requests that come into him, he would do well to look at this question of paving the roads over which fish is trucked. I think that is a very important consideration and something which should be a very major determinant in public policy in this Province.

We support the petition, Sir. I see the minister has now returned to his seat. We support the petition. I would hope that the Minister of Fisheries will have his constituents' request granted. If not I would suggest to him that he consider resigning from the House and thus causing a by-election. He would be able to run in the by-election and seek re-election. But the advantage

MR. ROBERTS:

of causing a by-election, of course, on the record of the present Tory administration, is that they have a marvellous habit, Sir, of paving machines sprouting and road work sprouting even in cases in the Winter. We have even had cases, Sir, - so the minister does not even have to resign in the Summer - we have even had cases in November month with snow being brushed aside by the graders and the paving machine coming behind and laying the pavement, Sir. So it is a marvellous way to get pavement and I would commend it to the minister because I know he is determined to serve his constituents. So I say if he is not able to persuade his colleague, the Minister of Transportation to part with some money this year for this very reasonable and very modest request, he should consider come Fall resigning and it would fill in the odd moment between the October 18th by-election in St. John's West and the January by-election which is going to be held when the government get up enough courage to face the people of Bonavista North and Exploits and Ferryland.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why resign?

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman could resign to run again. By all means he could. I am just suggesting to him a way to get the roads paved. I know he wants to serve his constituents, Sir, and in all charity and good humor I am suggesting to him a way to consider it because, Sir, -

MR. WOODROW: That is an extraordinary suggestion.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course it is extraordinary. But it is an extraordinary problem, Sir, and extraordinary problems require extraordinary means, and as the minister is an extraordinary man, Sir, I know he is willing to consider extraordinary means. So I suggest it to him for his consideration. The easy way is to get the road paved this Summer but if he does not I think he should consider the extraordinary suggestion I put to him. I support the petition, Sir.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

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

MR. BECKFORD: I give notice, Mr. Speaker, that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Local Government Act, 1972." (Bill No. 78)

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. MOODY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave of the House to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Tobacco Tax Act." (Bill No. 79)

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Hospital Insurance (Agreement) Act." (Bill No. 77)

o o o

MR. SPEAKER: We are back to Answers to Questions, I presume.

MR. CROSBIE: I just want to table an answer to a question, Mr. Speaker. I will not go into the details. It is Question No. 737 on the Order Paper dated March 25 asked by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to do with new homes heated electrically and the like. There are some copies. As always I rush to get the information.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the minister is about to take off over there, or if he is waving or if the pages are gone or something has happened. Anyway we are on Oral Questions, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps in the Premier's absence from the Chamber - he was here earlier but he seems to have slipped out somewhere - my question should be directed to the Minister of Mines and Energy -

MR. CANNING: When is he going to slip in?

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning) has asked when the Premier is going to slip in? Well, that is not parliamentary to answer that, Sir.

Mr. Speaker for the Minister of Mines and Energy, but it may be that his colleague, the House Leader, but whichever of the two is better equipped to answer - I know that hon. gentleman -

MR. CROSBIE: That is obvious.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I agree it is obvious, Sir, but I am too polite to say so at this hour of the morning. Mr. Speaker, the question grows out of the statements which have been made overnight by Mr. John M. Shaheen of New York in which he has said again that he has access to sufficient money to enable him to revive the Come By Chance operation and to pay off the creditors and so forth, and that is all very welcome. My question, Sir, initially is, could the minister tell the House, Sir, whether the government have had any approaches from Mr. Shaheen or any of his associates or anybody

Mr. Roberts.

speaking in his behalf and if so, Sir, what those approaches have been and what response has been made?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the only approach that the government has had from Mr. Shaheen or his associates - there is nothing new in it - yesterday Mr. Casey and Mr. Roy Furmark had a meeting with the Premier and the Minister of Industrial Development and the Minister of Finance and myself and the Minister of Justice and what they said in effect was what was said publicly. There is nothing more detailed than that. They suggest that they have \$600 million, or they have a lender who will make available \$600 million to do certain things at the oil refinery when and if the feasibility study is completed and the feasibility study is positive - you know, presumably says it is feasible and economic. And as to the source of the money, they are unable to say at this time what the source of the money would be or to provide any proof that such funds are available. Anyway, they say they are seriously pursuing this and that if the lender did come up with the \$600 million that they would have to make arrangements, of course, with the trustee in bankruptcy and made a proposal to the creditors generally. They would have to make proposals to ECGD and the Government of Newfoundland. None of these proposals have yet been made.

MR. ROBERTS: What about the Government of Canada under the wharf agreement?

MR. CROSBIE: Well, they would also have to be included, because the wharf agreement is in default. Payments have not been made, and the Government of Canada has repossessed the wharf.

MR. HICKMAN: And any reversionary rights on that wharf belong to the -

MR. CROSBIE: Yes. And the wharf, by the way, has - you know, any rights to the wharf were with Provincial Refining Company Limited, which is now in the hands of the trustee in bankruptcy. So the conversation was

Mr. Crosbie.

all completely generally, as I say. The government has said that when they do know whether or not they can obtain this money, and what their proposals are, then the government would expect them to make their detailed proposals to the creditors and to ECGD and to the government, and we would deal with it at that time and the same as we would deal with anyone else at that time. So we have no more information other than what has been said, generally, publicly. And the suggestion is that there would be money to refurbish the oil refinery and a possible extension for aromatics, and that would leave a certain amount of money which would be available for the creditors, but the creditors would have to agree to stretch out their payments.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, they would not be paid in full.

MR. CROSBIE: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: Or at least not at once.

MR. CROSBIE: That has not been suggested.

But it is all, you see, quite general. So that all we know is what has been said to the public by Mr. Shaheen or other parties. I think that is the position. So there is nothing new on it except we have been told that and presumably and maybe in a month or two months there might be more.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition on a supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary, yes. My supplementary grows out of the last remark of the minister. He made have half anticipated the sort of question that I am going to ask, but could he be a little more specific if he could, you know, if he has the information, is there any indication when the proposal will jell? It seems to be in flux, and as I heard Mr. Shaheen on the radio newscast this morning, he was saying it was dependent, this money, this \$600 million that has been sort of standing by available, is dependent upon a feasibility study. I thought

Mr. Roberts.

he said from the Bechtel - I thought I heard the Bechtel Corporation, Canadian Betchel or - anyway the Bechtel Corporation, a very well-known firm. But is there any indication when that report - what sort of time frame are we talking of? Are we talking of a couple of months or we are talking of substantially longer?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, it should be made clear, you know, that we do not want anyone to get the impression in the Come By Chance area or otherwise that there is any quick resolution of this situation. Now they are hoping that Bechtel would be finished with their report by the end of June. They have to report to the proposed lender, assuming there is a proposed lender. So obviously even if that was met, the lender would have to consider it, and there would have to be a lot of detailed work, and there will certainly be nothing concrete until the Fall at least. So that appears to be the time frame.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, one has to treat this with a measure of scepticism because we have no proof that any of these things will be done. But they are working on it, and once they have their feasibility study, primarily they will have to get in touch with the trustee in bankruptcy and deal with the other creditors, in particular the major ones. So that is the position. And when they have got more information I presume they will be back in touch with the government.

MR. J. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: I wonder if I could phrase my question in two parts for the Minister of Mines and Energy. One, a question that obviously rises in a sale such as this when you are talking about Come By Chance is, why would anyone want to apply \$500 million or \$600 million for a plant that if it is down long enough obviously will be available at a much better sale without having to be responsible to the creditors and so on? And the second part of my question, Mr. Speaker, for the same minister is, apparently Mr. Shaheen has decided to go public in his negotiations on this to some extent since he has recently been on CBC-TV and so on, they have been in New York, and he has made some statements again today. Now what I would like to know is since

Mr. Nolan:

this is all very vague, does the minister have any knowledge of any more concrete agreement or concrete arrangement or offer, if you like, from anyone else that we have not heard from on this matter other than Mr. Shaheen. What we are looking for is something definite.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, other than Mr. Shaheen, you know, whose proposal is vague, and so on, itself, and certainly we cannot give any opinion on it at the moment. We do not have the information. There have been other approaches to the trustee and to the government, and these are groups who want to get all of the information that is available on the refinery, and study the whole matter. Now there are several that may be prospects who are doing that. But there has not been anyone else that has made any offers, as far as I know, certainly not to the government and not to the trustee or E.C.G.D. any concrete offers whatsoever.

There have been several groups who are looking into it, and assembling information or studying the available information and none of whom have said anything publicly because, of course, that is not the way, if you have a serious intent, that you do things; you do not discuss it all in public before you know what you are doing. So there are other groups interested, but their interest has not resulted in any concrete proposals yet. And whether they will or not we do not know.

With respect to the first part of your question, we asked that question ourselves yesterday, and that is just the risk you have to take, we are told. You know, your question is, well if somebody can, you know, somebody might be able to buy the refinery from the trustee or the mortgages for much less than \$600 million, why would they loan \$600 million? I do not know why they would. Perhaps they are not in the business of operating oil refineries, you know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Twillingate, followed by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did I understand the minister to say that Mr. Casey was one of those involved? Is he not the former head of the securities, the SEC of the United States?

MR. CROSSIE: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The same Mr. Casey?

MR. CROSSIE: Mr. Casey, I believe, Mr. Speaker, was at one time head of the SEC, and he is a lawyer, I think, in Washington or from Washington.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, would the minister in connection with the reply he just gave to the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan), as to the amount of money involved, would he not agree that perhaps as much as a couple of hundred millions or more of that would be not to purchase the existing refinery, but for extension, petrochemical and so on? So it is not a case, even if it comes to \$600 million, which it may not - but his claim is that he has in sight between \$400 million and \$600 million, up to \$600 million - but even if it were up to \$600 million, a very large part of that surely would be for the purpose of paying the cost of a big extension to the refinery that does not exist at all now.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSSIE: Mr. Speaker, that of course is not a question, as the hon. gentleman appears to be well briefed, and perhaps he has been in communication with Mr. Shaheen or one of his people. But since he mentions the subject, \$600 million is the amount mentioned and of that - I am just going on what we were told - \$250 million would be to refurbish or reconstitute or correct any deficiencies in the refinery, and about \$200 million, we

MR. CROSBIE:

are told, to build a petrochemical extension that would produce aromatics. That would leave -

MR. NOLAN: I thought it was \$40 million.

MR. DOODY: Between \$40 million and \$60 million for the -

MR. CROSBIE: Well no one knows exactly. This is only general talk. This is what we are told. Say \$50 million to refurbish and reconstitute the refinery and \$200 million for an extension to produce aromatics. That would leave \$350 million, if the \$600 million was raised to satisfy the creditors. Well as hon. gentleman know, the amount owed by these companies is far in excess of \$350 million.

So that is all we have been told, just general or generalities like that. We have no proof that any of it can be carried out, and there cannot be, of course, until after a feasibility is done. So it is just at this very general stage and everyone can make their own mind up as to how real they think it may be.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the hon. member for LaPoile and there will probably be an opportunity later to get back.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister of Transportation and Communications, fresh back from Ottawa, tell us if there is anything new on the government's proposal for a ninety-ten cost sharing agreement with the Government of Canada to upgrade and to resurface or reconstruct and repair the damage to the Trans-Canada Highway? Also, could the minister tell us if there is anything new on a DPEE agreement with regards to the Great Northern Peninsula, paving the Great Northern Peninsula and reconstruction?

