

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

House of Assembly

For the period:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

February 15, 1977

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Before calling the first order of routine business there was a point of order made by the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) just before the adjournment yesterday which has not been disposed of, and which I would propose to do now.

The hon. gentleman for St. John's North in his point of order alleged that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was out of order and gave three references or citations with respect to his allegation. I would first wish to distinguish between the rules with respect to length of speeches, covered by Standing Order 49, and the rules relating to the substance and form of speeches referred to very briefly in Standing Order 51 and given much more substance and body in the rulings of the House and in the authorities, particularly Beauchesne and May. There are two different areas, length of speeches and substance of them. There is no way that any hon. member or the Chair can modify questions of the length of speeches governed by Standing Order 49, unless of course it is done pursuant to the House of Assembly Act.

With respect of the three specific citations quoted and referred to by the hon. gentleman from St. John's North, the first one was, and to quote his exact words, "A rule which prohibits one from being tedious and boring." In our own Standing Order there is no reference to tedious, although in the authorities in Beauchesne there is.

I find the term "tedious" an extremely subjective one, and what might be of little or no interest to some hon. members could be of consuming interest to others. The terms in our Standing Order are "needless repetition," and I think it is to that particular term that I have to refer.

From my point of view, repetition could only be considered

MR. SPEAKER: needless if it cannot be reasonably justified.

Now bearing in mind the number of subjects referred to by the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) yesterday, among them references and critiques of various government departments, his analysis of the position of denturists and the dental profession, and his general comments upon the legal profession and kindred subjects then I do not think I would be right in saying that any repetition he might have engaged in would not be or could not be reasonably justified.

With reference to the hon. gentleman from St. John's North's contention

Mr. Speaker.

that some of the matters were covered in the same manner in a speech by the hon. gentleman in last year's session, I do not really have to decide whether that is or is not the case, because there would be no rule precluding any hon. member from repeating in one session what he may have said in another session.

The third reference was to Beauchesne 149 (i) which refers to an hon. member obstructing the business of the House. Now obstructing, obviously there has a technical, parliamentary meaning and according to May it is defined as follows: "A member who abuses the rules of the House by persistently and wilfully obstructing the business of the House, that is to say, who without actually transgressing any of the rules of the debate uses his right of speech for the purpose of obstructing the business of the House or obstructs the business of the House by misusing the forms of the House, is technically not guilty of disorderly conduct. It would seem, therefore, that a member so obstructing the business of the House cannot be required to withdraw from the House for the remainder of the sitting. He may be, however, guilty of a contempt of the House and may be named although comparatively little use has been made of this power by the Chair." Bearing in mind the nature of the motion to which the hon. gentleman was speaking, and indeed the motion to which it is an amendment, bearing that in mind, bearing in mind the precise wording of Standing Order 50 and bearing in mind as well the prerogative of the government to call the order of business on all days except Wednesday after the Orders of the Day have been called, then I would not find that the hon. gentleman was obstructing the business of the House.

The third matter referred to by the hon. gentleman for St. John's North was with reference to Section 144 of Beauchesne which is quite lengthy, which I will not read, which in summary prohibits an hon. member from reading his speech or from reading letters, other documents, etc. I am not aware the hon. gentleman was reading his speech

Mr. Speaker.

Obviously all hon. members are entitled to use notes, extensive or otherwise, to refer to documents for the purpose of jogging their memory. If in fact they do read an actual document, then it should be tabled. So with reference to the three citations given me by the hon. gentleman for St. John's North, and I think bearing in mind the necessity to distinguish between the question of length of speeches, covered by the Standing Orders, which can only be altered in a specific way, and the substance of speeches, then the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was in order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Thank you very much, Your Honour.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, last week I announced in the House a job creation programme with respect to the provision of certain fishing facilities at which time I promised to table the locations of these facilities and the number of man-hours which I am very pleased to do now.

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, over the last month or so there has been an increasing amount of debate and discussion in the national and provincial media on the subject of the energy problems of the Maritimes in general, and of this Province in particular, and its need for some form of assistance from the federal government along the lines of the \$12 million package accepted by Prince Edward Island and the \$63 million energy conservation proposal that was under discussion until yesterday between the federal government and the government of Nova Scotia. In view of the growing public interest on the subject of energy conservation throughout the Province, I believe it is appropriate to release to the public an outline of the government's efforts to secure federal assistance for the Province.

MR. PECKFORD: The question of an energy subsidy was first raised by Nova Scotia at the Energy Ministers Conference of 5th March, 1976. Nova Scotia's request was for a subsidy for the province's high energy costs. Prince Edward Island joined in the request. The then Minister of Mines and Energy (John Crosbie) requested that Newfoundland should be included in any such federal programme resulting from the Nova Scotia initiative. The subject of special assistance was then referred, among other subjects, to a meeting of officials for discussion prior to the First Ministers Meeting scheduled for May, 1976.

At the officials' meeting of the 22nd March, 1976 the subsidy item was considered and the province provided several papers detailing its case. Unfortunately was not discussed in any depth and it was concluded that the federal government would consider the request to see what if anything could be done. At the First Ministers' Meeting the subject of special energy assistance, one of the several energy topics on the agenda, there was no specific conclusion on the subject. At the Finance Ministers' Meeting prior to the First Ministers' Meeting the subsidy subject was again raised and our minister- who is present here today- of Finance argued forcefully for our inclusion in any federal programme of assistance. By midsummer of last year it was becoming clear that the federal government was reacting to substantial Nova Scotia lobbying pressure for a subsidy for electrical rates. However, throughout the whole period of discussion, Ottawa was taking the position that no subsidy on electrical costs would be forthcoming because of the problems of giving it to some provinces and not to others. In our discussions with the federal officials and politicians involved, we were subject to some pressure that Newfoundlands best interests lay not in persuing the energy subsidy avenue but in negotiating additional help for the Gull Island project.

In any event, no positive federal action took place in the Summer or Autumn so the Premier wrote to the Prime Minister on the 19th October to clarify the position and to request that our province should be included in any federal considerations of assistance to Nova Scotia and P.E.I.

MR. PECKFORD: Following this letter we were given to understand that while the government was considering some form of assistance to certain provinces to relieve the burden of increasing oil costs on the generation of electricity, no decision on the subject had been reached as late as the end of November. We were further informed that our oil usage for electricity generation was not serious compared with the other two provinces and that we should be directing our attention to solving our energy problems by the development of hydro resources in co-operation with federal officials. The next development was the end December announcement that an energy conservation package amounting to \$12 million had been granted to Prince Edward Island, and that a corresponding package amounting to \$63 million had been offered to Nova Scotia. . The announcements stressed the linkage between the subsidies and the high cost of electricity generation in the two provinces. On the 18th January, 1977, the Premier wrote to the Prime Minister requesting an explanation for the provinces exclusion strongly criticizing the federal governments rationale for singling out Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia on the grounds that other provinces were somehow in a better position than either of those provinces in terms of the burden of oil prices in the generation of electricity.

The Premier's letter pointed out the need to review individual provinces' cases for assistance in much wider terms which would take into account relative economic and energy factors relating to the province. To date no official reply to this letter has been received. Following instructions referred to in the Premier's letter, I wrote to my federal counterpart , the Hon. Allister Gellespie, enclosing a copy of the Premier's letter and enclosing a paper which compares the economic and energy situation in Newfoundland , Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. It is my opinion that this paper represents an objective analysis and demonstrates conclusively that the case of Newfoundland for federal energy conservation subsidy proportionate to those

MR. PECKFORD: granted to or being discussed with P.E.I. and Nova Scotia is irrefutable. I believe it is correct at this stage to release this information to allay any public concern that the present government of the province is not actively pursuing a determined line with the federal government on this important matter.

MR. ROBERTS . This way the paper will be tabled.

MR. PECKFORD:

Yes. And since, Mr. Speaker, posing this statement today, the Nova Scotia government and the federal government have signed an energy conservation package. I got the details on it this morning, and subsequently I wired Mr. Gillespie earlier today the following telegram.

"The hon. Alastair Gillespie, Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, Ottawa. The Province of Newfoundland is suffering under an extremely burdensome combination of high energy costs, high energy requirements, and a large and increasing dependence on expensive oil. These factors, coupled with low per capital income, are creating extreme hardship for consumers in this Province. Our situation is in every logical way comparable with that prevailing in Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia which are to be the recipients of some \$75 million in energy conservation subsidy from the federal government.

"I am therefore once more requesting that the federal government grant to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador an energy conservation subsidy programme similar to that already given to our neighboring provinces of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia."

That has been sent -

MR. MURPHY: Around the figure of \$80 million on the radio today for Nova Scotia.

MR. PECKFORD: There are varying figures of between \$63 million and \$80 million. So, Mr. Speaker, I table for the benefit of the hon. members here in the House and for the press -

MR. NEARY: Could the minister give the ones tabled?

MR. PECKFORD: I am tabling the letters on the dates that I have mentioned in the statement.

AN HON. MEMBER: The one from the Premier to the Prime Minister?

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, and my own letters and also the proposal that we put to them which indicates in our opinion that our case is as good as the other provinces. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, since I have not had, obviously, an

MR. ROBERTS:

opportunity to look at these documents, my reply must of necessity be somewhat circumscribed. I am very glad the minister has made this statement and I am very glad he has tabled the documents that he has tabled. I would hope that they will be quickly made available to the members of the House. It does take a while for these things to get around sometimes and I would hope they will be quickly distributed to us.

I would hope also that the minister would table the Prime Minister's letters. Now I realize that cannot be done without the Prime Minister's approval, and I would be the last to suggest that we guilty of such a grave breach of courtesy as to do so without his approval, so I would ask the minister if he would undertake either himself, or perhaps the Premier should do this, to get in touch with the Prime Minister to ask if the Prime Minister would agree to have his letters tabled here in the House. Because it is difficult to read the letter which our Premier sent without at the same time being able to read the reply, particularly when there is a further reply. I think it is important that we see all of the facts. I will look forward to seeing the documents because it is my clear understanding, without in any way taking away from the merits of our case, that the real reason why we have not up until now received this assistance is of course the fact that we have been very much tardy and dilatory in pressing our case.

Now, the minister shakes his head and well he may. But the documents will speak for themselves. The record will speak for itself. The Premier of Nova Scotia, Mr. Regan, raised this matter first more than two years past in Ottawa and has been following it up assiduously, a matter which is well documented publicly. Now, Sir, I make that observation. I wish we could debate it at this point but we are not allowed to according to the rules. So I say we will be debating it because it is an important subject and I think the conduct of the ministry, Sir, as I understand it, in this matter will not stand up to the light of day.

MR. PECKFORD: You are wrong.

MR. ROBEPTS: Well the minister says I am wrong, Sir. I happen to know the minister is wrong on a number of points. And if ever, Sir, we -

MR. PECKFORD: I am not wrong about this point.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBEPTS: Mr. Speaker, am I allowed to make my few comments without the minister interrupting me and trying to entice me into debate?

MR. PECKFORD: No debate.