MR. SPEAKER: . The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MOPCAN: Mr. Speaker, the federal Ministry of Transport has had officials in the Province approximately two weeks ago. The senior officials from the Surface Division of the MOT were in Newfoundland to travel the Trans-Canada Highway and inspect the conditions of the Trans-Canada Highway, and also to take a look at the volume of traffic on our highway.

MR. MORGAN:

Since returning to Ottawa they are now analyzing the information gathered while here in the Province and they are returning again in approximately less than a week, returning to the Province to meet with my officials and myself to have further discussions on this matter. That is the status of that part of the question asked by the hon. gentleman.

With reference to the DPEE roads agreement this year in the Province, we have been given authority, this government and my department, to call tenders for a number of projects which will obviously be included in this year's DPEE agreement. These tenders were called and have now closed and bids received. But we are unable to award the contracts on these projects until the actual agreement is signed. I am hoping, and so is my colleague, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, that the actual agreement will be signed in a matter of days so as we can award these contracts.

There is no delay, as I indicated a few days ago, on the part of this government.

MR. NEAFY: The Great Northern Peninsula?

MR. MORGAN: Yes. We have not been given the permission nor the authority to call any tenders on the Northern Peninsula. We have been given permission to call tenders on the LaSclia Road, on four projects in the Bonavista North Loop Road, the Burgeo Road and the Bay D'Espoir Road. But we have not been given authority or permission to call any tenders on the Northern Peninsula. We have not any indication or any reason given to us from Ottawa as to why.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West followed by the hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Finance. The question is, has his department to date given consideration to the prayer of the petition of the World War II veterans requesting that consideration be given to the war service in regard to the period of service aspect as to their qualifying for pensions?

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MP. DOODY: I assume the hon. gentleman is referring to the federal employees. Well, that question was answered at some length by me some weeks ago, Sir, and I am sure the answer is in Hansard. There was a petition presented by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall). I explained government's position on it at that time. Subsequently we had a five minute go each in the Late Show, and I think that the government's position is pretty well outlined in that particular edition. The situation has not changed since that time.

MP. CANNING: A supplementary. Is the minister saying that they have not given further consideration to the prayer of the petition of government help?

MP. DOODY: What I said, Sir, was that government's position was explained about two weeks ago or three weeks ago in that particular question-answer period and in the subsequent debate on it recorded in Hansard. We stated at that time that we were quite prepared and indeed had passed legislation to look after those employees who are employed by the Government of Newfoundland, but that we were not prepared to get involved with the employees of other jurisdictions, whether it be the federal government or any other government. We were also prepared and were quite anxious and willing to be of any assistance that we could in helping these federal employees to prepare any case that they might have or any assistance that they might need with federal Treasury Board in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER: I had indicated that I would recognize the hon. member for Lewisporte after.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the Minister of Mines and Energy in connection with the question he has already answered with regard to the Come By Chance oil refinery. Mr. Shaheen told one reporter yesterday from one of the media that he is looking at a ninety day proposition. This is going to be heard by the employees in Come By Chance and so on. Assuming everything goes smooth as people are anticipating, can this thing be put together the ninety days.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, you know, we can only give opinions. It is very difficult to see how in a complicated affair like this that, even if there is a lender and he does approve going ahead how it all could be accomplished in ninety days. You know, even if everything went smoothly, I would not expect - and it was accomplished, and we are not giving any opinion as to whether it could be accomplished or not - it certainly would not be in our view until the Fall, and that is also what the people who we spoke to yesterday said. You know, it would not be until October and, you know, there would have to be furious work to do that. You got all kinds of renters you would have to see, and all kinds of technical difficulties, etc., you know.

MR. SPEAKER: Is any hon. gentleman now rising to a supplementary to the previous question? The hon. member for LaPoile followed by the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to put a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. The water system in the community of Rose Blanche seems to be in a state of limbo at the present time. Could the minister tell us when he expects to complete his negotiations and get construction of the water system back on the rails again?

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

MR. PECKFORD: Back during the last federal election the member for the district, who is now the Minister of Trade and Commerce in Ottawa, promised the people of Rose Blanche a water system, as I understand it.

Mr. Peckford.

As a result of that promise negotiations were entered into between the community, the Department of Municipal Affairs, provincially, and then the Department of DREE which the hon. member MP was responsible for. As a result of those negotiations, some very long and complicated and protracted negotiations, it was finally agreed by DREE, through Treasury Board in Ottawa, that they would help finance a water system in Rose Blanche to the tune of fifty per cent of a maximum of around \$1.2 million. I think it is \$625,000—\$625,000 for each government. The Government of Newfoundland at the time, through the Department of Municipal Affairs, were somewhat reluctant to even get involved in that agreement, because it was setting a precedent, because there are many places in the Province that want water and sewer systems and yet here was the federal government getting involved in infrastructure in the Province but only in the M.P.'s district. And we had indications after his commitment to the people of Rose Blanche that we understood that it was going to be ninety-ten or seventy-five-twenty-five, a better agreement than fifty-fifty. In any case, we did enter into it for the sake of trying to get some kind of a water system in Rose Blanche. After tenders were called on the project and contracts came in it was found that the system was more expensive than had been previously envisaged. Therefore, that the total capital cost of the project would be far in excess of the \$1.2 million which had been allocated on a fifty-fifty basis, Province and Federal Government.

MR. NEARY: About how much?

MR. PECKFORD: Oh, quite a bit. It could go to \$2 million to \$3 million.

As a result of that and in consultation with the -

MR. COLLINS: How many households are there in Rose Blanche?

MR. PECKFORD: How many households? Two hundred and fifty households.

MR. NEARY: Yes. I guess it is over 250 to 300.

MR. PECKFORD: Two hundred and sixty-two, I think, I remember is the figure.

MR. PECKFORD: In any case in consultation with the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and myself, we wrote the hon. Minister of DREE indicating to him that there is going to be additional costs, that you can award the contracts in isolation of the fact that the whole capital costs is going to be more than the agreement of fifty-fifty, totalling \$1.2 million, and that would the federal government please indicate to us whether they were going to participate on the additional funding in the same way as they did on the \$1.2 million. We are waiting on an answer from DREE in that regard, and from the member for the district in that regard, because he has received a copy of the letter sent by the hon. Minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs to Mr. Lessard pointing out that if you are willing, your commitment is there to finance the system; you are not financing it any more now than the Province is anyway, which sort of destroys your commitment in the first instance; if you are willing to go fifty-fifty on \$1.2 million, you should be willing to go fifty-fifty on whatever the cost of the project is. The federal government still has a little bit more money than this Province does.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Just for the sake of clarification, I presume what the minister is saying is that the Province is prepared to continue the construction to put in more money into it on a fifty-fifty basis. The hang-up at the moment is DREE.

MR. PECKFORD: That is exactly, precisely correct, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue, followed by the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. I wonder could the minister briefly explain why it is, you know, in view of the statement made this morning about housing developments and so on throughout the Province, why is it that a building lot costs between say \$5,000 and \$9,000 as the ones in Arnold's Cove costs? What makes the tremendous cost?

MR. PECKFORD: Briefly, Mr. Speaker, the answer is this; that the cost of servicing land in Newfoundland is extremely high; that the corporations are non-profit, so you are just trying to recover the costs of installing the services. When you put in a main line or trunk line and so on and your curb and gutter and your paving that is what it comes out to per lot. It is just a simple matter of economics.

MR. CALLAN: Five to nine?

MR. PECKFORD: That is right. If there are fifty lots and the total cost was \$500,000 or whatever, divide it out and you have got -

MR. CALLAN: How much are they in St. John's?

MR. PECKFORD: In St. John's in Newtown now they are between about \$8,900 to \$11,200 in Newtown.

MR. WHITE: What about commercial zones?

MR. PECKFORD: In East Meadows, the average cost in the East Meadows development, which is a private development, is still somewhat higher per lot than are the ones developed by public money. They are still somewhat higher on the average, although the Newtown now is getting close to being almost the same as what it is in a private development.

But the whole problem - and I think it is recognized by most people - the problem is just in servicing. Then again -

MR. CALLAN: What about the land acquisition costs? Do they not matter very much at all?

MR. PECKFORD: Land acquisition, very small, extremely small. Most of the places where there are land assemblies now except Springdale as an exception and a couple of others, is land that was brought five, six or seven years ago or some of it was Crown land and was banked. So the only way to get down land costs for housing is to reduce the size of lots thereby getting more lots, number one. Number two, reducing the sophistication of your servicing and not paving your streets and not getting into so much storm

MR. PECKFORD:

drainage and this kind of thing. The answer is just a matter of sheer economics and the cost of servicing is just so high.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I wonder is there any truth to the item that was on the news a while ago that consulting fees on projects such as that one cost sixty-five dollars an hour? Would that drive up the cost, I wonder?

MR. PECKFORD: Well the engineering costs, Mr. Speaker, are involved in a lot of it. Now we do a lot of these land assemblies ourselves, you see, a lot of development; and the consulting engineering part of it is not that great. Consulting engineering is really greater on water and sewer systems per se rather than on land assemblies, because a lot of the planning and design work is done by the corporation. So that the engineering part of any land assembly would not appreciably increase the cost of the lot, not to any great degree. It would have some bearing on it but not to any great degree. So that is not a real major factor. It is a factor but not a major one.

I was talking to, Mr. Speaker, people outside Montreal just some time ago. Apparently in some of the suburbs of Montreal they are still selling lots for \$3,000 and \$4,000. The servicing must be a lot easier and their volume must dictate the lower -

AN HON. MEMBER: \$1,800 or 20.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, that is what I say. It is volume and your land. Even in Nova Scotia, Mr. Speaker, now where, you know, one time people used to say, "Nova Scotia is made of sand washed from the banks of Newfoundland", so it was easy to service a lot of those areas. Even in easily serviced areas of Nova Scotia you are up to \$7,000 and \$8,000 per lot.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Fisheries. The minister is aware, I am sure, that there are what we call fishing zones established around the number of fishing communities in this Province for the use of fishermen who live in those particular communities. Could the minister tell me what criteria is used in establishing these zones, and whether the fishermen of those particular areas are consulted with regards to the boundaries of those fishing zones?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if I got the question correctly, fishing zones or fishing rooms or?

MR. RIDEOUT: If the minister will permit, I am thinking, for example, I have received representation from Woodstock where there is a fishing zone for Woodstock and Pacquet. Woodstock would like to have their own fishing zone. I am sort of green on it so that is why I am asking for information.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: I think what the member - we have no designated fishing zones. There are fishing berths, I am aware of that, and these are prime areas.

MR. DOODY: They are may be for licencing purposes.

MR. W. CARTER: It might be for licencing purposes, which would be a Federal regulation. Certainly I will look into it and find out what the criteria used by the Federal Government would be in the establishment of such zones.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Some weeks ago the Minister of Mines and Emery stated in the Legislature that the policy of the government was to try and get chartered flights, international chartered flights to originate and arrive back in St. John's. I wonder if the minister could tell us what action he has taken on this particular matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

HON. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have taken no action whatsoever.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue followed by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. W. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. In view of the fact that you can go into practically any store in Newfoundland and see P.E.I. potatoes - and usually, of course, an unemployed person sitting down on that bag, but that is another matter - In view of the fact that practically every store in Newfoundland sells P.E.I. potatoes say for \$4.00 a bag, and locally grown potatoes you have to pay \$5.00 a bag, and, you know, a year or two ago hundreds of barrels of potatoes were dumped down around Glovertown in Central Newfoundland, why is that? Why is that not cured? Why are not our local potatoes bought first?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

HON. J. ROUSSEAU: That is a beautiful question. And if I could urge you and urge the rest of the Province to buy locally, if they would listen to me, you know, I certainly would ask them to do it. You can only ask -

MR. CALLAN: If they did not have the price, if they were not there they would have to buy the local.

MR. ROUSSEAU: They would have to. The only problem is, and we have that problem, in other areas too, there is no way the Provincial Government has jurisdiction with regard to Interprovincial trade. We cannot cut off the supply of potatoes from any other province in Canada into Newfoundland nor vice versa.

AN HON. MEMBER: Neither can the Federal Government.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Neither can the Federal Government.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Neither can the Federal Government. We have no jurisdiction over the trade and commerce across Provincial boundaries, and it is unfortunate because sometimes the power would be put to better use especially here in Newfoundland, on the Island part, and in Labrador we have a problem being at the tail end of the transportation

Mr. Rousseau:

transportation system. So the cost of the materials that are necessary to grow potatoes, and other factors that we would have here in this Province that other provinces do not have, of course, would add to our cost. But certainly if there was any way that one could appeal to the people of the Province to buy locally, I would be the first one to do it. But it is a problem that we are going to have to grapple with. I have already talked to Mr. Whelan and written to him in respect to other aspects of trying to have our boundaries closed to certain products to encourage growth here, but it is a difficult thing. And, like I say, with the Provincial Government has no jurisdiction over it, it is unfortunate. I do not know what the answer is, but we should be able to produce potatoes here in our own Province cheaper than Prince Edward Island does.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The thirty minute period is up.

Before calling Orders of the Day I wish to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of fifty-three students from Little Hearts Ease, Trinity Bay. They are accompanied by five of their teachers, Miss Phyllis Weir, Miss Barbara Smith, Mrs. Drodge, Mrs. Stringer and Mrs. Smith. I know all honourable members join me in welcoming these fifty-three students from Little Hearts Ease.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

On motion of the hon. Premier, a bill, "An Act To Style The Department Of Provincial Affairs And Environment As The Department Of Consumer Affairs And Environment," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (Bill No. 65)

On motion of the hon. Minister of Finance, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Liquor Control Act, 1973," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (Bill No. 73)

On motion of the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Agreement Ratified, Confirmed And Adopted By And Set Forth In The Schedule To The Commodore Mining Company Limited(Agreement) Act, 1968, And To Make Certain Statutory Provisions Relating To That Agreement," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (Bill No. 74)

On motion of the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Stephenville Linerboard Mill (Agreement) Act, 1972," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (Bill No. 69)

On motion of the hon. Minister of Education, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Local School Tax Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (Bill No. 71)

On motion of the hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, a bill, "An Act Respecting Labour Relations In The Province," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (Bill No. 75)

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 20. It is moved and seconded that the hon. minister shall leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Control The Relationship Between Employers And Employees Within The Province And To Provide Uniform Minimum Standards Of Conditions Of employment." Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. minister shall have leave to introduce said bill? Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay". Carried.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: I wonder if the House Leader could tell us when these two bills, No. 75 and No. 76 will be available for distribution because they are very major pieces of legislation and I think questions are certainly in order.

MR. WELLS: As soon as they are printed, I will see to it.

MR. ROBERTS: Is there any indication will they be long in being printed?

MR. WELLS: On Tuesday or Wednesday.

MR. ROBERTS: So we may have them on Tuesday or Wednesday of next week. They are at the printers, are they?

On motion of the hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, a bill, "An Act To Control The Relationship Between Employers And Employees Within The Province And To Provide Uniform Minimum Standards Of Conditions Of Employment," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (Bill No. 76)

On motion of the hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Forest Fires Act, " read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (Bill No. 68)

On motion of the hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Waste Material (Disposal) Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (Bill No. 70).

MR. SPEAKER: Order 1, the Address in Reply; the debate on the amendment to the Address in Reply was adjourned by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall).

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is hard for one to address one's self to the Address in Reply when it has been delivered so long ago. Of course, this debate opens many areas that a member can bring before the House. It is pretty well an unlimited area. Before getting into the burden of my remarks, which I hope will not be a burden, the main burden of my remarks, I should like to draw to the attention of the House remarks made by the hon. Minister of Justice yesterday in his speech in this debate with respect to the mode of presenting the

MR. MARSHALL:

Address in Reply. The House will recall that the hon. Minister of Justice made what I thought was a very good point with respect to the format of the Addresses in Reply to which this legislature has been accustomed over the years and the fact that perhaps we ought to have the types of Address in Reply that are -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. Could we have a little more quiet inside and outside the chamber?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. members are requested to keep noise to the minimum.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: If there are people outside the chamber who are making noise, then one of the officers of the House is to please inform them to be quiet.

MR. MARSHALL: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice as far as I am concerned made a very valid point. I think I would even stretch it a little bit further to suggest - this is not original, this has come up in the House before - that the whole procedure with respect to deliverance of the Addresses in Reply should be reconsidered. To me it has always seemed to be very artificial, to put what has become and what must necessarily be a political document in the hands of the Queen's representative and have the Queen's representative read it. Now I am not saying that we should abolish the Lieutenant-Governor or the position that the Lieutenant-Governor has in opening the House. That obviously should continue. But I think that the remarks that are made should be more in the nature of constitutional matters and that the Leader of the government should then get up as they do, I think, in Quebec - here again I am not advocating we follow Quebec, but it is a fairly good procedure - we would retain the Lieutenant-Governor for constitutionally opening the House and making a few -

MR. W. CARTER: You would not suggest we read it in French?

MR. MARSHALL: No, I would not suggest we read it in French.

MR. MARSHALL:

But we have the Lieutenant-Governor make a few statement that are not related to the policies of the government, as it were, and have the Leader of the government get up and read out what the policies of the government are, and the Leader of the Opposition reply. It would seem that that would make the procedure a bit more relevant, because, I would gainsay, although I do not know, that successive Lieutenant-Governors having to come into the House and read documents that have in effect been prepared for them and contain in many cases political positions, is not something that they would particularly prefer.

So I think that not only would I concur then with what the Minister of Justice said yesterday with respect to improvement of the mode of addressing the Address in Reply, but I think the manner of presentation of it should be perhaps looked at.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course Her Majesty the Queen does it.

MR. MARSHALL: I realize Her Majesty, the Queen, does it, Mr. Speaker, and I do not know what type of document she reads. It is along the same lines. But first of all I would say that I do not think we should be blinded to the possibility of change although we should not make change just for change sake. Secondly, I doubt really in many of the Throne Speeches that I have heard, whether it is really meant to put a type of what has become a political document, to a large extent largely a political document, in the hands of the Queen's representative. I think this is a political document on policies and the best person to deliver it full force would be the leader of the government and to reply, the Opposition. Then we get things centered, as it were.

Mr. Marshall.

Now with respect to this Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, I did not find this Throne Speech, I must say, any different than many of the others that have come before us. I found that it is somewhat heavy and laborious, and somewhat tedious in the presentation of the various positions that were put forth. And this is not unusual. It is not completely isolated to this particular Throne Speech, but with all of them. I think that this Throne Speech, as well as many of the others, follow along, for instance, a recitation of departments, and what each department is going to do. I think there is somewhat of a danger in doing this, because you cannot compartmentalize human problems, as it were, and the needs and problems of the people. And there are matters that continually, I think, because of the way in which these Throne Speeches have been brought before this House in centring them on departments - this department is going to do a certain project, and another is doing to do another, that other matters are perhaps left out. Because there are certain things that I think merit consideration by this House that ought to be done and I feel that some of them have escaped notice. And one or two of them I am now going to mention.

I think one of the major needs in this Province today, apart from the - as I always qualified my remarks by talking about the fiscal situation that we have talked about before, that is the overriding and the overbearing problem which we have, and I will not go into it again by saying that I feel that it is not perceived by the people, and even indeed by this House. But I think one major reform that is necessary, which would not cost the government any money and should be looked at very carefully is the provision in this Province of compulsory pension plans in private industry and to make these pension plans, if they possibly can, to be portable

Mr. Marshall.

that is to be able to be taken by the employee from job to job. Now a situation has arisen in this Province, and we have seen it from bitter experience. There are many people nowadays who are retiring, and who have retired in the past decade, where it was not fashionable to provide for pensions in the past in private industry. No pension provisions were provided. There was no funding of their pension rights, and they had no vested rights with respect to their pensions. And some very cruel and very harsh results have resulted from this, where people have laboured for years in certain firms - and I speak particularly in St. John's, but I know it is not confined to St. John's; it is all around the Province everywhere - they have worked in firms throughout Newfoundland for years for a very small salary, they come to the age of pensionable service, and if their neighbour happens to be in the civil service that is fine, when he gets to sixty-five he gets a reasonable pension; if their neighbour happens to be in certain other places where they do have funded pensions, that is fine as well; but as I say in many cases in this Province there was no actual provision for pensions over a period of years. I should not wish my remarks on this end to be construed as being a criticism of the employers. It is very easy for people to take off on the employers from time to time. It would particularly, I would think, be of great delight to the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to see such an attack being taken.

But the fact of the matter is over the period of years, it is only recently that people have become pensioned and security conscious as it were, and there was no provision made, and the people who are left in business when the older employees retired had to look after the ones who are still there at the time or their businesses would have foundered. So they had absolutely no recourse but to do what they did, either left their people out without any pension

Mr. Marshall.

at all or at a bare pittance and certainly it would always be one that would be a pension based merely on the gratuitous conduct of the employer. There would be no obligation with respect to it.

Now I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that that type of situation should be allowed to continue in this Province. It has been a matter of concern to me for quite a period of time, and I have done a bit of research and a bit of work on it. I feel that we are right now, as I know, in very difficult times financially with inflation and what have you. And the government cannot make moves, precipitous moves immediately to bring in acts without the proper type of investigation into the effect of it at the immediate time. But I would recommend to the government that immediate consideration be given to the enactment of an act in this Province for the provision of compulsory pension plans in private industries. And I also feel, Mr. Speaker, that these pensions should be made portable if possible. In other words, if John Jones is working with a local concern and he changes after ten years his employment, he ought to be able to carry that pension with him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said I have done a bit of research on this myself, and you will find, for instance, in various other provinces, Ontario, Saskatchewan, Quebec and Alberta, these provinces have acts entitled, "The Pension Benefits Acts" or acts of similar nature. I have also, Mr. Speaker, had conversations with the national president of a major trust firm in Canada with respect to it, and find that in the Province of Ontario, when they brought in this particular act, they included the aspect of portability in their pension plan and they had to deter from it, they had to cancel that aspect out, and they are looking at it right now from the point of view of putting it back in again. So there is a problem with respect to making pensions portable, because of the contributions of employees and other technical difficulties and what have you. But I say right now that there are many people - and

Mr. Marshall.