MR. ROBEPTS: Mr. Speaker, the minister says I am wrong. I in turn surely would be allowed to say he is wrong and the facts will speak for themselves. And if ever, Sir, we get back to the debate in this House we will have the opportunity to examine some statements the minister made in debate where we can show conclusively, beyond any doubt that - well it is not a parliamentary term - he is very wrong in what he said in this House on a number of points.

Mr. Speaker, all I can say now is we shall read these documents with care and with attention. We have seen only one side of the story. I would hope the government will undertake to get the Prime Minister's permission, assuming he will grant it, to table the letters which the Prime Minister has sent our Premier and then, Sir, I say to the minister let him put down a motion on the Order Paper to examine the question of the conduct of the ministry in this matter and let us have a debate, and then, Sir, let the facts come out and let the people judge as they will.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity of informing the House of the most recent Provincial bond issue, Euro-U.S. dollar issue of yesterday. The Province of Newfoundland, Sir, has successfully raised \$50 million in the Euro-U.S. dollar bond market. This issue was the largest the Province has ever floated outside of North America, and it was very enthusiastically received by the investors in Europe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: The debentures are issued at a coupon of 9 per cent, and at a premium price of 100.5 to yield 8.73 per cent over the twelve year life of the issue. The debentures are dated February 15, 1977, and mature on February 15, 1989. The issue is co-managed by A.E. Ames and Company and Credit Commercial de France, along with Burns, Fry Limited, Deutsche - Girozentrale, Deutsche Communalbank, The Credetbank of Luxenbourgeoise, Merrill Lynch International, Morgan Stanley, Societe General de Banque, and the Union Bank of Switzerland.

The issue, Sir, was increased from the original \$40 million, which the Province intended to ask for in Europe or to sell, to \$50 million due to the exceptionally strong demand for the Province's securities.

The total indications from the full investment syndicate were in excess of \$100 million, the book at the time of sale was of \$100 million. The issue was managed out of Paris and reported in the media as being the most successful foreign borrowing of the month on the Euro market.

This issue, Sir, completes the Province's borrowing programme for fiscal 1976-1977.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it is cause for cheer that the Province is another \$50 million in debt or not. But in the absence of my colleague, the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir

Mr. Roberts:

(Mr. Simmons), who is in his district attending some public functions, let me say just three things. First of all, of course, we welcome the news that the government have completed their borrowing programme for the current fiscal year. They are not very far ahead of things because, of course, the current fiscal year has only six weeks left to go. And I assume the government shortly, Sir, will be launching into whatever borrowing programme they may be authorized to carry out for the coming fiscal year.

Secondly, I wonder if the Minister of Finance could indicate to the House exactly how much is going to be the net draw down on this bond issue? If the face rate was \$50 million, American dollars, I assume they were American dollars, were they?

MR. DOODY: U.S.

MR. ROBERTS: U.S. dollars, they are American, yes. I would ask the minister how much we are actually going to get. Because, of course, one of the problems is that we must pay the gentlemen who manage these things. And I do not begrudge paying them, but I would like to know how much we pay them, because while we have an obligation to repay \$50 million, of course, you know, we do not get \$50 million, we may only get \$49 million or \$48 million or whatever it is.

MR. NOLAN: Like bonuses.

MR. ROBERTS: We repay \$50 million U.S together with interest at the rate of 9 per cent on \$50 millions U.S., \$450, I am sorry, \$4.5 million U.S. dollars a year in interest going out, but what do we actually draw down? What receipts will actually come into our Treasury? The minister doubtless does not have the answer here. But I would ask if he would undertake, please, to get it for us.

And thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the minister has said that the rate is 9 per cent on the coupon, 8.75, I think, he said, on the effective rate, in other words, twenty-five basic points off the coupon rate.

MR. DOODY: The basic price is \$100.

Mr. Roberts: Yes, you are paying \$100.50 for every \$100 bond, but the basic rate is 8.75 effective on the face value. It is a little more than that if we have only borrowed \$48 million or \$49 millions. And I would be very surprised if close to \$1 million or more has not been consumed in the brokers' fees, in the lawyers' fees, the travel expenses and all the things that tend to get buried in bond issues. And I think it is time we revived them.

But could the minister also indicate, please, Mr. Speaker, the going rate for recent bond issues in the Euro market, 8.75 in Canada, or in the U.S. would be an extraordinarily good rate. Public borrowing in Canada today nine, 9.5. Quebec is up I am told to 10 or 11 now, when they can sell their paper. Our recent bond issues I think have been ten, 10.5, of that order. So

MR. ROBERTS: my question is what is the going rate in Europe? Is 8.75 a very good rate or a very bad rate or the average rate? Perhaps the minister could get in touch with the gentlemen in the syndicate who manage these affairs for us - manage them perhaps well, but certainly lucratively. They are well paid for their services - if he could get from these gentlemen some information which would indicate exactly how our rate compares.

I welcome the news that our bonds sell so handily in the Euro dollar market, but of course that naturally raises the question, are we paying too much? I do not know whether we are or not, that is why I ask the question. So I would be grateful if the minister could get that information and I would hope get it, obviously he cannot get it today, but fairly quickly. It should not be too difficult to get either piece of information, I repeat again, exactly how much we drew down and what expenses we paid? If the minister were so kind perhaps he could tell us how many lawyers got paid and whether any Newfoundland firms got paid.

Secondly - because, of course, Sir, it should be realized by the House even if the underwriters pay their own counsel that counsel is inevitably, shall we say, indicated by the government of the Province, and we are bearing the shot because the underwriters simply take it off the amount that they send through to the Province, and if we borrow \$50 millions it comes out to, I do not know what, \$48.5 or \$49 million probably.

AN HON. MEMBER: It used to be Dick Green.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Richard Green of the Bar of this Province has on occasion been paid for legal services in this connection. He may or may not, I do not know, have been paid on this one.

MR. DOODY: Curtis and Dawe are -

MR. ROBERTS: I would think Curtis and Dawe did admirable work over the years, and Halley and Hickman and a

MR. ROBERTS: number of other firms have been involved in it. I merely ask who has been paid in Newfoundland, of the Newfoundland Bar with the Newfoundland taxpayer's money, and I would like to know as well, Mr. Speaker, as I said - you know, the going rate for issues in Europe to see whether we are getting a good rate or a bad rate.

MR. DOODY: I think it is about average but I will get the information.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, if the minister would get the information for me. I do not know whether it is average or not. I have not recently borrowed any significant amount of money anywhere except at my bank here in St. John's and I wish they would give it at 8.7 per cent but unfortunately they do not.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, if the minister could get us that information then, I think, we would be in a position better to judge the wisdom or otherwise of the ministry's actions in borrowing this money at this rate at this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to present a petition on behalf of 350 residents of Cow Head and St. Paul's in the Electoral District of St. Barbe North on the Great Northern -

MR. ROBERTS: That is just St. Barbe.

MR. NEARY: - St. Barbe South rather -

MR. ROBERTS: No, St. Barbe.

MR. NEARY: In the Electoral District of St. Barbe on the Great Northern Peninsula. The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is that the 350 residents who have applied their signatures to this petition are asking that they be able to retain their traditional rights of hunting rabbits in the Gros Morne National Park.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, just to give the members of the House an idea of what it is the 350 petitioners are asking for, I better read the prayer of the petition.

"We the undersigned of Cow Head and St. Paul's who are living inside the park boundary see no reason to be prohibited from catching rabbits in the park. This animal is of no value to the park. They have a seven year life cycle which means if they are not caught they will die anyway. They are destroying -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MURPHY: Say that again 'Steve'.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, members may think it is funny but partridge - now as the hon. the Premier probably knows, the hon. the Premier is the expert on partridge in this House, partridge destroy themselves too, they eat one another.

AN HON. MEMBER: How long?

MR. NEARY: A year and-a-half.

AN HON. MEMBER: And moose.

MR. NEARY: No, they rot. They rot down in Bay d'Espoir.

Mr. Speaker, they have a seven year life cycle and, Mr. Speaker, these people down there know what they are talking about. This is not a joke. They have a seven year life cycle which means that if they are not caught they will die anyway. "They are destroying the young birch and white wood trees by chewing the bark off. However, the park has a law stating that we cannot catch them within their boundaries. We would like to have this law changed and be able to catch rabbits in areas where we were always permitted to do so."

The petition is

MR. NEARY: signed, as I indicated, Mr. Speaker, by 350 residents over the age of nineteen years.

My understanding now is, Sir, that petition can be signed by men and women over eighteen years of age but obviously these people did not know that. They were not informed by their member, who apparently the people in that particular part of Newfoundland have lost complete confidence and faith in.

And so, Mr. Speaker, it is signed by residents over nineteen years of age. Now I realize, Mr. Speaker, this may be a federal matter. I am not quite sure if it comes under my good friend -

MR. DOODY: Who? Who? Who is it?

MR. NEARY: No, I am not sure if it comes under my good friend the Minister of Tourism, whether -

AN HON. MEMBER: Is it negotiable?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if it comes under my hon. friend, the Minister of Tourism, whether that minister has the jurisdiction or not, or whether it is federal jurisdiction because it is a national park.

Well, it really does not make any difference, Mr. Speaker, I was asked to present the petition on behalf of these 350 residents in this hon. House and I am obligated to do so. If it comes under federal jurisdiction, then I would assume that the minister responsible for Inter-governmental Affairs would bring it before the proper authorities in the Government of Canada.

Anyway, Sir, it gives me great pleasure to support the prayer of this petition and I ask that it be placed upon the table of the House, and before I conclude my remarks I might point out that there is a precedent by the way, for allowing people to carry on their traditional hunting rights in national parks.

MR. DOODY: Guaranteed!

MR. NEARY: No, in Gaffin Islands where a national park either has been constructed recently or is presently under construction,

MR. NEARY: the people were allowed to maintain their traditional hunting rights.

And so there is a precedent, Sir, if it is federal jurisdiction, I am not sure, perhaps the minister, if the minister cares to comment on the petition, could tell us whether or not it comes under the minister's jurisdiction.

But I support the prayer of the petition, Sir, ask that it be placed upon the table of the House and directed to the appropriate minister in the administration for immediate action.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the prayer of the petition I should point out that the point that the residents bring up is a very fundamental point in the creation of national parks.

Previously a national park was created without really much discussion with local residents, and generally the park was made devoid of human life or if communities were allowed to maintain within the park they had to restrict their traditional way of life.

Recently with the concern of the Gros Morne National Park and the national park in Nova Scotia, which created a good deal of furor in Ottawa, the National Parks policy changed and Baffin Island National Park, which was created two years ago, allowed the people in Baffin Island the right to continue their traditional way of life. In other words, if they were hunting animals or fishing or whatever they were doing in the area of the park they were permitted to carry on this kind of activity.

The discussions are particularly important at the moment because we are faced within this Province of the creation of two national parks, possibly two national parks, a national park in the Torngat Mountains and the national park in the Mesley Mountains near Happy Valley, Goose Bay in the district of the

MR. STRACHAN: member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie). And we have much concern of this because we feel the people want to maintain their rights, as do the people in Cow Head to continue their traditional way of life in hunting and fishing, and that the national park should be an integral part of the Province. It should not be an isolated part in which people are moved out or resettled or where the people are not allowed to continue their traditional way of life in hunting. And I strongly support the prayer of the petition. I think that the people have every right in the world to continue to fish, to trap, to hunt and should be an indigenous part of the park. A park should not be something which is devoid totally of human life and people, and I have no hesitation in supporting the prayer of the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I stand, too, to support the prayer of this particular petition. I understand quite well the problems of the people as expressed in this petition, being that I also have a national park in my own district, and it can only affirm what the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) was saying. I think in the establishing of these parks that there was not very much consideration given to the people that lived adjacent to and contiguous to the boundaries of the national parks, and how establishing these national parks, with the various rules and regulations, restricted people from hunting in the area and carrying on their traditional way of life, how this would indeed change and restrict their lifestyles. So I just simply want to say that I support the prayer of the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. gentleman speaking in support of this petition?

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition in principle. But in supporting the petition I would like to draw to the minister's - and I would presume that if the prayer of this petition is to be implemented or if the people are to get what they are asking for, it would have to be done under the Department of Tourism. Sir, it is time that the Department of Tourism would recognize that you have to recognize people's basic rights in parks or anywhere else, but you also have to extend that into looking at their rights ten years down the road. Now somebody said that rabbits got a seven year life cycle. That may well be, but if you wipe out all the rabbits in Newfoundland, the cycle will suddenly not mean anything. You know, if they are wiped out at the three years into their cycle, there would be no rabbits left for a cycle.

MR. HICKMAN: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has come up.

MR. HICKMAN: Your Honour, I realize , has been very, very generous on this petition, but I do submit that it is going way beyond a few brief comments and support thereof is becoming a debate. Certainly the cycle and the sex life of the rabbit is not being debating in this House at this time.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order.

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

MR. ROBERTS: I happen to have a few references here, but that is another point. To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. There is no rule of this House which requires - to quote the House Leader - "A few brief comments." The rules say that a member may speak in support of a petition, and that he shall not speak for more than five minutes. I believe it is Standing Order 92, although I do not have it before me. My friend and colleague from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) was speaking in support of the petition. I submit his remarks were germane to the point of the petition. They certainly constituted support. All that he is doing is saying that if we are to implement the prayer of this petition, and he said that he thinks it should be implemented, we should do so conscious of the consequences which it could have. And I may add, Sir, that my colleague is speaking only in the absence of any comment at all from the government side of the House. Obviously, Sir, they neither know nor care sufficient to enlighten the House on the matter raised by the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Nearv) at the request of 300 or 400 people who live in the electoral district of St. Barbe.

I submit, Sir, that my colleague from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) is in order, and he should be allowed to continue without this infantile and puerile harassment from the Government House Leader, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The rules with respect to what may be spoken -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

The rules with respect to what hon. members may say, the tenor of their remarks in support of a petition, are quite precise. Apart from the statement of the parties and the number of signatures there should be no debate. Standing Order 97, "An hon. member may speak with respect to the material allegations." 'Material allegations' essentially in this petition is a petition whereby people are asking for the right to be able to hunt rabbits in certain areas, and matters related logically and closely to that would be part of a material allegation. To stray far from that would be out of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have no intention of saying anything that I feel is not germane to the petition, and if I do, then I would ask Your Honour to interrupt me. I do not see how one can either propose or oppose a petition if one is not permitted to point out facts that relate to that petition, and point out to the minister that in implementing the prayer of a petition that he should consider certain facts. The hon. member read in the prayer of the petition

MR. FLIGHT:

that one of the reasons the people of the district wish to have their rights to snare rabbits retained is that they support that right with the fact that there is a seven year life expectancy and they will die anyway. So I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, to this House a situation that exists relative to this. A short time ago we took it for granted, our right to go in the woods and catch rabbits. Well let me tell this hon. House that the traffic on those access roads that we have built in the Province now is so heavy that one cannot park. People are bringing 2,000 rabbits per family out of the woods.

Now, I submit to the House that either the Department of Tourism take a hard look at that type of thing or the park that my hon. friend mentions will be the only refuge in this Province for anything left alive wild. And in addressing himself to that petition and deciding whether or not he is going to recognize the prayer of the petition, then I would suggest to the minister in doing that that he would also recognize the desires of the people of Newfoundland that some refuge be left in this Province because under our present Game Laws, five years down the road nothing will be left.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker -

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the petition that was presented by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), the prayer of the petition and the relevant points in the prayer had to do with the people in that area being allowed to snare or hunt rabbits within the Gros Morne National Park. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) is now commenting upon the wholesale destruction of rabbits around the Province and the need for government action to regulate and control and to ensure that there will always be a supply of rabbits for our residents. That is not relevant to the particular point made by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in his petition.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, with whatever respect is due the gentleman for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) on his remarks, Sir, let me say that his remarks are irrelevant, offensive and, I suggest, designed to obfuscate the point at issue. The point at issue, Mr. Speaker, in this petition is a request to be allowed to hunt some rabbits in a certain part of the Province, specifically the area contained within the boundaries of the Gros Morne National Park on the West Coast in the district of St. Barbe, whose member to date has not spoken on this point, and the gentleman for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) in speaking in support of this petition is making some observations with regard to the continuance of an adequate supply of rabbits in the Province. Now, Sir, nothing could be more germane, because if there are no rabbits in the Province, I would say to the hon. gentleman for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford), there would be none in the park. And it is therefore fair to say in speaking of a petition with respect to the hunting of rabbits in the National Park that one may make some observations surely, Sir, with respect to the hunting of rabbits throughout the Province being as the National Park is of course contained within the Province.

I would say, Sir, in conclusion, to the gentleman for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) that where his mentor, the house leader cannot succeed, he, Sir, would be well-advised to sit back and let the rules be observed by hon. gentlemen here as they are and let the debate go ahead without further interruption.

SOME NON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: I concur with the remarks made by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. The member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) is indeed wandering far and wide from supporting this petition and obviously he is not supporting the petition because he is pointing out to the House the wholesale destruction of rabbits in this Province whereas the petition seeks the right to destroy rabbits in the Gros Morne National Park. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this most assuredly has developed into a debate and does not in any way constitute the

MR. HICKMAN:

hon. member confining himself to the material allegations contained in the petition before this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: After listening to the learned submissions of hon. gentlemen to my left and to my right, I feel I am now in a position to make a decision on this matter. I will not repeat Standing Orders 92 and 97 again because that has been frequently done. The overall format, or the overall principle of petitions is well stated by Beauchesne and I think is quite relevant.

"The right of petitioning the Crown and parliament for redress of grievances is acknowledged as a fundamental principle of the constitution, and has been uninterruptedly exercised from very early times." And it also goes on later to say - this is one page 256 - "It is no doubt the birthright of every Canadian to apply to parliament for the redress of grievances." Certainly in our own legislature the procedure and practice with respect to petitions has been very wide and this right has never been denied. It has almost invariably been the custom that petitions are not the cause of contention between hon. members on different sides of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: It would appear to me that the whole concept behind petitioning, and the right of the citizen to petition, would suggest that when proceedings are contentious that somehow that - not the right is being undermined, but its exercise is being made quite difficult.

With respect to the actual petition, as far as I recall the hon. member was speaking on the subject of the hunting of rabbits and was putting forward what he considered to be some relevant data with respect to that and relevant data with respect to his supporting the allegation of the petition, and in my opinion it was in order. Let us say it would be very difficult when people speak extemporaneously, as hon. members do, and as they are required to do, not to read speeches, to clinically examine every word and phrase to the extent that - that kind of an analysis. To the best of my knowledge the hon. member was speaking on the material allegation which was hunting of rabbits.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think that I have made my point. I hope I have made my point. And in closing I would want to say that in as far as defending the basic rights of people in Newfoundland, and I support the prayer of the petition, I simply ask that the Minister of Tourism would indicate implementing the prayer of the petition, that he has more of a handle, that he is more aware of what is happening to our wildlife than the policies of tourism as they are being administered in this Province right now. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Any hon. gentleman speaking on the present petition?

The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support my friend and colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) on this petition on behalf of

MR. ROWE: 350 residents of Cow Head and St. Pauls in the District of St. Barbe.

Sir, I made many friends when I served the original district of St. Barbe North, and I shared many of the concerns of the people now in the new district of St. Barbe, Sir. And I fully support the prayer of the petition presented by the member for LaPoile and Sir, may I just end by saying this, that I find it quite astounding—he has disappeared altogether now—that the member for the district has not spoken in support of this particular petition and I invite him to do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, before I present a petition I would like to -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a brief point of order, Sir, I do not wish to, nor could I even if I wished to, prevent the hon. gentleman from Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) presenting a petition. We will enjoy that, Sir. But there may be other hon. gentlemen who wish to speak in respect of the one that has been presented by the gentleman from LaPoile, and I would suggest, Sir, that perhaps the gentleman from Bay of Islands could contain himself for just a moment or so. I had understood the gentleman from St. Barbe (Mr. Maynard) had indicated he wished to speak in support of that petition.

MR. WHITE: The Minister of Tourism too.

MR. ROBERTS: And the Minister of Tourism and, Sir, I certainly would not want to see them cut off in the eagerness of the gentleman from Bay of Islands to do his duty as he sees it by his constituents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is a fundamental rule of this House that the Chair and the Chair only recognize the hon. members who rise. Your Honour has recognized the hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) and I have never

MR. HICKMAN: heard such a preposterous point of order raised in this House before.

MR. SPEAKER: At the time I recognized the hon. gentleman to my left, I was not aware that any other hon. gentleman rose. If in fact any other gentleman wishes to speak to the previous petition, then the hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), having been recognized, is in fact recognized, he would probably be asked to yield by an hon. gentleman who wished to speak to the previous petition and without being able to read his mind I presume he would do so, but obviously I do not know.

Does the hon. gentleman wish to speak to the previous petition?

MR. NOLAN: That is right.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member for Bay of Islands yield?

MR. WOODROW: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Then the hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: What an absolute abuse!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order, Sir. I distinctly heard the hon. gentleman the House Leader that this process was an abuse of the House. Now, Sir, that can only be construed as a defiance of Your Honour's ruling. Your honour made a ruling, and my colleague for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) asked the gentleman from Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) whether he would yield. The gentleman from Bay of Islands indicated he would yield. My colleague was about to begin a few brief remarks in support of the petition when the House Leader very loudly, Sir, very loudly said, "An abuse of the House," and that, Sir, can only be a defiance of Your Honour's ruling.

MR. NOLAN: Withdraw 'Alex', withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition has on a point of order put forward his opinion that the statements by the hon. Minister of Justice were a comment upon the ruling of the Chair. If they were so, I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw them, and if they were not then to inform the House that they in fact were not.