I do not want this, as I say, to be construed as a criticism of the industry or the employers, as it were, as very often people from outside St. John's would like to say and make us whipping boys of Water Street merchants. But it is a fact that there are many people, Mr. Speaker, who have been employed in concerns, worked hard for years, get up to age sixty-five and seventy, and there are no pensions provided for them. There are no pensions available for them. There have also been cases when people, when employers, have gratuitously, although they were under no obligation so to do, have provided for pensions for senior people who have retired over a period of time, have found that because of the business reverses or changed circumstances and what have you, that they have had to cut their pensions when they have been out. Now that is inhuman and it is cruel, and the only recourse that we have is to this Legislature for the provision now of in private industry of a pensions benefits act which is going to require as broadly based and defined as possible group of industries, group of private concerns, to provide funded pension plans for their employees, so that that person has a vested right, and we stop and we cease and we remedy this problem that has occurred.

Now I do not know whether hon. members in this House have experienced the same problems, but I have been acutely aware of it representing an area in St. John's, in the urban areas of St. John's, which comprises of many people who have worked in places on Water Street and what have you, and they come to the point of retirement, there are no pensions provided for them. The employers, in all fairness, cannot provide the pensions without their business going bottom up, and without then a loss of employment to the people who are currently there. But it is a pathetic situation to meet. It is

Mr. Marshall.

an unjustifiable, an untenable position to meet, and it is something which should be taken up and taken up forthwith. I do not say that we can rush right immediately to the bill or to the legislation now, and I think we have to take credence of the fact that in this particular time with spiralling inflation and problems that businesses entail as well as everybody else, that it has got to be done, and it has got to be done very carefully so that the equilibrium is not completely upset. But this I am sure of, Mr. Speaker, that one of the best reforms outside of the other acts, like the Civil Service Commission Act and the Public Tender Act and other great moves that this government has brought in, but one of the biggest reforms that this government could bring in now - you talk about the flag, and you talk about your other bills that are on the Order Paper - there is no bill that could claim a greater significance to the people of Newfoundland than the provision of a private pensions act for private industry requiring these pension funds to be put there. I would hope to see, Mr. Speaker, this matter pursued. I mentioned matters in this House before from time to time, and it seems that it is not just peculiar to me. Everybody has mentioned them, and we seem to adjourn and, you know, that is the end of it. But I think

Mr. Marshall:

that there ought to be striken, that the government should immediately make moves with respect to investigating this. I offer the government if it wishes whatever limited knowledge I had on the matter. As _____ I say, I am not speaking in a vacuum, as it were. It is something that I have done a great deal of research on and can refer to the government to the various types of material that they need to study for it. But certainly -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Assuming that the decision is made, that there shall be pensions in private employment and that these pensions shall be portable, so that if a man goes from one job to another, from one employment to another, he carries his accumulated pension rights with him. Assuming that is agreed on, Does the hon. member mean that the limit of the government's activity and it should be that of introducing legislation to be adopted hopefully by the Legislature, imposing that obligation on private industry, but private industry not only to be obliged to do it, but to organize it and handle it and be exclusively in the hands of private industry; or does the hon. gentleman mean that the government shall be the collecting agency? It is already the collecting agency. It collects all kinds of money, and pays out all kinds of money. Would the hon. gentleman pass that also on to the government, for the government to impose rates of premium payments by the employers, and the government to pay it out when it becomes payable, or would he have it entirely private?

MR. MARSHALL: I thank the hon. member for Twillingate for the question, Mr. Speaker. In answer to it, I do not think that this government can afford to get into a programme like this financially, and I do not think it is necessary for it to be done. But what I do think is that the government obviously will have to regulate it through the Superintendent of Insurance or what have you. They will have to set down regulations, and they will have to see that they are

Mr. Marshall:

complied with. But as far as the fiscal support with respect to it within the regulations that are provided, the monies will have to come from employer and employee contributions, as is normal. I do not feel that the government should get involved in the funding of it. There are many pension plans available in private industry where these pensions can be put in, and that they can be funded in a very secure, and a very beneficial manner.

As a matter of fact, I should not wish to see the government get involved in that way because I feel that what the government would do is what really it has done in the public service; it would then in effect collect the premiums and pay out the money. Now I have long thought as well, although it is very hard in these fiscal times to do it, that the pensions of public servants ought to be funded and provided for outside the agency of government itself. Now that is -

MR. NEARY: The Auditor General recommended it.

MR. MARSHALL: Well yes, but that is a big expense to change this tide. I would hope that the government would do that in the future. But for the present time what I would recommend is that it would be quite adequate. Obviously government brings in an act, obviously government has got to regulate it, and government has got to police it. But the funding of it -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. This background of noise, it comes from human throats, it continues, and a member is entitled to be heard.

MR. SPEAKER: (MR. YOUNG) Order, please! I will ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to see that the noise in the corridors is kept at a minimum, please. And before the hon. member continues with his remarks or his speech, on behalf of all of the members of the House of Assembly I would like to welcome to the galleries a group of Grade X students from Cape John Collegiate, LaScie accompanied by their Principal, Mr. Hatfield and their teacher Mr. Burton. I trust your stay will be a happy and enjoyable one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, you know, the noise does not subside and it is coming from this side, so perhaps, you know, I do not know what else we have got to do. It is rather distracting.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not only to the gentleman speaking but to those who want to hear him.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Now then, Mr. Speaker, I hope I have made, you know, that position quite clear. The hon. member for Twillingate asked a very reasonable question there. It is not - it certainly I think, it would almost defeat the purpose for this money to be paid into the government and the government to administer it. This money has to be collected, it has to be what we called funded and paid to the large companies that fund pension concerns, but the government has to see that this is done, and that is the government's involvement. The government has to make it compulsory on employers to provide these pensions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, the House.

MR. MARSHALL: The House, yes. The House has to make a compulsory, the House has to regulate the manner in which it is going to be carried out to ensure that there is security for the people involved, and that it is done fairly. But the money has to come obviously from private sources, employer-employee, which is normal through their contributions, and it has to be funded.

But as I say, Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any reform or any measure that a government could take that is so necessary in this Province as this particular thing, and I would hope that it would merit the attention of the government, and that government would pursue and enquire into it. As I say, I have a certain amount of information about it that I would be only too glad to give them. I was going to draft a bill on it, Mr. Speaker, myself, because I have drafted bills before and in the past. But it is a very involved thing, and it requires a tremendous amount of work by a lot of people with various expertise. And I think the government through the, you

Mr. Marshall:

know, through the government agency is the proper place to do it. But I draw this one, I draw this one observation when I say the government is the proper one to do it; I feel that it is up to the elected representatives that is, the Cabinet, in this case, which is the executive arm to take the bull by the horns and to see that this is done. I have noticed that with respect to the reliance, as there has been a great reliance in all governments, in all stages, in all places in Newfoundland and what have you, upon the public service, and senior public servants, their word is almost taken as the Holy Writ, and if they turn around and say something cannot be done, it never turns up to be done. And I say to the Cabinet and to the government that this is something that can be done. It has been done in other provinces. Let us see that it is done. And let us see that we use the agency of government to bring it about so that we can bring in a very beneficial reform into this House of Assembly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman yield again for a moment.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How would the legislation if it were introduced into the House, debated, passed, how would it guard against imposing too heavy a burden? It would be too heavy possibly on some but not on others. A scheme impose on Brice in Grand Falls or the Iron Ore Company in Labrador City and Bowaters and so on, and so on, might fall, you know, reasonably lightly on their shoulders, but on some little firm employing four people or seven people fall much more onerously. Would it be as a proportion of wages earned or what? How would that danger be avoided?

MR. MARSHALL: Well, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! Before the hon. member continues. I would like on behalf of all the members of the House of Assembly to welcome to the galleries a group of twenty-four Grade XI, students, from Our Lady of Fatima High School, St. Bride's, accompanied

Mr. Speaker (Mr. Young):

by their teachers, Sister Patricia King, and Mr. Hubert McGrath. I trust your stay will be a very enjoyable and educational one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The hon. member for St. John's East may continue.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The question posed by the hon. member for Twillingate is the reason why we have to proceed very, very carefully with it, so that we do not have a real adverse affect on the small businessman. But this I say, I do not care what size of the business, whether it is Price or what have you, and there are certain businesses that might possibly have to be exempt, but I would have to look at them very closely before you exempt them, it would have to be something like employing seasonal workers. But I say this, that anybody who conducts business in this Province who cannot provide for the security of employees who have worked for them for thirty and forty years ought not really to be in business. They have to pay the employee a salary, so they obviously have to pay the employee a salary and they have to provide for these pension amounts.

Now it would not possibly be a flat rate pension. What really would have to happen, it would have to be based on the wages of the person, and there would have to be contributions the same as it is in a normal pension plan where large concerns have these particular plans.

MR. MARSEALL:

I feel, as I say, that it is a matter of urgency. In my district - and my district is maybe no different than anywhere else - but I have a large number of elderly people who have retired from various businesses downtown. I underline again, I am not casting aspersions - but I will not go into that again - against the merchants, but here they are. They are in houses here in the City of St. John's. There is spiralling inflation going on. Sure they got their Canada Pension Plan and they got their Old Age Pension but they have nothing else. If they do happen to have a pension, it is a pittance because that is all that can be afforded to be paid to them, thirty or forty dollars a month in some cases.

I talked to a person there about six months ago who was employed from a firm that is carrying on business here for a long period of time and his pension works out to twenty-seven dollars and fifty cents a month. That is gratuitous. He has to rely on the benevolence of the former employer and that is not good enough. In this day and age, in 1976, I am not advocating that government get involved in everything, I do not think government should get involved in everything. But I do firmly believe that government has to set the regulations by which the general populace works and that this regulation ought to be set down. There must be a pensions benefit act in this Province and it ought to be brought in as soon as possible, but not to rush to print. Be very careful what we are doing, to make the enquiries beforehand so that we may bring it in as easily as possible. But we cannot be put off by people who say it cannot be done, because it has been done in other areas. We are not to be put off by highly paid civil servants who have certain ideas as to the orderliness of life, and I thoroughly recommend and strongly recommend to the Cabinet that it take the bull by the horns and, as I say, I will give the government any information or anybody who wishes it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It has already.

MR. MARSHALL: It has been done. The hon. member who usually listens comes in when I speak, Mr. Speaker, and listens very attentively - had to go somewhere else. But it has been done in Ontario. It has been done in Saskatchewan, Quebec and Alberta. In Ontario they attempted to bring it in on the matter of it being portable, that is to be able to be moved from one business to another. But they found that they had difficulties there.

MR. NEAPY: Compulsory pension.

MR. MARSHALL: Compulsory pension plans and if possible to make them portable.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, at the risk of wearing out my welcome, would the hon. gentleman yield again? On this matter of portability, a fellow goes to work with a firm and he works a year, two or five, and the firm goes broke or he gets fired or he quits them to get a better job elsewhere, and so going through life maybe in six or eight different employments including public service, the government. Will it matter, should it matter, the portability, the accumulating rights that he is earning just by working and by the passing of time, would that be affected by the nature of his change of employment? The firm goes broke, he gets fired or he quits or whatever reason, would the portability continue in any case?