MR. HICKMAN: Your Honour, they most assuredly were not meant to reflect at all upon the Chair, but rather upon the behaviour of the hon. gentleman opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. J. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to the petition I do so, and I might say that I would have risen before, but I did see my hon. friend opposite rise earlier, and I was under the impression, as were others, that he was going to speak in support of this petition, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NOLAN: If it is permissible, I would like to thank my hon. friend opposite, by the way, for giving way. What we merely would like to do, Mr. Speaker, is to support the prayer of the petition. I do not propose to have all the answers on the life span of the rabbits there or anywhere else. But the fact is the people in the communities concerned traditionally have had certain rights which they have depended on for food. And it is all very well for those who can go off to the supermarket to be high and mighty about this, but this is a real problem for some of them. Maybe those opposite in responsible positions together with their colleagues in the federal government can bring about some answer and some solution. All we are asking is surely that someone should try.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: So we certainly do support the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Any other hon. member wishing to speak to the petition presently before the House?

The hon. member for the Bay of Islands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. WOODROW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I first of all, Mr. Speaker, before presenting my petition congratulate the hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) for so ably presenting his.

MR. NEARY: Thank you very much, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: I would like now to read the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, because this is a very important petition we have here today. "We the undersigned do hereby petition the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador on behalf of the Sunset Park tenants situated in Corner Brook, in the Electoral District of the Bay of Islands, to urgently bring before the House legislation to include mobile homeowners in The Landlord and Tenant Residential Tenancies Act, 1973."

I would like to make the following comments on the petition, Mr. Speaker. The importance of this petition is borne out by the fact that a Delegation of two people brought it in from Corner Brook yesterday to have it presented to the House today, and these two people are presently in the galleries of the House. Involved are ninety-two mobile homeowners or one hundred and eighty-four married couples plus children. At least ten families have received eviction notices for February 28. In order to prevent these tenants from being put out in the dead of Winter, I am asking that Bill No. 16, "An Act To Amend The Landlord Tenant Residential Tenancies Act" take precedence over all other matters in the House today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: And would ask the support of all hon. members on this matter.

Number five, these people are being evicted for it seems no apparent justifiable reason.

Mr. Woodrow.

Number six, I have talked the matter over with the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment, and also the hon. House Leader, the hon. Minister of Justice. And finally, Mr. Speaker, before the delegation returns to Corner Brook, they want to be assured that this bill will be passed with all haste, and before the pending date of eviction. Now I understand that it has received first reading, and I now lay this, Mr. Speaker, on the table of the House of Assembly for its consideration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of all the people in our caucus to support the petition so very well tabled by our hon. friend opposite. And this is a matter that has been discussed, not this particular matter, but in this House before. Now my hon. friend opposite surely realizes, I am sure, that Bill 16 can, if the hon. gentlemen opposite wished, bring this bill before the House this afternoon and have it debated and have it settled one way or the other, but that is up to the government to bring this in. We have, as he says, ninety-two mobile homeowners involved, ten families about to be evicted, and here is a situation where we have once again, I submit, Mr. Speaker, where mobile homeowners, who for whatever reason live in mobile homes, are, I believe, as has often been the case in this Province, mistreated. And I submit now to our hon. friend opposite that in supporting this bill, or in supporting rather his petition, which we do most heartedly, that if he can convince his friends opposite to bring this bill up this afternoon, everyone here will support him in his endeavour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to whole-heartedly support the petition so ably presented by my hon. friend the member for Bay of Islands in behalf of ninety-two mobile home owners in Sunset Park in the district of Bay of Islands. The member, Sir, in presenting the petition pointed out to the House that it is possible to have that particular bill, Bill No. 16, "An Act To Amend The Landlord And Residential Tenancies Act," to have that bill brought before the House this very day providing, Mr. Speaker, that the Government House Leader sees fit to call that particular order of business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member did not mention this particular significant fact in presenting the petition and that is, Sir, that ten homeowners are being presently evicted because they refused to pay a five per cent commission to the owner of Sunset Park. People who did not pay the five per cent commission on their mobile home are being asked to get out. And that is why, Sir, it is urgent - and the member tried to impress that upon the House - it is urgent that this matter be brought before the House as quickly as possible and made retroactive, if possible, to protect these ten mobile homeowners who are now under notice and who will be evicted later on this month from their homes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is the five per cent for?

MR. NEARY: The five per cent commission? Nobody knows what it is for. It is just an arbitrary five per cent commission.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What does he say it is for?

MR. NEARY: Well he does not give any justifiable reason for it except that he wants to collect five per cent commission on every mobile home that goes in his park immaterial of who sells it or where it is bought. It is a surtax. It is a rip-off, that is what it is, Sir. And these particular ten tenants - as a matter of fact there was a case

Mr. Neary.

before the court, and the judgement was handed down in favour of the ten tenants. And then just because the owner of Sunset Park got contrary, because he lost the case, he gave notice that these ten particular mobile home owners that they were going to be evicted. And, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member indicated, there is a cross section of people involved. You have engineers, school teachers, old age pensioners, I believe, being evicted in the ten people that are now under notice. And if the Minister of Justice, Sir, is doing his duty at all to the people of this Province, he will call that order of business today. I am prepared, Sir. I am the speaker this afternoon in the Throne Speech. I am prepared to forego that for an hour or two, and

MR. NEARY: let us get down and debate Bill 16 and make it retroactive to protect these people in Sunset Park out in the district of Bay of Islands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I have every possible sympathy with people who live in mobile homes, not because I happen to have a brother who lives in one, but because I know many people who do, in many parts of the province. And I have to say to the House that I have no sympathy at all, none at all, with the feeling there seems to be, not perhaps in ministerial circles, because I do not know of any such feeling in ministerial circles, but it seems to be in official circles, civil service circles, there seems to be a positive, a very definite and a very positive prejudice against the existence of mobile homes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now my sympathy is entirely with the owners of mobile homes. I do not see anything wrong with them, anything, provided they are laid out properly, provided there is water and sewerage, provided there is electricity, provided there is collection of garbage and so on, provided the thing is operated decently I see nothing what-so-ever against them. And having said that and to that extent supporting the prayer of the petition that the hon. gentleman has brought in, I am curious about the reason for the evictions. First of all, I suppose the eviction is by order of a court. I do not suppose the owner of the park can just order them out, he cannot evict them. He can only go to a court, and only the court, I take it, can evict them. What reason has he given the court? What reason has the court got to order their eviction? The court would have to have some reason. And if the reason is non-payment of a contractual amount, if they have contracted to pay 5 per cent of something or other,

MR. SMALLWOOD: we have not been told what it is 5 per cent of of what is it 5 per cent, but if that is the reason—they have contracted to pay and have not paid it—I suppose the court would have no choice but to order their eviction.

The Minister of Justice, as I would expect is listening -

MR. NEARY: The first step is a lawyer, the lawyer sends him a letter; the next step would be to court.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He has not as yet gone to court? The Minister of Justice is listening intently, I am not familiar with the Bill that is on the Order Paper that the hon. members are demanding should be brought forward here today, because it apparently is an emergency, apparently it has not as yet come into court and apparently if it is to be headed off it ought to be dealt with here today.

But I wish someone would tell us what is this 5 per cent for? If it is an amount which the tenant agreed to pay—whether rightly or wrongly, they agreed to pay it—if it forms part of the contract, then what is wrong, what is it, what are we up against, what is the real basis of the complaint? With these exceptions I heartily support the prayer of the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the petition simply to get the facts before the House. Some of the petitioners—and I met with their representatives yesterday—some of the petitioners are in possession of a notice to quit the premises, and this notice to quit expires on February, 28, 1977. This is a notice to quit, Mr. Speaker, from the solicitors for the landlord, the owner of the property in question upon which those mobile homes are situated. Government gave notice of a bill which has had first reading dealing with, among other things, the question of mobile homes and there is a provision under clause 1 of a bill "An Act To Amend The Landlord and Tenant (Residential Tenancies) Act (Bill 16)

MR. HICKMAN: a provision to bring mobile homes within the scope of the act. This we intend to bring before the House on second reading and I am sure that I can—listening to the spokesman from the official opposition and from the hon. gentlemen from Twillingate and LaPoile, that it will be supported, this government measure will be supported.

MR. HICKMAN:

The gentleman who presented the petition asked me if I could give them as Government House Leader an assurance that this bill would be brought before the House in sufficient time for it to be thoroughly debated and passed and assented to by February 28, 1977. That is approximately thirteen days from now. I can publicly and I will give that assurance to the petitioners. I do not want to bring it before the House today because the bill has to and must go back to the legislative draftsmen. One has to proceed with a great deal of caution when you are dealing with legislation to deal with a particular problem with a particular group of people. That is very fundamental to any kind of legislation.

But may I assure the petitioners on behalf of government that this matter will be brought before the House. I am sure that they can count on the government's bill being supported. And the chief legislative draftsman will very thoroughly review the bill to see what amendments if any are necessary when the bill comes into Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further speakers on this petition?

Are there any further petitions?

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of ninety residents who live in the town of Come By Chance. Now these residents of Come By Chance, Mr. Speaker, have had some setbacks, as everybody in the Province knows and perhaps everybody in Canada knows. But the prayer of this particular petition is - and I will read the prayer - it says, "We the undersigned citizens of the community do hereby request that the first phase or - they mention first phase, I suppose, because this is how it is usually done in the last several years at least - the first phase or completion of a water and sewer system be put in Come By Chance."

There is a second aspect to the petition. It says, "Also we want the freeze on Crown land removed as it is essential for the expansion and development of our community. We, the people, feel that

MP. CALLAN:

we are not being treated the same as other communities in this area in that we have tried on several occasions to have these same demands met. These matters are considered very urgent and important, and you may be assured that our efforts will continue until we receive the required consideration."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the drafters of this petition, which I think is headed by the town council at Come By Chance, have already made application for water and sewer and have also made application to have these freeze on the Crown land removed. This was done at least last year because I had a delegation come in from Come By Chance representing the council there who talked about these two matters to the appropriate officials here in St. John's.

Mr. Speaker, the people are asking for a water and sewer system in Come By Chance. Now there is a lot that could be said regarding the subject of water and sewer systems and where they go and why, and what have you, and where they do not go, and why. However, there is a danger there of entering the realm of debate. So all I will say - and I will risk entering that realm - it seems quite strange to me at least representing the district of Bellevue, in which of course Come By Chance is located, that five water and sewer projects were carried on last year in one particular district and other districts who have been looking for water and sewer for their towns for years have not been justly treated.

I can talk about Sunnyside, which is next door to Come By Chance. They have been asking for water and sewer. They started with water and sewer and then they switched and they just asked for water. In the last several years they have been asking for water only. And Norman's Cove, the community in which I live, has been doing the same thing for the past several years. Some strange things happened.

MR. CALLAN: When these two communities were under another electoral district, Trinity South, Mr. Speaker, they were pretty close to getting water and sewer and then for some strange reason the water and sewer went to another community which would no longer be in the district represented by a certain individual -

MR. FLIGHT: Shameful! Shameful!

MR. CALLAN: - who, of course, was the successful applicant when that water and sewer was given to a community in which that member decided to run for a future election.