MR. MARSHALL: It would have to continue, Mr. Speaker, because what I am saying is that these contributions would be what you call funded, which is really another way of meaning that they are put through a third party in trust, and it is almost like a sinking fund, if you want to try to equate it, although it is not as simple as that, you know, to borrowing and it grows.

Now if he goes from one place to another, and in the other place within the regulations or for some reason or other it is not provided there the money should remain there so that he can get the benefit at a certain age anyway. It should not be allowed to be withdrawn by him unless in the case he reaches the age of retirement of sixty-five or in the case that he passes away and then the benefits

MR. MARSHALL:

would go to his family. But it is a case of protecting, as far as I am concerned, the employee and it is - I will not say long overdue, that is a cliché phrase-but it is certainly is a reform, as I say, that must be looked into and I feel that something should be done about it because we have in this Province very dramatic and unfortunate examples of what has occurred by reason of the fact that people have retired without pensions, or if they retire with them they are very meager and even at that they are gratuitous depending upon the fortunes of the business. If the business goes bankrupt, they are gone with it too. I do not think that people when they get to retirement should be put in that position. That is why I say it should be funded by a third party.

Now, if there are any other questions I would be delighted to answer them. There are a few other points that I would like to make in connection with the Throne Speech.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would like to ask a question but I am not sure that the hon. gentleman can answer it. The one who could answer it is the Premier. What about bringing in this legislation?

PREMIER MOORES: Good idea.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Good idea. We are getting somewhere.

MR. MARSHALL: I thank the hon. member for the assistance, Mr. Speaker. Now we get on to another point that I think needs to be brought up. We hear in the City of St. John's now a little bit - probably not enough - of the position with respect to clean-up. I think that dramatic steps need to be taken, here again have to be taken, by the government with respect to not just the city of St. John's but our entire countryside.

One of our greatest assets in this Province has to be the outdoors and our scenery and what we have. But you do not need to travel very far in St. John's particularly and you will see the condition of the streets. Well, that is a municipal responsibility. But if you go to places like the Marine Drive, for instance - I can

MR. MARSHALL:

pick them out - or St. Phillip's, which I have occasion, as we all do, - from time to time to go through, and you look at the lookouts that have been provided along the sides of the roads everywhere. It is a provincial disgrace and there is no way - we are all Newfoundlanders and there is no way of getting around it - that Newfoundlanders do not respect their countryside in the same manner as other Canadians do. I know that is the type of inflammatory statement that politicians would love to get up and perhaps say that the hon. member for St. John's East is all wrong and the people from Newfoundland are just as good as anywhere else and what have you. It is almost like the clarion call to battle. But it is true and all you have to do is compare the countryside in this Province with the countryside everywhere else. This is, as far as I am concerned, one of our major resources.

You know there is an old popular song that one of my little daughters used to sing about cats and rats and elephants. I mean, you see everything but - well, you see cats and rats on the side of the roads but you do not see elephants. You see beer bottles. You see cans. You see pop bottles. You see everything strewn all over the countryside everywhere. Something has to be done about it.

Now, what are we going to do? I would recommend to the government, first of all, one of the obvious things is heavier litter fines and stricter enforcement ought to be maintained with respect to this. I would also ask them to consider possibly deposits on bottles, making it mandatory for there to be deposits on bottles and beer cans and what have you. I think the major thing is that there has to be a process of education. When I heard the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) in the estimates when he made, I thought, a really good speech on education and our contribution into education, I think that we should be educating the young people

MR. MARSHALL:

in this Province with respect to the necessity to cleanup.

Now, the Minister of the Environment has already taken certain steps with respect to it and there are various other concerns that are working on this. But I think that we need to have a real crash effort with respect to this, with respect to our younger people. Now one of the things I would recommend is that in many other provinces-although I do not like to recommend that we do things because other provinces do them - but in many other provinces they have a holiday every Spring in the schools - heavens knows the children get enough holidays anyway - but a holiday specifically set aside for the purpose of school children going out around the countryside and picking up the litter. This draws it to their attention. I think some of the money that is used in public relations in this government could be well directed to the production of television programmes to make younger people much more conscious, much more litter conscious.

All of us who in this Province have smoked from time to time, and have been subjected to our own children coming at us about the smoking and the hazard of smoking over the past few years, can realize just what an effective weapon the television media particularly can be in this respect. I think that this is something that the government should consider.

I also feel that the government should consider - and I am concentrating on the younger people, because if we do not do it with the younger people and really educate them with respect to it, they are in many cases much more litter conscious than the adults are, but I think it has got

Mr. Marshall.

to be hammered home to them, And it is only through them that there can be improvement, that there could be with younger people, there could be a programme implemented by the government without any increase of expenditure. We could cut down perhaps in a few other places through various associations, Boy Scouts, Girl Guides or what have you - that might sound very trite, but it is necessary - and to get them involved in going out on projects to clean up our countryside and to keep it clean. And then following that, I think we have got to slap down and slap down immediately with very heavy fines. Look, Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion, as we all have had, I suppose, to go out in the country, and I enjoy the countryside as well as all members here do, and I have been, you know, eight or nine miles off the main road, and you are in the middle of nowhere and you get the feeling that the last people who were here were perhaps the Beothucks, and that is a great feeling that I know we have all experienced. It is a great release, and you look down at your feet and you find a beer can or a pop can or what have you in the water, and you will see garbage strewn, not just by the road side but throughout the country everywhere, and I feel that as far as I am concerned our greatest tourist resource is our Island itself. And Newfoundlanders are seemingly bent on desecrating this resource, and I feel that the Department of Tourism, not just the Department of Tourism, the government, but perhaps through the Department of Tourism and Environment and whatever all these restructured departments do, that they could make a real effort. And the effort has to be done in a real, as far as I am concerned, programme through education and television with the younger people to do something about it.

Look, you do not have to go, as I say, very far. When I say the Marine Drive, I do not mean the people in that district, because everybody is the same. The reason why the Marine Drive is littered is that people come in from the outside and they are throwing cans around and what have you. But all Newfoundlanders, I think, bear

Mr. Marshall.

the burden of the responsibility with respect to it, and I know the government is taking steps with respect to it, but I think it has to take more dramatic steps than it has done.

Another item that I would like to bring up - I had a note on it. I had these notes done many months ago when the Address in Reply was first given. And I said then that I was disappointed, but now I have to qualify it. I was disappointed to see nothing done with respect to no announcement made with respect to ground rents, to the position with respect to absentee landlords who own land here in the city of St. John's. Now I qualify that, I say, by saying that I have since been on the Minister of Justice's own initiative, he has been in contact with me, and I am hoping that legislation will be before the House this session or if not as soon as possible thereafter. Members may remember that during the last session of the House I brought in myself a private member's resolution which never got debated. But it was not brought in for the purpose of debate, it was brought in for the purpose of drawing the problem to the House of Assembly. And the problem is this: There are many people - and I speak of my own district in St. John's, but I know it is all over St. John's, everywhere, and it is certainly in the interests of anywhere in Newfoundland where this occurs - who occupy homes on land which is owned and leased to them. The people who leased the land to the homeowners, the leases were in 1890, and many of those have gone away to Australia, England, many of them came from England, and never came from Newfoundland, and they are all over the world everywhere. The original lessors have died, and their estates have devolved down. I know of one case, for instance, where a party living in Puerto Rico has a one hundredth and thirty-six interest in a ground rental, and the ground rental is \$20 a year. Now, of course, that person has no interests whatsoever in that lease, and the person who is on the property has no means of getting a freehold deed, as he is

Mr. Marshall.

entitled to under the amendments to the City of St. John's Act. My proposal last year, and the proposal that I hope will be coming in in this legislation, is that absentee landlords - and here you got to be careful when you do this type of thing that you do not interfere with vested rights - that absentee landlords are to be given by law a certain period of time within which to appoint an attorney to sign on their behalf and represent them in the Province. I would suggest that this period of time in fairness should be between six months and a year, but we are open on that. If they do not respond to this within this period of time, then the registrar of the Supreme Court should be constituted with the power to sign on their behalf and to give good titles collecting therefor the monies that these people would have been entitled to had they signed themselves so there is no cancellation of their rights.

The second thing I suggested was that the provisions with respect to arbitration of the value of the land is provided by the St. John's Act, and in the City of St. John's Act depending on the lease you can buy it in certain cases for twenty times the annual ground rent. In other cases, if it is before 1921, for the fair market value of the land. Now where you get the leases before 1921 you have a problem, because what happens is, what is the fair market value? How do you establish it? It is set down in the acts by arbitration. That involves expenses. It involves very heavy expenses for the people much inordinate to the value, in some cases, of their lands. So I have suggested also that a method be set up, a speedy and summary method, and I just take the concern, as it were, the Public Utilities Board - it may be another board, I am not advocating that a new board be established or new people be employed. Certainly there are mechanisms here that can handle it, but just say the Public Utilities Board - a person will be entitled to go before them, and have the value of their lands set. When the value is set,

Mr. Marshall.

they either pay the lessor or his attorney, or if he has not nominated an attorney, you pay the registrar of the Supreme Court and get the deed. And that frees the title, and will do a lot for housing in this particular area of St. John's.

Now, as I say, I had a note before that I was disappointed not to see in the Throne Speech any reference to this particular legislation. But I have to amend this by saying that the Minister of Justice, who has always been to me anyway very receptive to ideas, has already informed me, and I am glad of it, that the matter is under active consideration from his department. The officials of his department have been in contact with us, and we hope to see in the very near future very beneficial legislation to that effect which is going to benefit not only people in my district, but the people all throughout St. John's and certainly I think will very much improve the opportunities for development and the improvement of housing stock.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many minutes I got left. I can go on for quite a period.

MR. SPEAKER: You have five minutes.

MR. MARSHALL: I have five minutes left.

MR. DOODY: You can carry on by leave.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): By leave.

MR. MARSHALL: I do not know. There are other people who want to speak.

I have the note now. I also got a sign from the Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another matter that I want to speak of as well now that the matters are out of the court, and I was involved with them at the time that they were in the court, is the recent elections under the - what we call - cancelled elections of the former members for Bonavista North, for Exploit's and for Ferryland. It was not possible - I suppose it was possible, but it would have been, I think, wrong to have brought it up at the time that

Mr. Marshall.

the matters were before the courts, but they now happen to be resolved. So I want to make certain comments, because I was connected with two of these cases and watched the other one, and I think that there are matters surrounding these cases that should be of concern to this House and should be of concern to the government and this is this: Mr. Speaker, in all of these cases, there were incidents of people who voted under the terms of the Election Act and had gone in on polling day and had signed sworn affidavits to the effect that they were ordinarily resident in Newfoundland for a period of six months preceding the election, and they were ordinarily resident in the polling station on election day. Now they went in and they took a bible in their hand, they swore an oath, which with the bible and the oath happens to be the way in which we administer things in this Province to assure the statements are true, and they took these oaths. And then they come into court, preceded to take another oath from the bible and told an entirely different story. Now in some of these cases it was done obviously with a - in my opinion, I am quite sure it was done innocently and nothing should result from it - but there were certain cases, and obviously I am not going to get specific, but there were certain cases in my opinion of people who took these oaths, in Exploit's I can think of - the hon. member for Exploit's election was voided, and he is not here sitting in the House as a result of that - in Bonavista North and in Ferryland where people came in and told a diametric, opposite story from that which they gave when they went in on polling day. Now I feel, and

MR. MARSHALL:

here again there are two people particularly that stick out in my mind who certainly should have known better, but I feel - maybe this is not the place to do it, but I think it is because it is a matter of privilege of the House, it is a matter of privilege of the members of this House. We are all here as a result of the Election Act. The Election Act was set up - and by the way, there has been some talk by the Leader of the Opposition with reference to it that the Election Act needs to be changed, and it may, but it does not need to be changed to the extent that he is labouring under the impression. It is the same type of Election Act, here again, that operates in other provinces in Canada, in many other provinces of Canada.