MR. ROBERTS: The member was not successful, as I recall it.

MR. CALLAN: He was unsuccessful but he was successful in getting the contract for the water and sewer in -

MR. ROBERTS: He got the contract in that district.

MR. CALLAN: That is true, in that particular community. I would not mention the community, Mr. Speaker. I have nothing at all against a community like Heart's Delight or any other community in this Province getting water and sewer because I know they probably need it, but the way it is granted is utterly contemptible.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further petitions?

Speakers on petitions?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I should like to table the answer to a question asked by the hon. the member for Burgeo, is it? There were two parts of the question; the first one said, "Give the locations, places and the type of employment of the 5,000 chronic welfare recipients who were removed from Social Welfare to productive employment during the years 1972,

MR. BRETT: to 1976." The second part of the question is; "Indicate how many of these jobs were on Local Initiative Projects or other Federal sponsored projects."

MR. NEARY: That is the member for LaPoile.

MR. BRETT: Lapoile, I am sorry.

I will not read it, Mr. Speaker, The evening is getting late and we have not done very much business so I will just table it.

MR. NEARY: May I have a copy of that?

MR. BRETT: Yes, I have a copy for everyone.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education, Sir. I wish to refer to the negotiations, whatever state they are in, currently under way between the Newfoundland Teachers' Association on one hand, representing the teachers of the Province, and the government on the other hand, as represented therein by the Treasury Board. Could the minister please tell the House, Sir, exactly what steps he as Minister of Education has taken in an effort to try to resolve the difficulties which apparently, up until today, have not been resolved and which have led to at least the threat of a withdrawal of services or a strike?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the negotiations are being carried on headed up by Treasury Board and, of course, we have a member representing the Department of Education on that board. I think the question should be to the President of Treasury Board rather than to the Minister of Education.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: My question did not talk of the negotiations themselves, Sir, or I would have directed it to the gentleman who heads the Treasury Board. May I phrase a different question, Sir? Could the Minister of Education tell us whether he as a minister, the minister responsible in

MR. ROBERTS: in the first instance for the administration of our educational systems, whether he as minister has taken any steps at all to try to resolve these difficulties?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I have had no negotiations with the Newfoundland teachers. I have had some contact with the president and, of course, I have had contact with Treasury Board and, of course, these have been private conversations.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Is the minister prepared to take any steps in an effort to try to resolve a series of difficulties which may well lead to a strike?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the last thing we want is a strike, and I will assure the hon. member that we will be taking any steps that we can to avert a strike.

MR. F. ROWE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary to the Minister of Finance on the same subject, Sir. In view of a possibility of a teachers' strike, and the fact that the teachers are still quite flexible on the salary issue, would the minister consider dropping his insistence in changing the pension plan legislation until a final actuarial study has been completed, which would indicate whether or not the present plan is actuarially sound or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated to the House yesterday, and have indicated publicly before, and have indicated to the President of the NTA and to others through Treasury Board officials, government is prepared to sit down and discuss anything at any time. The details of the discussion, of course, in any collective agreement cannot be made in a public forum because they are meaningless. If that is the case the NTA does not need a bargaining team nor does government. We will undertake to report to the House developments as they occur, Sir, Certainly we cannot make commitments, statements and make the sort of statement that the hon. member is asking for because it would be in complete violation of the spirit of collective bargaining.

I have indicated on behalf of government that we are flexible. We are willing to sit down and talk. If the people from NTA want to come in tomorrow and sit down and discuss it with us again, we will go through the whole thing again. The ultimate aim of government is to find a solution to this impasse, and hopeful we will do so, despite the fact that we are under considerable pressure

Mr. Doody:

from everybody, not the least from the Minister of Education who has hounded me and lashed me and kicked me ruthlessly for not being more flexible on behalf of the teachers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY: The Minister of Education has been after me relentlessly to try to be more flexible and to give more, but on behalf of Treasury Board I am in a somewhat different position.

But as I have said we are only too willing to sit down and talk about any of the issues under discussion, and including the pension plan. And, you know, if these people want to come in tomorrow and sit down we are available.

MR. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROWE: Am I correct in understanding that a preliminary actuarial study has been completed?

MR. DOODY: Right.

MR. ROWE: Now could I ask the minister what the hurry is in changing that pension plan legislation? Why cannot the minister sit down and have a final detailed actuarial study done and completed and negotiated, sit down with the NTA, the government and the NTA sit down and look at a final actuarial study, it might take a year, and then, if necessary, change the pension plan legislation. What is the hurry at the risk of a strike, a teachers' strike?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, with all negotiations, with all deliberations, with all sectors of the public service the Treasury Board deals with there is always the imminent or at least the danger of a strike. That is obviously the ultimate weapon that the union has in a collective bargaining arrangement. The hurry is obviously then not in any way involved with the desire to precipitate a strike. That is, as the hon. Minister of Education has indicated, the last thing that government wants to do. The urgency in changing the collective bargaining language to give government the right of consultation

Mr. Doody:

as regarding the amount of premium that is paid into the pension fund is an urgent matter, because that is part of the subject matter that is under discussion, it is part of the collective agreement that is now being discussed by Treasury Board people and by the NTA and by the school boards. The urgency is simply an urgency of the fact that the agreement is under discussion at the present time, and that is the whole subject, you know, if it were not a part of the collective bargaining process then there would be no urgency, but it is a matter under discussion, and that is why it is an urgent matter.

MR. ROWE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. One further supplementary.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the minister's answer. Could the minister indicate to the House, Sir, at approximately what time it is anticipated that there will be a liability against the plan? Because last year as the minister knows there were \$1.25 million paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund over and above the contributions that were made to the teachers in the way of pension. When does he anticipate a liability against the plan?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. ROWE: That was one of the stated reasons - I am sorry,

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker—that was one of the stated reasons by the minister for wanting to change his legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I think there is a misconception there.

It is not a change in legislation, Sir, it is a change in a collective agreement, and I think that is a very radical difference. We are trying to make this consultative arrangement in the pension premium benefit now in anticipation of a possible disarrangement of the amount of money for which the plan may be liable in five, ten, twenty, thirty years down the line. We are not anticipating any great charge against the pension fund next year. In 1957 or 1958 or 1959 the government paid out more money than it took in. Last year the government took in more money than it paid out. Somewhere down the line there is going to have to be an arrangement made which is equitable to both sides.

What we are asking for in this particular set of negotiations is the right of consultation rather than having the NTA given the complete veto power over how much money they should pay into the plan. I have tried to explain this on many occasions, but I have had great difficulty in getting the message across. We are not anticipating or trying to change any of the benefits of the plan. The plan in terms of benefits is superior to any of the other general service plans or the civil service plans generally. We do not want to reduce that. We do not want to reduce the age limit. We do not want to reduce any of the benefits. We are simply asking for the right of consultation on the premium amount. And that is in the language of the present collective agreement and we are asking that it be changed.

The NTA takes a different stance. And as I say, you know, if they want to come in and have another discussion about it tomorrow, you know, we will do everything we possibly can to work it out. I am simply pointing out the dilemma that government finds itself in, because it is responsible ultimately on behalf of the taxpayers on paying the charges against this plan during the years to come. This

MR. DOODY:

year and last year are not problems, you know, but obviously we have got to look at the generations in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Fisheries. Would the minister indicate to the House what effect the recent takeover of the fish plant in Isle aux Morts by Connors Brothers will have on that community?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the B.C. Packers plant in Isle aux Morts was transferred to Connor Brothers some months ago, and meetings have been held since with that company to determine exactly what their plans are and to what extent do they intend to expand the operation. We are satisfied that they are going to make an effort to expand the operation and maybe to get more heavily involved in other types of development, and I look upon that transfer of ownership as being very significant, and I think it will have some very beneficial effects on the community and on the fishery in that area.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Is the minister aware that since Connor Brothers took over that fifteen of the permanent employees of that plant have been served notice that their services are no longer required? Is this the kind of beneficial effect the minister is talking about?

MR. W. CARTER: I am rather surprised, Mr. Speaker, to hear the member because at one point I believe he welcomed the idea of having Connor Brothers acquire ownership of that plant. But certainly I am not aware of the layoff notices referred to. I will certainly look into it and see what reason if any they can give for it.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. minister aware that Westons of Canada owned B.C. Packers, which was Nelpack Fisheries in Isle aux Morts, the previous operator? They also own Connors Brothers. So is this just merely a marriage of convenience? Have they asked the

MR. NEARY:

government for any assistance or any grants or any help in the takeover of this plant? What is the purpose of just switching it from one company to another that is owned by Westons?

MR. W. CARTER: The hon. member is aware, I am sure, that B.C. Packers is a privately owned company and the government was not consulted in the takeover nor could we prevent such a takeover. But certainly I believe he should be aware that Connor Brothers is the largest canning company in Eastern Canada. It is owned by Westons but certainly they are more familiar with the canning of herring than what B.C. Packers would be. And I am, like I say, quite pleased that that takeover occurred.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. I wonder if the minister is in a position to inform the House today as to what steps he has taken to bring this wildcat strike in Labrador City to a satisfactory solution?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. ROUSSEAU Mr. Speaker, no, I am not. Obviously when anything might be going on, anything may be passed in confidence to me or through me, you know, the House is not the place where I can discuss it until such time as an appropriate statement can be made, and I certainly would like to do that, but I can assure the hon. member and assure the hon. House that every possible human step that can be taken is being taken and as soon as I have something noteworthy to inform the House, I certainly will do so.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister tell the House if it is the minister's intention to go to Labrador City on a fact finding tour to do an on the spot inspection of the activities that are going on in Labrador City with a view to bringing both parties back to the bargaining table so that work can resume and production can get back to normal at Labrador City? Does the minister intend to go down there?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, not at this point in time. I have the president of the union, Local 5795, United Steel Workers of America, here in town and I can carry on discussions with him here and if I need any information from either side they have been more than co-operative in giving it to me. And I can assure the hon. member - as the hon. member was acting Minister of Labour for one year, he knows what the situation is - what is going on between both parties

MR. ROUSSEAU: and anything that might be going on with me is not in the public interest at this point in time to say. When the time comes for me to say something, and in five years there has been some involvement, it takes time, but when it is time to say something I certainly will give all the information that I can to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: I did not hear the hon. gentleman.

MR. FLIGHT: I will yield.

MR. SPEAKER: All right, I will hear the hon. gentleman for a supplementary.

MR. LUSH: A further question to the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. I wonder if he can inform the House whether or not he has been invited by either of the parties to make intercession on behalf of the workers, intercession to try and meet and bring the parties together?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Oh, yes, I have a wire from the union, and I replied to that wire. It certainly asked me to intercede, and I have done so. But you know, suffice it to say that one does not order one or the other side of the table, unless both sides want to sit down and discuss it, it is rather difficult to force them to do so. So certain preliminaries have to be looked at, and right now at the preliminary stage is where we are, and eventually, I do not know what is going to happen, but certainly the request of the union is, in the mind of the president and I hope through him the executive, they are well aware of the effort that is being made, and the company is too.