But the fact of the matter is that the procedures were set down under our law with respect to people coming in and swearing where they were ordinarily resident. Now in some cases it was a mistake. In some cases it was the polling clerks. But I do feel that the ministry - and I would recommend to the Minister of Justice that now that the cases are closed that he take a look at the evidence which was brought before the case and investigate it and have the Director of Public Prosecutions look at it for the purpose of seeing when and in what cases, if any, there should be any charges, any appropriate charges laid because the whole basis of our system is going to fall down. If people are going to be allowed to come in and take an oath, if they are to be able to take an oath and they do take an oath, one day and the next day they come in and they say something diametrically opposite, I do not think that we should sit back and say, jack easy, you know, that this is it. I mean there have been three members of this hon. House as a result of this who are not in their seats at the present time.

I dare say if this type of thing is allowed to go on it will be impossible for anyone to win an election by one vote or two votes or even ten or fifteen or twenty votes because you can always

MR. MARSHALL:

find certain circumstances like this. And it is very difficult to lay down laws with respect to these things. But I do feel that, you know, I am sort of nonplussed, as it were, when I see people come in and they have made statements that are diametrically opposite to what they signed and what they presumably knew they were signing. Now I am not saying that necessarily you just haul them all into court. There are many of them that should not have been. But at least the matter should be looked at and I think it is a matter of the privileges of the House and that is why I raise it at this particular time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's forty-five minutes have expired.

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all I must say that the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) has said many of the things that I feel strongly about and some of them I have already mentioned during the Oral Question Period and in Presenting Petitions and what have you.

Now yesterday afternoon during the Late Show I raised a topic which I felt needed to be raised and it was also raised again last night by the member for St. George's (Mrs. McIsaac). Also last night in a speech by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), which was responded to by the member for Trinity-Bay De Verde (Mr. Rowe) and then by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) there were some others points raised and questions raised and what have you that are kind of getting at the heart, I think, of many of the problems that we have. Mr. Speaker, when I decided to enter politics, I think it was ten days before election day last Fall, I did so for several reasons. Things that I saw wrong and things that I hoped that I could have a hand in curing if I should be elected as an MHA.

During the first month or so of the legislature last Fall, I must say that for most new members I suppose it was a period

MR. CALLAN:

of disillusionment. The government did no wrong. Member after member got up and said the government did no wrong. We did not make any empty promises leading up to the election. On this side of the House we had members getting up, of course, saying things, again some of them were wrong but again they could do no wrong as well. So it was a period of disillusionment for me and now after six or seven months of playing the role of an M.E.A. I think I am beginning to see what the whole system is about.

The idea of getting up and making suggestions and talking about reforms and so on, I believe that is an absolute waste of time. I hope it is not but I think it might be an absolute waste of time. It seems to me that - not only to me of course, but to the average Newfoundlander. I am sure that nobody would disagree that the average Newfoundlander looks on this House of Assembly with distaste, and many of the members who make up the legislature, with distrust. You know there is no honour to be a member, to be an M.E.A.

The member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) last night talked about the small salary that we are receiving and he talked about the mistrust that people have, you know, thinking that that is not all we are getting out of it, our salary. As a matter of fact only yesterday before I came in here to St. John's I went down to the school to pick up my daughter and a gentleman came along - I believe he was joking at the time or I hope he was - but he had a few drinks that morning. He is one of the gentlemen who worked at the Come by Chance refinery and lost his job, by the way, so he does not have too much to do now like an awful lot of unemployed people. They spend an awful lot of their time in beer taverns and what have you, because as everybody knows an idle mind is the devil's workshop and it is not the healthiest situation to have. Anyway this gentleman - I think he was joking, I hope he was - but I am wondering how widespread his opinion was and some people sincerely believe it. "At least", he

MR. CALLAN:

said, "with our MHA we get the chance to see our car, you know, fairly often." The fact that I live in the district, one of the few MHAs, I believe who do live in the district. So, as I say, even though the gentleman was joking I believe and sincerely believe that there are a fair number of people who think, you know, the fact that you do probably drive a car a little bit better than the average person - some of us do and some of us do not - that it was a gift from somebody.

Now the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) last night expressed many of the fears and so on that most of us have as MHAs and he kind of got at the crux of the matter. You know, the salary that we are receiving is too little, too small. When a gentleman, when a man or a woman has to take a cut of \$10,000 in salary to become a member of the House of Assembly it does not make sense. Or in the case of the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) when that gentleman has to go \$5,000 in the hole in six months, you know, representing his district there is something terribly wrong. I have talked to bank managers who have told me, casually mentioned about other previous MHAs who resigned and he thinks and they think that this is why they resigned. You know, under the set-up that we have - I do not believe there is any other set-up probably in the universe where, you know, we get paid in such a haphazard manner. That is something else. I mean, why it is not done on a monthly basis is beyond me! Our salary as everybody knows - of course the general public does not know - but our salary, the salary of an MHA is \$8,000 and that is it. That is \$8,000. There are

Mr. Callan.

a couple of other things, you know, travel and district expenses, travel and expense allowance. And, of course, you know, even that is not allocated reasonably and sensibly. You know, for me to travel through the district of Bellevue, as I often do, you know, I have attended council meetings in Come By Chance, Sunnyside, you know, Norman's Cove, and travel all over. Tonight I am over in Chance Cove to the Lion's thing. I am expected to be there. And I am burning my own gas. People think that I am getting paid for it. Perhaps I am. But then if I have to travel 200 or 300 miles throughout the district to attend meetings and to visit constituents and to travel down to the wharf at Little Heart's Ease, you know, because the fish buyer down there is so tangled up that he does not know where to turn and what to do because, you know, the federal government owns this building, and the provincial government owns this building, and, you know, and the mess, and oh, there is a task force to look into this. All this will be straightened out, but when? How many years will it take? So there is no question about it. I do not blame the general public for being disillusioned.

You know, I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question there this morning. You know, why is it that we have potatoes coming in from P. E. I. which go on the market here in every store in Newfoundland cheaper than you can buy local potatoes. You know, there is something wrong, and the minister says, well I wish that we could convince people, the average Newfoundlander, to buy local potatoes. Well what efforts are being made to explain to the people and to try and educate the general public to the fact that, you know, support your own industry, your local industry, support your own Province, not P.E.I. The only time that ever I saw anything on television or heard anything on radio in the way of, you know, putting forth our Province was a month or two months leading up to the election last Fall. You know, it sickened me. And I did not mention this at all yesterday afternoon. But I could write a book on the efforts that I and several others put in to try and get a stadium for the young people in our area, the stadium which is now under construction at Whitbourne.

MR. CALLAN:

You know, then last Fall you had every now and then on television you would see these lovely playgrounds being shown and the government has done a wonderful thing in recreation and so on. But, Mr. Speaker, I know that it was not thanks to the government for most of these facilities at all, ball pitches, and all the other things. You know, these things came to communities in spite of the government, in spite of, not thanks to or because of, but in spite of the government. The government put in money, yes, but, you know, how many trips did I and somebody else have to make to St. John's, you know, and get a run around from a senior civil servant or from a cabinet minister, a runaround. What a waste of time and gas and money. There is something wrong. There are answers. I am sure there are answers. But, of course, you know, the answers that I will suggest will never be implemented naturally and, you know, perhaps only will be laughed at. Perhaps it is because they are too sensible.

The member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) raised a point just now about litter and garbage and Newfoundlanders are dirty. They throw things through their car windows and so on. I remember when I was president of the Lion's Club in Norman's Cove two years back, you know, we had the same problem there. But as a good Lion's member I got down in the ditch and helped pick it up on clean-up day. We distributed containers throughout the community, you know, so that people would place their garbage in their containers. There is no reason in the world why you could not have - I know in my own case, for example, I have been driving from here, from St. John's to home, and I have had garbage that I liked to get rid off, and, you know, it would seem almost too long to carry it home, a full ashtray or something. Well if there were containers along the highway somewhere, you know, all you would have to do is just pull off and, you know, containers which would be dumped frequently, perhaps once a week. Who is going to dump them? How much is it going to cost to keep them emptied and so on? Many of the people that are unemployed and many of them who are on social assistance, you know, able-bodied relief could be doing these things. You know, we have

Mr. Callan.

in Norman's Cove, as we have in every other community in Newfoundland, schools and churches which are being broken into and, you know, damaged and so on. Why cannot these people earn their social welfare, their assistance by being night watchmen at places like that?

MR. DOODY: You might not save that much money.

MR. CALLAN: You might not save that much money? I wonder if the schools that we had burned in the last several months, the one here in St. John's, I wonder if these schools would have burned, you know, completely down if there had been somebody there who could have caught the fire, you know, in its early stages. Anyway, as I said, these answers are too simplistic and so on to be even given a second thought, I assume.

Mr. Speaker, I was talking yesterday about the government playing politics. You know, my philosophy for a long time has been that we have too little government, from the government we have too little government and too much politicking. I would say that a prime example now will be the stadium that will go down on the Southern Shore. And I know about these things from firsthand. I believe I was chairman of the municipal government in Norman's Cove a few years back, when the by-election was coming up for Hermitage. I know I was there in some capacity, President of the Lion's Club, chairman of the council or something or other, you know, and at the same time, Mr. Speaker, we were getting pavement through Norman's Cove, Chapel Arm and Long Cove. In the middle of Norman's Cove the pavement was stopped. What reason was given? It was too late in the Fall to do any more paving, to do any more paving; any more this Fall, the pavement would crack up, you know, the next year and so on. We fought and we got the paving equipment to stay there and so on, and even then it did not go, you know, the full distance to the Trans-Canada. It was absolutely impossible. We cannot lay another bit of pavement. It is too late in the Fall. And, Mr. Speaker, you know, two or three days later where was that paving equipment that was supposed

Mr. Callan.

to have been finishing the job in our area, in my area? The paving was down in Hermitage, putting pavement on top of the snow.

MR. DOODY: A warmer climate.

MR. CALLAN: Warmer climate, yes. The snow was not caused by the frost, it was warm snow, artificial snow. Confetti it must have been. How can you expect the average Newfoundlander to look on government and look at us as legislators, you know, with anything else but distrust, and distaste and so on?

Mr. Speaker, the Election Act. The hon. gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) mentioned, you know, some reforms there.

MR. WOODROW: - Bay of Islands.

MR. CALLAN: Last Fall during the election, as I said, I was on the campaign trail about seven days. As a matter of fact, seven days was plenty.

There are thirty-six communities in the district of Bellevue, and where I went, of course - I had no campaign manager, I was my own campaign manager, I did my own work, I hired my own drivers, and as a matter of fact I would not have hired any, but then you know if you are into this rat race, you know, you have to be as good as the P. C. candidate or the other candidate - were little communities where there was no need at all for any driver. There were no people there who wanted to be taken, old persons to be taken to the polls, But already there had been two hired boats. You know, there had already been two cars hired in a little community where there was none needed. So, of course, I had to do the same thing. So here we had seventy-five dollars or whatever it happened to be, the going rate, paid out to three drivers when there was nobody to drive. Now it is crazy. And if we think that the average Newfoundlander can see through that, you know, I mean obviously there must be something wrong with somebody, somewhere.

I made up my income tax a couple of nights ago. I have to pay in \$700, not because of the big money I made, because I am

Mr. Callan.

claiming at the married rate. Most people claim at the single rate, and they get some back, you know, which is illegal, but anyway that is fine. But I am wondering

Mr. Callan:

if I was a businessman.

MR. ROBERTS: What is illegal?

MR. CALLAN: I am wondering if I was a businessman whether or not I would have to pay in any, you know, how many things could I claim that would cover that?

But anyway, the point that I am trying to make is, you know, the moral fibre is gone out of our Newfoundland people, and to me it is quite obvious why. You know, you hear about shoplifting. A couple of days ago I was on the way in to St. John's and I was listening to CBC and there was a lady there talking about, you know, shoplifters. She was more or less saying what everybody thinks anyway, the people who do it; you know, kids go in and they pick up a bag of chips or something and they go throughout the store and they eat it and so on. The parents, as far as they are concerned, well I am being ripped off by big business anyway, so all I am doing is getting justice, you know, meting out justice.

People who work, you know, in the big plants like Long Harbour, Come By Chance when it was opened, and others, you know, these people, many of them, they come home at night after their shift is over with a hundred foot light cord or whatever else they want. You know, they are not robbing, and they are not, I suppose, in their own mind because everybody else is doing it. If they had stole it from their nextdoor neighbour or perhaps a local store, you know, everybody would look on it as stealing. But the moral fibre is gone, and I am wondering why. I am wondering, you know, where it all started?

People are mistrustful of government. They are mistrustful of the big businessman. You know, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) took a few knocks last night, but I do not know if it was all warranted by the way.

MR. NEARY: When you are knocking the establishment, the system, you have to take your knocks.

MR. CALLAN: You know, there is no question about it that the hon.

Mr. Callan:

member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) had had some good points, you know, but I do not think that the hon. member for LaPoile was directing his remarks at people like the member for Eagle River.

MR. NEARY: Certainly not. The member for Eagle River knows that.

MR. CALLAN: As it happens, you know, -

MR. NEARY: I am trying to protect his leader.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: As it happens, you know, there are an awful lot of things wrong, and they are glaring, glaring, you do not have to be a genius.

MR. NEARY: I have got a file here that would shock the hon. member if he could take it and read it out.

AN HON. MEMBER: Concerning what?

MR. NEARY: Concerning mortgages and bonusing and brokerage fees.

AN HON. MEMBER:

MR. NEARY: No there is a police investigation going on right now, so I will not -

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, last Fall on several occasions the member for LaPoile called for, I think it was a select committee or something to investigate, you know, the Sciences Complex, was that what it was?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, this is not the only case. And, Mr. Speaker, what disappoints me about the government is that, you know, the way the government treated this, you know, they were accepting blame to the average Newfoundlander because the government said nothing. If a spokesman for the government had gotten up in answer and said yes, we agree, we agree that this thing should be investigated. The government in the eyes of the general public would not have looked nearly as bad as they did. I know cases myself, I have heard carpenters that I know, friends of mine who work here

Mr. Callan:

in St. John's every Summer, you know, seasonally; they live around the Bay, and, you know, there is one case in particular where this bunch of carpenters were hired by a company, and then they were taken off the regular job that they were on and they were taken down to this gentleman's home, a professor at the University he is, well known, there is no Newfoundlander, I do not think, that has not seen the gentleman, you know, and as far as I was concerned you know, a man of integrity and so on. Perhaps he is, perhaps there is nothing wrong with what happened. But these gentlemen went down and this man wanted a cement wall, you know, around his lawn, And so these carpenters went down of course, they were told to go there by the contractor and the boss and so on; so a day's work is a day's work. This man was a doctor. So anyway they built the forms and the cement was poured and so on, you know, all that at somebody else's expense, you know, obviously not part of the job at all. So this doctor, anyway, he said There is no need to come back and strip this; I will strip the concrete myself when it dries. In the process of doing so he broke a leg. The poor gentleman! So these carpenters were called back again.

So one of the carpenters said, of course, with little education and so on did not realize what kind of a doctor he was, you know, Well you are the right fellow to have a broken leg, you know, you are a doctor. Oh, no, no I am not that kind of a doctor. I am a doctor of philosophy at the University. You know, these things are going on, and there is no effort made by government to try and get at the root of the problem, and to try and discourage people, and the more it goes on, and the more people get away with it, the more the word spreads, you know, well I did this and I got away with it, you know, the more people are going to try it. You know, when I think, I am sure that government can do things to remedy situations like these.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) turned back his increase of salary.

MR. NEARY: He should. He does not do any work and he does not attend the House very often.

MR. CALLAN: Very interesting. But, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the man is trying to be a hero in the eyes of the public. He is no hero.

You know, what is he trying to prove? How honest he is and so on, and does not want to take unfair advantage?

Mr. Speaker, the number of seats were increased, fifty-one seats. A couple of days ago I went down to pick up a passenger down in St. John's Centre, and Cabot Street I guess is in St. John's Centre; I was talking to an uncle of mine there. He says there are too many seats, too many electoral districts in Newfoundland, too many M.H.A.s.

MR. NEARY: Over-governed.

MR. CALLAN: But, you know, too many Cabinet ministers. But I mean the answer, again the average Newfoundlander knows the answer why it was done, who did it, and why it was done.

AN HON. MEMBER: They should have been decreased.

MR. CALLAN: I am sure. Of course, the number of seats should be reduced. But where should they be reduced? In many of the places where they were increased. For what reason? And this gentleman said to me, of course the reason why they were increased is the P.C.s would not have gotten elected if they did not add on additional districts in the P.C. strongholds like St. John's. You know, the St. John's City Council covers the same area and does the same work, of course, what work there is, you know, there is no work, the type of things that I have to look after in my district like improved roads, rebuilt, paved, artesian wells, water and sewerage. The M.H.A.s who represent district in St. John's do not have these problems. They are not problems anyway, but even if they were -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Suburban parts.

Mr. Callan:

- even if they were, you know, the St. John's City Council. So fine, we will cut out a half a dozen seats or a dozen in St. John's. And some of the people who called for this, they represent these seats. That is fine, if they are prepared to give up their seat.

Mr. Speaker, again the average Newfoundlander wonders why a gentleman like the man from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) why he is in the backbenches? He was a Cabinet minister. The man has some good ideas, and these ideas have been put forward here in the House of Assembly, and they have been put forward through the press. You know, the average Newfoundlander today is not stupid. This is not fifty years ago. Why? What ever happened to the big witch hunt back in 1972 and 1973? Why was it called off? You know there are several possible reasons. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, is it because that the people who suspected, and who had the evil minds at the time, I am wondering if these hon. gentlemen did not call off the witch hunt because perhaps they thought they might be doing to hurt themselves. It is a good question.

MR. NEARY: I am the only man in Newfoundland who was the subject of a formal judicial enquiry for a year and a half, the only one I suppose in Newfoundland's history or in Canadian history, and came out of it smelling of roses, under a microscope for a year and a half.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I have talked to cabinet ministers. I had a delegation in from the District of Bellevue about a month or two ago. I talked with this cabinet minister and in the presence of the delegation I put the question. I said, "Now this project, will this project be done on the lines of priority and on need, or will it be done for political reasons?" "Of course," he said, "it will be done for political reasons." The man told me to expect anything different I would be a fool. But I tried to make the point that if the government did things with priorities and need in mind, perhaps the average Newfoundlander who has so much disrespect and mistrust and so on for the government and the politicians, if they did it fair and square, perhaps they would regain some of the dignity and trust that the House of Assembly should have.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: Bring in television cameras! I dare say we should bring in television cameras. I do not know for how long but then the average Newfoundlander would get the picture. The television cameras would show, number one, who are the part-time members, the members who are out of the Legislature fairly frequently for obvious reasons.

MR. DOODY: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: And more important, of course, I believe the television cameras, if the average M.E.A. knew that they were there, perhaps we would not get half nor quarter of this name calling and quibbling and nonsense that we have seen here. Perhaps the M.E.A.'s who are responsible for these things - cabinet ministers are no different, by the way, it comes from both sides of the House - perhaps this would be nipped in the bud because nobody would want to make fools of themselves, knowing that somebody sitting down in a living room anywhere in Newfoundland was watching them.

MR. NEARY: We are not quite as bad as in Westminster yesterday, where they had a brawl.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, as I said, I started off last Fall disillusioned. I am starting to see now that it is an absolute waste of time. I have not been going on radio and television every second day or every week making derogatory or negative statements about the government. But anybody who has half a grain will know that that is how it is done, that this is the popular politician, this is the man who is going to get re-elected, the man who is getting the publicity. I have not done it. As I said, I have not been too harsh on cabinet ministers with whom I have met with delegations looking for water and sewers, looking for artesian wells, looking for pavement for the district that I represent, but I am anxiously waiting to see what the results will be when all the paving contracts and all the road contracts are awarded. I will be interested to see whether or not, as I suspect, as I suspected yesterday in connection with this stadium that is going in Ferryland, I will be interested to see how much politics is being played and if necessary I will have no other choice, my conscience will not permit me to do anything else; if it is unfair, if it is immoral I will expose it for just that.

MR. NEARY: Resort to the court of public opinion.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I intended to talk about the district. Of course the biggest single item would be the Come By Chance refinery and I honestly and sincerely do not blame the government for what happened there, which is probably an opposite view from the position taken by some members of this House on this side. I would like to know all the facts and no doubt in time all the facts will come out. Of course the thing that concerns me now is how soon? Will it be another Old Perlican fish plant? Will it be dragged out for months and years?

Most of the people who worked at the refinery, and I talk to them daily in person, on the phone - it created a lot of problems for me. I would not have been nearly

MR. CALLAN: as busy as the M.E.A. for Bellevue if the plant had stayed open and so on. But all that is part of it. You have your good times and bad. But if this refinery can be reopened within a couple of months, before the winter sets in especially, and some of these people can get back to work, I will praise the government, if the government deserves the praise. But if it drags on and drags on, again I will have no other choice but to be political about the thing.

Mr. Speaker, my time is just about up, I think. Perhaps I will have another opportunity and perhaps the next time I will not be as negative as I have been this morning, but this has been building up for a long time, and I had to get it off my chest.

If people want to sacrifice their morals and their principles and so on to be a politician that is fine! Let them do that! But I do not intend to do it, I will resign first. I will get out of this mess first.