And if we can get both sides to assist us in ending this dispute, I would be a very happy man and I am sure the people in Labrador City would be very happy and I am sure that the people of this province would be very happy.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this question for the Minister of Forestry. Would the minister advise the House in keeping with the department's stated intention of spraying for spruce budworm in designated areas on an experimental basis, Has his department or has government decided yet where those designated areas are? Would the minister name the designated areas to be used on an experimental basis for spruce budworm spray?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, we have made some preliminary decisions on the areas to be sprayed and we are talking to the two paper companies about it at the present time. No, I will not indicate the areas to be sprayed.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the minister confirm to the House or deny that the two paper companies, Price Newfoundland and Bowaters are putting great pressure on his department to do away with the experimental programme and start a massive spray programme now?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MAYNARD: I would deny that the paper companies, either Price or Bowaters, or both are putting any pressure on the government to carry out a massive spraying programme. I just finished a meeting at quarter to three with officials of both companies. They are willing to co-operate every way with the programme that the government has outlined. When the details of that programme are ready to be announced, I will be making an appropriate announcement to the House of Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the minister tell the House why he will not indicate the designated areas?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Yes, a question for the hon. Minister of Justice, and I realize that he may not have the answer immediately available. It is based on the fact that just recently a resident had an accident. In other words, he was sideswiped by another car and considerable damage was done. The person who hit the car did not carry insurance. What protection, if any, is there there either through no-fault insurance or through the Recovery Judgement Fund or any source that can assist such an individual?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman for Conception Bay South has been very generous and kind to me when he suggested that he does not expect an answer at this time. I will attempt to give an answer which - I underline - is without prejudice. My understanding is that Judgement Recovery Limited, which was the successor to the Unsatisfied Judgement Fund, and is a fund that is administered by the Automobile Insurance Industry - it was given legislative sanction by this House, I would think, in the late 1950's - that that fund still remains in existence despite the fact that last year this House approved a very major amendment to the Highway Traffic Act making it compulsory for all motorists to have automobile liability insurance. I realize that it may not be of any consolation to the hon. gentleman's friend or constituent to know that the person with whom he was involved in a collision is in breach of the law, and presumably it has been reported to the police who in turn, I am sure, will initiate the necessary prosecution under the Highway Traffic Act. But the Judgement Recovery Fund is still in existence as far as I know, and I am quite certain that that was not removed and that fund is administered by the law firm of Curtis, Dawe,

MR. HICKMAN: and Fagan, Mr. Ralph E. Fagan, Q.C. is the named administrator of that fund. I am sure that if the hon. gentleman's constituent would approach Mr. Fagan, advise him of the facts, and if Mr. Fagan comes to the conclusion that there is liability he will negotiate a satisfactory settlement.

If, on the other hand, there is question as to liability, which there so often is in motor vehicle accidents, then that does not necessarily establish liability although it creates a very strong suspicion thereof. He will, I am quite certain, then say to the hon. gentleman, "You can proceed with an action," I wish I was back practicing law, I think that the procedure to be followed is that notice is served upon the Registrar of Motor Vehicles in the event that the person who has committed this hit and run offence has not been found.

So I hope that satisfies the hon. gentleman. If anything I have said is not precisely and absolutely accurate I reserve the right to once again reply to that question by the hon. gentleman for Conception Bay South (Mr. J. Nolan).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: A question for the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications. Has the city of St. John's contacted the Department of Transportation and Communications for emergency assistance in its present circumstances or in case of a snow storm?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge there has been no contact made. This morning I was at a Cabinet all morning, but to the best of my knowledge none of the officials in the department were contacted by the Mayor or any official of the St. John's City Council with regards to offering assistance. And if they did, of course we would have to give serious consideration to it, looking at the fact that we would be looking at breaking a strike situation which I understand is a quite legal situation in St. John's.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile followed by the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde and Terra Nova.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice, without any reference at all to the cases presently before the court, without any reference, would the minister indicate to the House just what is happening now in connection with the investigations of fraud in relation to the gear replacement scandal? And I am talking about ongoing investigations, investigations that are presently going on. Who is involved? The RCMP, the CID, how many representatives of the Newfoundland Constabulary, the CID and the RCMP are involved currently in these investigations?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will appreciate that I have to be awfully careful in answering that kind of question so as not to prejudice the rights of any person presently being investigated or who may be investigated.

I have forgotten the exact number of members of the RCMP who are involved almost on a continuing basis but I did give this information to this hon. House last year. Suffice it to say that there are a fair number. The Newfoundland Constabulary have been involved in investigating some of the cases. I do not believe they are actively involved in any new investigations, but rather they may and I know they have been involved in some that have not yet been quite concluded.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is this a supplementary?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, it is not.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education, Sir. In view of the fact that the payment of \$1,800 was made for services provided to a public relations firm in respect of these miserable school taxes, could the minister indicate, Sir, whether or not public tenders were called?? How many bids were submitted? Rather than get into supplementaries, Sir, I will just state the questions off if I may. Were public tenders called? How many bids were submitted? What was the name of the PR firm that got the contract, and what services were provided?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the firm was a public relations firm, I think it was Bonnell. It was a firm. I do not know if there were contracts called. I do not think there were. I think it was negotiated. It was for a service to the Provincial Association of

MR. HOUSE: School Tax Authorities to do some public relations in school taxes. I believe it is the time they were setting up the St. John's Authority.

The monies were voted of course in the operations of schools and our staff thought at that particular time that since this was a service to school boards it was the place to put it. And the Auditor General of course felt it should have been in administration. But I do not think there were, I am just speaking off the cuff now, I know the firm, and I know the amount is there but I do not believe there were tenders called.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow one supplementary. The hon. gentleman did in fact have quite a number of questions in the first one. So I will limit the supplementaries now to one.

MR. ROWE: I do have a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the minister quite nicely answered the question I did not ask but did not answer the question I did ask. Could the minister indicate the nature of negotiations that went on before the contract was awarded if public tenders were not called? What was the nature of the negotiations? Were invitations put out or what?

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

MR. SPEAKER: I previously indicated I would recognize the hon. member for Terra Nova, followed by the hon. member for Ferryland.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Social Services. With respect to the job creation programme that was his department's allocation, I wonder if the minister is in a position to inform the House as to what standards and what conditions were applied in granting these projects to the various communities?

MR. WHITE: Besides partisanship,

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I did not get the question. Would you mind repeating that please?

MR. LUSH: It was respecting the job creation programme as allocated recently by the hon. minister's department and the question was, I wonder if the minister could inform the House as to what standards or what conditions were applied in granting these projects to various communities?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, that information was tabled in the House yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Ferryland.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Fisheries a question. It is do with the joint venture. What I am thinking about in particular, Sir, is there is going to be 2,400 tons of fillet brought into Newfoundland, I would assume as well there is going to be about 5,000 tons of fish offal which represents

MR. O'BRIEN: somewhere in the vicinity of \$400,000 worth of fish meal and I am wondering if the companies, the Newfoundland companies that are involved in the joint venture, are going to get any piece of that action? Or is the Newfoundland Government going to get it? Or is it going to be a gift to the West Germans?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, there will be altogether 6,000 tons of fish harvested with 2,400 tons landed. The offal, I am afraid, would not last long enough to be brought ashore to the processing and the fish meal plants.

MR. O'BRIEN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes. I am not sure if the minister is aware or not, and I am not totally sure, but on most of these West German factory ships, which I believe it is going to be a factory ship that is coming here, they have meal plants on them. They have meal plants and filleting plants, the whole thing, and I would assume they are going to make meal out of this offal.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: I am not sure, Mr. Speaker. Maybe that is the case.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes, I would say.

MR. W. CARTER: Probably it is right. They will.

MR. SPEAKER: One additional supplementary.

MR. O'BRIEN: I wonder as well if the minister could give me any indication as to what by-catch those trawlers are going to be allowed to take, and is that going to be brought into Newfoundland as well or is it going to stay aboard ship and end up in West Germany or somewhere else?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, ships fishing in that area at that time in the year for a directed fishery, as is the case,

MR. W. CARTER: will not get any worthwhile by-catch. In other areas, yes, but not in the Northern areas where these ships will be fishing.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker,

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

This will be the last question.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health, and by way of a brief preamble the minister will recall that he introduced legislation to the House last year to govern the activities of optometrists. I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether there was any prior consultation with that group before the legislation was introduced?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, there is always consultation with any group if legislation is brought into the House.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The thirty minutes is up.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, can I just say I would like to debate it at tomorrow evening's Late Show?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Order 1, the adjourned debate on the sub-amendment.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to repeat the sub-amendment for the benefit of members who may not have been in the House in the last few days since the sub-amendment was moved; "and the House regrets that which hath been done hath been done poorly and that which hath not been done hath brought sorrow to every corner of this land," according to St. Stephen.

Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock yesterday evening I was dealing with the matter of conveyancing, and I do not

MR. NEARY: wish, Sir, to rehash the few remarks that I made yesterday, Sir, in connection with this very important matter but just let me state briefly, Sir, in order to review the situation.

Mr. Speaker, consumers in this Province as well as in other parts of Canada are becoming more conscious and more enlightened and better informed as to their rights. And, Mr. Speaker, contrary to popular belief it is legal for people in this Province to fill out their own conveyance forms. It is legal, contrary to popular belief. Heretofore, Mr. Speaker, I submit that a lot of people thought when they were buying a home, whether it is for the first time, or buying or selling homes, that it is not, Sir, essential to get a lawyer to do your conveyance, to transfer the home from the builder or transfer the home from one owner to the purchaser.

MR. NEAPY:

Mr. Speaker, I will prove to the hon. gentlemen just how foolish it is. Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for people buying homes to employ the services of a lawyer, although it is a natural instinct, Sir, for people to do that. They have a natural inclination to do it. And I would submit, Sir, that this is out of ignorance of what is involved in buying and selling a home that people naturally do this. Of course, Sir, the lawyers have the people brainwashed into thinking that it is necessary to get a lawyer. The ordinary layman, Sir, thinks that it is necessary to use a solicitor for his conveyancing so that it will be done properly, when in actual fact, Sir, as I indicated to the House yesterday, that anybody who could fill out an income tax form, anybody who can fill out an application for a passport, anybody who can read a road map, anybody who can buy a mobile home which is a pretty hefty investment and sign the documents, anybody who can buy a coloured television set on the installment plan, can in actual fact, Sir, do his own conveyancing.

Now a lot of people are reluctant to do it because they are brainwashed by the system. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is high time to explode this myth about it being compulsory and essential and necessary to get a lawyer to transfer a home from one person to another. It is not a complicated procedure, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is, Sir, without attempting to oversimplify the matter or the racket that is carried on, that conveyancing, Mr. Speaker, is not complicated, it is not difficult and it can be done by any layman who will just take the time to do so.

The point that I am trying to make here, Mr. Speaker, is that my hon. friend, the Minister of Consumer Affairs who is not a lawyer, who is not obligated in any way, shape or form to the bar society or to the legal profession, my hon. friend if he were to design a form, work out a form, a standard form and have it over in the Department of Consumer Affairs and a few pamphlets and a handbook, that any reasonably intelligent person, Sir, could then look after his own conveyancing. As I started to say yesterday, Sir, when

MR. NEAPY:

the House rose, that I know that the lawyers in this hon. House are going to get up and try to shoot me down. They are going to try to get up and justify the high legal fees that they charge, the highest in Canada, I might submit to the House. The legal fees charged for real estate transactions in this Province are the highest in the whole of Canada. And they are so high, Sir, that on one occasion when I became embroiled in a controversy with the lawyers and took them on head on that resulting from that controversy a one man royal commission was established to look into the high cost of housing in this Province. Mr. Leonard Kostoszek, a gentleman who was familiar with this procedure, was brought in from Ontario and did a study into this whole matter, including legal fees, and confirmed, Mr. Speaker, what I had been saying all along; that legal fees were the highest for real estate transactions here in this Province.

Is it any wonder then, Sir, that when we hear the lawyers in this hon. House on the government side standing in their places to try to justify their involvement in the conveyancing, that they will use some of the following arguments, Sir. And I am going to skip over the ones that I read yesterday. And I am prepared to table this for the information of the hon. Minister of Justice whose

Mr. Neary:

name is on a door of a law firm downtown, and I presume who does not share, the minister does not share in the revenue of the profits going into that law firm. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is something that I also strongly object to, Sir, members of this House having their names on the doors of the law firms with which they were associated before they became members of this House. I think, Sir, that that is habit that should be abolished. I do not think they should be allowed to leave their names on the doors of the law firms downtown.

Why do they leave them there? What is the purpose of it? What is the purpose of it, Sir? Can the Minister of Justice tell me why?

MR. MURPHY: His career as a politician is not guaranteed.

MR. NEARY: His career as a politician is not guaranteed! Well that is for sure. We saw that in the last election -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - when the minister almost got defeated by a lowly dentist down in Garnish. But why, Sir? Why?

MR. ROUSSEAU: You almost got defeated on Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Imagine if that had been LaPoile. The last election does not count.

MR. NEARY: The last remark does not count.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, I said the last election.

MR. NEARY: The last election does not count, the next one will count. The next one will count and they will all be wiped out, Sir. The whole hon. crowd. And they will be wiped out for one of the reasons we saw this afternoon when the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Maynard) refused to stand in his place in this hon. House and support a petition that was presented on behalf of 350 of the hon. member's constituents. You talk about arrogance, Sir. Why that is political suicide.

Mr. Neary:

I called the hon. minister's office this morning. Unfortunately I did not get the minister, the member himself, but I had my secretary tell the minister's secretary, because the minister was suppose to be gone to Cabinet, that I was going to present a petition in the House this afternoon, gave the minister ample warning, and as a matter of courtesy, Sir, common decency, the minister should have supported that petition on behalf of 350 of the member's constituents who are fighting for a very simple right, and that is to snare rabbits in the Gros Morne National Park. Not because they are going to die after seven years, Sir, but because they need them for food.

And that is why, Sir, that administration will be abolished after the next election, in case the hon. Minister of Manpower is interested. That is why, Sir, they will be knocked down like ten pins after the next election, because of their arrogance. Most of the ministers, Sir, as I indicated yesterday, are just useless hulks, and obviously the people in St. Barbe have lost faith, have lost confidence in their member, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, a useless, honourable, big lump, too arrogant to get up and support a petition presented on behalf of 350 of the hon. member's constituents. How many votes did he win by?

AN HON. MEMBER: Seventy-five votes.

MR. NEARY: Seventy-five votes.

AN HON. MEMBER: He lost that today.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: He lost that today.

MR. NEARY: Three hundred and fifty there today that the hon. minister lost. And I think about another 1,100 or 1,200 in a petition I presented a couple of weeks ago on behalf of the member's constituents. Pure arrogance, Sir, and contempt for the ordinary people of this Province.

Mr. Neary:

But, Mr. Speaker, I am drifting away now from the point that I was making here of how the lawyers will counter the arguments that I am putting forward for people for doing their own conveyancing. And let the message go out from this hon. House, Sir, let it go out now loud and clear that it is not necessary to have a lawyer, although many people may still elect to do so and lash out the \$700 or \$800 or \$900 or \$1,200 or \$1,500, they may still elect to do so.

MR. NEARY: But I think it is incumbent upon members of this House and those of us who speak for the ordinary people to let them know that it is their right if they so desire and they are not too lazy and they have the initiative, it is their right to fill out their own conveyancing form and they do not have to go to a solicitor.

But here are some of the arguments we will get. I will skip over, "There are 101 things which can go wrong." That is one of the arguments the lawyers will use. And this gentleman who wrote the book that I have in front of me, thanks to the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) - and I am going to return it to the hon. gentleman when I am finished my few remarks on the lawyers. It was most helpful indeed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I believe that the hon. member is a bad accountant but a good book keeper.

MR. NEARY: A bad accountant but a good book keeper.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. I do not want the member to be a good book keeper.

MR. NEARY: A bad accountant but not a good - Would the hon. gentleman repeat that again?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is only a joke.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, I am a good book keeper, yes. I have not made any notations. Look, the hon. gentleman can see that I have my little pieces of paper here. I do not even have any bookmarks, Your Honour. But I am going to pass it back to the hon. gentleman. I found it to be a very, very interesting book by Michael Joseph, entitled The Conveyancing Fraud.

AN HON. MEMBER: Table it.

MR. NEARY: I cannot table the book. I am going to table what I am going to read from. I only have to read what I am reading from. And I am not reading --

AN HON. MEMBER: You are reading from the book.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I am not

The Conveyancing Fraud is the title of the book. The book

MR. NEARY: is closed, look closed. Michael Joseph, Sir, got his law degree from Cambridge and worked fifteen years -

AN HON. MEMBER: You will have to take the cover off.

MR. NEARY: The gentleman worked fifteen years with lawyers, with solicitors, doing conveyancing. So the gentleman should know what he is talking about.

You Honour, the Speaker of this House graduated from the same university as Mr. Michael Joseph, Cambridge University. And so therefore I would assume, Sir, that this will add a great deal of credibility to my argument that, Mr. Speaker, that I am quoting an authority here. It is not just hearsay. It is not Neary versus the lawyers. It is not a vendetta.

Mr. Speaker, it is an actual fact backed up by statistics information. I would recommend the book to anybody.

MR. HICKEY: Central Mortgage and Housing will find you one.

MR. NEARY: Oh well I am coming to it. My hon. friend has raised a very interesting point, Sir, that Central Mortgage and Housing will insist that you have a lawyer.

As a matter of fact -

MR. HICKEY: And a title.

MR. NEARY: As a matter of fact they have -

MR. HICKEY: Political.

MR. NEARY: Yes, they will have a list of political hacks, appointees. They will tell you what lawyer you have to take. That will show you, Sir, how far the racket has advanced.

And that just did not only happen under this administration.

MR. HICKEY: That is not the lawyers.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, that is the government. The government should have better sense because, Mr. Speaker -

MR. HICKEY: Federal government.

MR. NEARY: - banks also do the same thing. They have fallen into the trap and they are brainwashed. When a person

MR. NEARY: goes to a bank for a loan to buy his house, the bank manager - if you told the bank manager that you were going to do your own conveyancing he would have a stroke. He would fall off the chair. He would say you are mad. "You have got to get a lawyer. We insist you get a lawyer. Otherwise you do not get the loan." That is a form of blackmail. And CMHC does the same thing. Does my hon. friend realize that? They have a list of lawyers over there that have been submitted by a political party, by the government in power.

MR. HICKEY: The federal government.

MR. NEARY: The federal government. A lot of the names, I would not be a bit surprised but my hon. -

AN HON. MEMBER: Name one.

MR. NEARY: Yes, the hon. former member for Placentia East's name was on that list. It was out there when he was a Liberal, when the hon. gentleman was a Liberal, and they forgot to take it off when he was a turncoat.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did they take it off?

MR. NEARY: I do not know if it is off yet. But it really does not make any difference. The principle is wrong, Sir. The principle is wrong.

CMHC should say to their clients, to their customers, "Look, you do not have to get a lawyer if you do not want to. You can do your own conveyancing."

MR. HICKEY: What about title?

MR. NEARY: What about title? Title. Title. How do you get title? How do you get title?

Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has a real estate company. The hon. gentleman is partners with the great hockey players in this Province, the two gentlemen who went up to the NHL, came back down now.

MR. HICKEY: Be careful. Do not give me any publicity now.

MR. NEARY: And are now in the minor league with the hon. gentleman, in a company I believe called Score, is it? Score. I mean they could not get away

MR. NEARY:

a company I believe called Score, is it? Score, I mean they could not get away from hockey. They even had to use the name Score. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman should know how you get title.

AN HON. MEMBER: But the mortgage companies will accept.

MR. NEARY: But the mortgage companies will accept. The mortgage companies are just as bad as the banks by the way. They also insist that you have a lawyer.

MR. MURPHY: Anybody who has a good job unless they are a minister.

MR. NEARY: Yes there are a lot of good people in the world. As a matter of fact ninety per cent of the ordinary people of this Province are good people. But since my hon. friend got his swimming pool around him and has started to hobnob now in the cocktail circle and got his big fat salary, poor man's champagne does not even come in his mind anymore. There are good people around, the people that my hon. friend abandoned, ninety per cent of the people of this Province who are ordinary people. They are pretty good people but they do not know their rights when it comes to conveyancing. And my hon. friend should be ashamed to ask that question, and the hon. gentleman who is not a lawyer, not obligated to the lawyers, who I hope is not completely swept away with all this glamour and excitement of being a minister and hobnobbing around with the Premier and travelling off here and there on wild goose chases and so forth, I hope that minister will once in a while think about the little fellow down on Flower Hill and get a few pamphlets in the minister's office, and get a few booklets and get a form made out that people can come in and pick up and do their own conveyancing.

Mr. Speaker, here are some of the arguments. Of course in the majority of cases, the lawyers will argue, in a kind of an offhanded way to try to confuse you, to put you on the defensive, to frighten you - of course in the majority of cases everything is straightforward. But, they go on to add, but once in a while, you know, once in every 100 or so cases something could go wrong. Conveyancing requires no special qualifications most of the lawyers

MR. NEARY:

will admit. And out comes some problem which probably presents itself every twenty years or so in a solicitor's career.

Here are some. They will say, when a man or a woman is spending so much money out of his life's savings embarking on the largest commercial transaction of his life, signing a mortgage which will take him a third of his life to repay, he needs professional advice highly trained experts. Highly trained experts! Why, Mr. Speaker, do you know who actually does the most of the conveyancing that is done? They are done by the secretaries and they are done now by clerks. The lawyers now are completely bored with it so they hire clerks now, office managers who have no training. The secretary types it up.