I talked to gentlemen last Fall who wanted to run, to run as the member, but they said their wives or their friends talked them out of it. "I would not lower myself," they said. They convinced me not to lower myself by going in and mingling with the members of the Legislature. That is the view that the average Newfoundlander takes of the Legislature. That, of course, was expressed again last night by the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). But, Mr. Speaker, the answer that I gave to that gentleman who said he had thought about running but decided to give it up because in order to do so he would have to sacrifice his principles and his morals, I said, "As long as the average Newfoundlander, as long as people like you take that attitude, then it is going to continue to stay like it is."

I do not see myself as a crusader or anything like that, but I think that the emphasis that government should put is on doing things more fair and square rather than governing

MR. CALLAN: politically, doing things for political gain. Of course they are not for political gain. This was demonstrated in Hermitage. Of course after all the promises that were made last Fall; "The Come By Chance refinery will be expanded," - I heard what was said. I was in the community of Come By Chance campaigning at the time and I was listening to the radio and I heard it. The Premier said, "Yes, we have known this for a nice while but we did not want to make it political so we just kept quiet about it. However we have known for a while that there was going to be an expansion." Of course we all know the story of what happened since. So, Mr. Speaker, all I am doing is asking the government, rather than being political why not be rational? I am sure that the respect of every Newfoundlander that is expected by the Legislature and by the government, that respect would come. But under the present situation all we can expect is the continued mistrust and disregard and, of course, the cute remarks you hear about M.R.A's. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the hour is late and if the House has no objection I would adjourn the debate until -

MR. CROSBIE: No, no. Carry on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Carry on.

MR. J. CARTER: I have leave to carry on.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You do not have leave not to carry on.

MR. J. CARTER: I do not have leave not to carry on. The Minister of Industrial Development has clarified the position. I do not have leave not to carry on.

The previous speaker made a couple of points about being political or being a politician. What came to my mind immediately was the hon. Robert Stanfield. I think probably the greatest contribution that he has made - and I think here all hon. gentlemen will agree - is that he has made it respectable to be a politician. Anyone who says, oh politicians are the lowest form of life cannot say that in the same breath as mentioning Mr. Stanfield's name. I think that this probably will turn out to be his greatest achievement long after his leadership episode has been forgotten. I think that all of us could do no better than to model our political ambitions and our political deportment using Mr. Stanfield as a guide, as an example.

The hon. gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) is trying to preach reasonableness and financial restraint. It is an unusual role for him and it reminds me of a dog walking on it's hind legs! It is not well done but you marvel that it is done at all.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: What has that got to do with the price of tea in China?

MR. J. CARTER: I was not going to get onto China. However there were some newcomers. Every day newcomers come into the gallery and what is it that a newcomer sees when he comes in. He usually sees one person speaking and at great length. In fact, hon. members seem

MR. J. CARTER:

to take a pride in filling their forty-five minutes or if they are able to speak for ninety minutes as certain members are under certain circumstances, they then take pride in filling the ninety minutes. If they have unlimited time they then take pride in making a marathon speech. I suppose the time will come when someone tries to read the whole encyclopedia Americana into the record.

AN HON. MEMBER: Backwards in Latin.

MR. J. CARTER: In Latin, yes. Also a newcomer or an onlooker will see veiled insults and threats put in such a way that the speaker is either forced to allow them or else if he calls the member to attention the member takes it back but of course it is still in the record. I make no apology for it. I am as guilty as many others. But at least I hope - I do deplore this tendency and I think to overuse it is a mistake.

One also sees arrogant, self-justification. The members, the government, are all right, the Opposition are all wrong and never the twain shall meet. At the same time you will see members giving the member who is speaking studied inattention, newspapers rattled, they have a conversation with their seatmate. I suppose it is not unparliamentary to have a game of cards. I have never seen cards actually played in the House, although I suppose it is not against the rules. It is all part of the adversary technique.

The burden of my remarks - I wish to make one proposal for the few minutes that I will be speaking and that is that a committee be formed to revise the rules of this House. The rules of this House are quite inadequate. They are anti-diluvian. They are worn out and they should be changed, changed fundamentally and changed drastically. I do not pretend to be wise enough to be able to suggest any final changes. But I do suggest - I think we all agree, in fact I know from private conversations that I have had with most members that they are extremely dissatisfied with the procedure in the House.

MR. J. CARTER:

All feel that some basic changes are long overdue. There are a number of ways of changing the rules of this House. But I think the first thing is that it should be an agreed change, agreed by an overwhelming majority of the members. Our rules call for at least two-thirds majority. I would hope that when the final draft is arrived at - and I believe such a draft can be achieved - that there will be practically unanimous consent.

At the present time the length or period allowed for speaking is, in my view, too long. I think that could be looked at. If someone has something really interesting to say as happened with the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) a few days ago he can be given leave to continue for as long as he wishes. This is a test of a person speaking. If a person is able to so interest his colleagues as to achieve unanimous consent, then I think he has the absolute right to talk as long as he wants to.

Just a few minutes ago a routine bill was passed around by the Page, Bill No. 13. I am just using this as an example. I have no particular axe to grind on this bill. It is An Act To Repeal The Newfoundland Marketing Act. It is a very short thing. I think it has got two clauses. It is only a housekeeping sort of picayune regulatory bill of no great importance. There are a great many of these bills in this session. It is a pity that our rules do not allow for the whole lot of them to be dumped together and passed in the space of about an hour. I do not see why we have not got the power. We could give ourselves the power to dispose of - I do not call it trash, it is necessary but it surely is not necessary to go through all the involved steps to pass some of these things that are only a clause or two long. This is one reform that I would suggest be looked at.

Because in order to pass a bill - we all know the rules - first of all I think there are something like eleven steps in getting a bill through. The first thing is to get the thing drafted by

MR. J. CARTER:

a legislative draftsman. Then there is the notice of motion. That has to take place one day and nothing further can be done until the next day. The second stage is the first reading of the title and all you can do then is just read the title of the bill and then you have to wait for another day. I realize this can be sped up by unanimous agreement.

MR. DOODY: Some of the titles are long enough to take a day.

MR. J. CARTER: The Minister of Finance interjected that some of the titles are long enough to take a day.

The third step is the debate on principle. This is a very necessary debate. But again members may only speak once except the minister moving the bill. He finally speaks and ends the debate. However a complex piece of legislation, it should be possible for a member to speak several times, not at length but certainly he may wish to make further points. If a debate is going to progress and develop then naturally a member might think of further points that he would like to interject. Now he can only do it by leave of the person speaking. Certainly for my part, anytime I am speaking, I would certainly be more than happy to entertain any interruptions but not all speakers are willing to do that. They feel they lose the trend of their argument and I can understand that too.

The next stage then is the clause by clause debate. This is certainly wise and necessary but there can be no harping back to the main principle. Again it does not matter if the bill is of a routine or ordinary nature. But if it is an extraordinarily complex bill this I think is a disadvantage. You would think by now the bill is all ready to be enforced. But no, it has to be signed by the Lieutenant-Governor. You think well at least the bill is through, there is nothing further to be done. No, it still has to be gazetted and when it has been gazetted it still is not enforced. It has yet to be proclaimed by the appropriate minister of the appropriate department.

MR. DOODY: Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTEP: Good. You would think by then that the bill is now law. No, no. There is still more to be done. Most bills these days empower the minister of the government or the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to make regulations under this legislation and these regulations have to be drafted, probably by a legislative draftsman or possibly by someone in the department. Then these regulations have to be passed in Cabinet. And unless it is signed again by the Lieutenant-Governor this does not have the force of law.

Then these regulations themselves have to be gazzetted and I presume they have to be proclaimed. So I have used this as an example to show how cumbersome and difficult the passing of legislation can be and, Mr. Speaker, I now note that it is one o'clock and I adjourn the debate.

MR. WELLS: The rule is that this House do now adjourn until Monday, May 31, at two o'clock in the afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn until Monday, at two of the clock. All those in favour "Aye", contrary, "Nay". Carried.

Contents

May 28, 1976	Page
Statements by Ministers	
Mr. Peckford made a statement on the housing situation in the Province.	9056
Mr. W. Carter made a statement on fish landings in the Province.	9062
Commented on by:	
Mr. Roberts	9065
Mr. Smallwood	9066
Mr. Rousseau made a statement on the abbatoir at Corner Brook.	9067
Commented on by:	
Mr. Roberts	9068
Mr. Smallwood	9071
Presenting Petitions	
By Mr. Rideout in behalf of residents of Woodstock, asking that a community stage be constructed at that community.	9074
Spoken to by:	
Mr. W. Carter	9075
Mr. Roberts	9075
By Mr. W. Carter in behalf of residents of Admiral's Beach, asking that the road from that community to St. Joseph's be paved.	9077
Spoken to by Mr. Roberts.	9077
Notices of Motion	
Notices were given that on tomorrow leave would be sought to introduce Bills Nos. 78, 79 and 77.	9080
Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given.	
Mr. Crosbie tabled the answer to Question No. 737.	9081
Oral Questions	
Query as to whether the government have had any approaches from Mr. Shaheen or his associates concerning the Come By Chance oil refinery. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Crosbie.	9081
Query as to when a feasibility study on the refinery will be completed. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Crosbie.	9083
Query as to whether offers other than those of Mr. Shaheen have been made for the refinery. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Crosbie.	9085

Oral Questions (continued)	Page
Query as to whether the funds Mr. Shaheen says are now available to him to regain control of the refinery would not result in an extension to the operation. Mr. Smallwood, Mr. Crosbie.	9087
Query as to whether the federal government is prepared to assist with reconstruction of the Trans-Canada Highway on-90-10 arrangement; and whether a DREE agreement has been reached for the paving of the Great Northern Peninsula highway. Mr. Neary, Mr. Morgan.	9088
Query as to what consideration has been given to the prayer of a petition from World War II veterans requesting that consideration be given to their war service in regard to the period of service aspect as to their qualifying for pensions. Mr. Canning, Mr. Doody.	9089
Query as to whether the minister means no consideration has been given the matter. Mr. Canning, Mr. Doody.	9090
Query as to whether arrangements can be made concerning the Come By Chance refinery in the ninety day period referred to by Mr. Shaheen. Mr. White, Mr. Crosbie.	9091
Rose Blanche water system. Mr. Neary, Mr. Peckford.	9091
The high cost of serviced building lots. Mr. Callan, Mr. Peckford.	9093
Query as to whether high consultant fees are increasing the cost of serviced lots. Mr. Callan, Mr. Peckford.	9095
Criteria used to establish fishing zones. Mr. Rideout, Mr. W. Carter.	9096
Query as to what action has been taken which would permit chartered flight to originate and terminate in St. John's. Mr. White, Mr. Morgan.	9096
Query as to why difficulty is experienced in selling locally grown potatoes. Mr. Callan, Mr. Rousseau.	9097

Orders of the Day

Bills Nos. 65, 73, 74, 69, 71, 75, 76, 68, and 70 were read a first time and ordered read a second time on tomorrow. 9

Address in Reply - Debate on the amendment (continued). 6

Mr. Marshall (continued)

Mr. Callan

Mr. J. Carter

Adjourned the debate.

Adjournment