Mr. Speaker, I am not allowed to call the hon. gentleman a big nincompoop, it is unparliamentary, Sir, so I am not going to do it and Your Honour will not have to ask me to retract it. If I could, Sir, I would and I would call the hon. gentleman worse than that. If the hon. gentleman only knew what his colleagues are saying about him. No wonder the poor old fellow is paranoid. You will see the hon. member tomorrow or the next day and the hon. gentleman sitting in the corner there with the specs, you will see these two hon. gentlemen get up tomorrow or the next day and stick darts into the administration. Well the people of this Province are getting wise to them. It is all a publicity stunt. That is all it is. If hon. gentlemen were sincere in their convictions and were prepared to do away with patronage and circumventing the Public Tendering Act of this Province and the graft and the patronage and the corruption that goes on, the hon. gentlemen would not be sitting on that side of the House.

MR. MUPPHY: Rather than sit next to you, we will stay here.

MR. NEARY: I will be around, Mr. Speaker, a long time when the hon. gentleman will be gone. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be sidetracked by the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: this is what the solicitors will say when they are trying to justify - when the Minister of Justice, the spokesman for the lawyers, when the minister gets on his feet, he will be telling us, and the member for Kilbride, and the member for St. John's East and all the other lawyers on the government side say "Sure, sure we agree with the hon. member for LaPoile. Sure he can go ahead and do it himself, but he has to have a trained expert, a specialist, a qualified solicitor to advise him on all stages of the transaction. To make sure that he gets what he is paying for, protect his interest, make sure he does not make an ass of himself." This is what they say "Sure boy, go ahead and do it but do not make an ass of yourself"; this is in the book, not unparliamentary, Your Honour, "Go ahead and do it boy, you know, sure, help yourself but you will be back to me next week on your hands and knees to get me to do the job."

It is all meant, Sir, to create confusion in the persons mind, to make him fearful of doing his own conveyancing because he may make a mistake. And then they say we are a professional body which is subject to the self-imposed discipline of the Law Society which insists on the highest standards being observed by the profession otherwise any chairman could set himself up. So these are the highest standards being observed by the profession. Well, Mr. Speaker, we saw some of these high standards that are observed by this profession that we have had here in Newfoundland over the past few years. And we are experts they say, we are specialists, we passed examinations. Mr. Speaker, they have passed examinations, they have gone off for five or six or seven years to law school and they come back and they spend all their time downtown in their offices involved in real estate transactions and conveyancing.

Do you have to spend seven years in law school for that? Could you not learn that in a couple of weeks over here at the College

MR. NEARY:

of Trades and Technology , if they ran a course? If the university Extension Department ran a course to show people how to do their own conveyancing , they probably would be cued up, they would have the biggest registration than any course ever had in this province. I have had more lawyers in the last three years, Sir, than you could shake a stick at , and I must say they have done a good job for me but, Sir, most lawyers, I would say 99 per cent of the lawyers in this province do not know the least thing, they do not know anything about criminal law. They do not.

Mr. Speaker, if Your Honour got in trouble, and I hope Your Honour does not , but if Your Honour got in trouble, ran afoul of the law, and Your Honour needed a criminal lawyer, where would Your Honour get one? On that side of the House.? My hon. friend in the corner is not a criminal lawyer. Well, Sir, if the hon. gentleman stays over with that hon. crowd much longer, he might be a criminal.

The hon. member for Kilbride is not a criminal lawyer. He might be as good as any you will find in the province.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Well, I do not know , Sir, that is debatable. I could debate that one. But, Mr. Speaker, Your Honour would have a problem if he went down over the list to find a criminal lawyer to take on his case. They are all experts in conveyancing , in second mortgage money, loaning out second mortgage money and in real estate transactions. My hon. friend sitting down to the table is enjoying my few remarks, the hon. gentleman is a learned gentleman. I am sure if the hon. gentleman could get up and speak in the House, Sir, that he would tell us, the hon. gentleman would tell us that if we do our job badly the client has claim for negligence. The hon. gentleman would use that argument and all the other lawyers in the House would use the same argument "And in the unlikely event of the solicitor

MR. NEARY: "being fraudulent"- Every profession has its black sheep , they admit, the client has recourse to the compensation fund of the Law Society Well I would like to know , Sir , how many people in this province in the last fifty years have had recourse to the compensation fund set up by the Law Society.

MR. NEAFY:

The Law Society, the lawyers involved in conveyancing, accept no responsibility at all if there is a bad sewer connection because they do not investigate it in the first place, and they do not know anything about it. They know nothing. They do not accept any responsibility at all for a man buying a house near an airport where you may have a noise problem. They accept no responsibility at all, Sir, if a house sinks down in the bog because of the foundation being put on soft ground, not a soft head as the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) has but soft ground. They accept no responsibility for these things at all, Sir.

Then they will always come back and say, "Well if a layman attempted to do his own conveyancing and he gets himself into a mess, he will have to ask a solicitor to bail him out." These are arguments, Sir, with which most conveyance solicitors justify themselves. And in the course of this book, Sir, Mr. Michael Joseph has exploded every one of these arguments.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that I have said enough, Sir, to be able to get the message out to our people, that they can do their own conveyancing if they so desire.

Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend, the Minister of Consumer Affairs might just take a few tips. Incidentally might table this document. The counter arguments that will come from the lawyers - now they will dream up new arguments to counter the proposal that I put before the House. They will find new arguments and they will probably come in and attack me personally, Sir. That is their old game, attack me personally, but I do not care. I can anticipate what they are going to say.

Mr. Speaker, here are some tips on how one can do their own conveyancing. I will table this and the hon. minister might want to pick it up. One -

MR. HICKMAN: An expert on jurisprudence.

MR. NEAFY: No, Sir, you do not have to be an expert on jurisprudence.

Mr. Speaker, 'Vendor's solicitor sends you draft (that is proposed)

MR. NEAPY:

contract with carbon copy. This contract sets out the terms of the agreement broadly that you, the purchaser, will buy the house in question from the vendor for the price agreed." Pretty straightforward, nothing to it. "The vendor's solicitor sends out the draft."

Two, "You return one copy of the contract unsigned to the vendor's solicitor indicating that you agree with the terms as alterations or additions to be made. You first agree to these with the vendor's solicitor over the telephone. Then write them into the contract before returning it."

Three, "Subsequently you sign the copy of the contract which you have retained and send it to the vendor's solicitor at the same time paying the deposit, usually ten per cent of the purchase price, either to the estate agents or to the vendor's solicitor whichever the contract provides. You take this step only after you have received a written mortgage offer and have tied up your sale if you are selling simultaneously."

Four, "Vendor's solicitor then sends you identical contract signed by vendor. This is called an exchange of contracts. There is now a binding contract. The vendor's solicitor will have inserted a date for completion in the signed contract which he sends you which date will usually be about four weeks from the date he posted it to you."

Five, "You prepare a transfer form if house is registered or conveyance if house is unregistered"

Mr. Neary:

which is the document to be signed by the vendor which will eventually transfer the house to you, and you send it with carbon copy to the vendor's solicitor."

Six, You send certain documents which you will have accumulated to your building society's solicitor, who will send you a mortgage form for you to sign.

Seven, "You and your building society's solicitor attend the appointment for completion. You will be handed the keys or told where you can collect them. You will also obtain the transfer or conveyance signed by the vendor together with the vendor's land certificate or previous conveyances all of which you pass on to your building society's solicitor. You also hand him the mortgage form which you have signed. You and your building society's solicitor then hand to the vendor's solicitor bank drafts making up the balance of the purchase price, that is, price less deposit already paid. The vendor's building society's solicitor will also be there, in fact, completion will probably take place at his office, will hand your building society's solicitor a short letter acknowledging the vendor's mortgage has been discharged, and undertaking to send him the necessary form of discharge.

After exchange of contracts send search form to Land Registry Office, which is down here on the ground floor of Confederation Building, and the fee. And there it is. There it is, Mr. Speaker. My hon. friend can draw up a handbook -

MR. MURPHY: - for about fifteen years and save a few hundred dollars.

MR. NEARY: Well my hon. friend can certainly see to it that a lot of the ordinary people of this Province can save themselves the money.

MR. MURPHY: You get the same thing now on a doctor that I would save the cost of an operation on my ulcer.

MR. NEARY: It is not the hon. gentleman's ulcer, Sir, that should be operated on, it is a little further up, it is above the hon. gentleman's shoulders that he should have treatment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to oversimplify the procedure, but, Sir, -

MR. MURPHY: You have done away with all the universities and the law schools anyhow, we do not need and that is for sure.

MR. NEARY: Does the hon. gentleman have a vested interest in the Law Society, in the legal profession of this Province?

MR. MURPHY: I do not even have an overcoat in there, not to talk of a vested one.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is the kind of contempt and arrogance that you get from hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, Sir, when you are talking about good, you are talking about good for the ordinary people of this Province. There is the kind of attitude that is displayed.

Mr. Speaker, this should be done immediately, should be undertaken by the Minister of Consumer Affairs at once, because when the word goes out, Sir, when the ordinary people of this Province find out that they no longer have to believe in the lawyers mystique, that they can do their own conveyancing, Sir, they can arrange their own financing on a new home -

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. gentleman from St. John's North raises on a point of order.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I am referring to our own rules, rule No. 49 in our own Standing Orders. "No member except the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition or a minister moving a government order and the member speaking in reply immediately after such minister or a member making a motion of no confidence in the government and the minister replying thereto shall speak for more than forty-five minutes at a time in any debate."

Now I appreciate the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the member does not have much confidence in the government. I also appreciate the fact that any person speaking to a motion of no confidence may have unlimited time, according to our Standing Rules. But the hon.

Mr. J. Carter:

gentleman is not making a motion of no confidence, he is not even amending a motion of no confidence, he is speaking on an amendment to an amendment to a motion of no confidence.

And I realize that I am sticking strictly to the letter of the Law, but, Mr. Speaker, I think that we have to be guided in these matters by the words that are spelled out in our Standing Orders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER: And therefore I would request that you rule whether or not, in fact, the hon. gentleman does have the right of unlimited time which I submit he is abusing.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. NEARY: That ruling has already been made by Your Honour and, of course, as usual the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), should stick to his savoury patch and not try all of a sudden to become a constitutional expert in this hon. House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): If there are no other discussions on the point of order raised by the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), the point of order raised was whether or not the amendments to the amendments constitutes a motion of no confidence because if it does constitute a motion of no confidence the hon. member moving such a sub-amendment would have unlimited time under our Standing Rules.

The Chair did accept that the sub-amendment was in order and it is my recollection that there is precedent in our House that such sub-amendments or an amendment to an amendment to the Address in Reply has been regarded as a motion of non-confidence in the government.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, how long do I have to put up with this harassment from the hon. the member for -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER: To a further point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): Order, please! Order!

In giving that ruling therefore, it would be my ruling that the hon. the member for LaPoile does, in fact, have unlimited time at his disposal.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I was not disputing the fact that the -

MR. NEARY: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): A further point of order.

MR. J. CARTER: You are being harassed. It is a point of order. You are being harassed by a point of order.

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): Order, please! The hon. member certainly can bring up a further point of order if it is on a different

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): matter. But if it is on the matter of the ruling from the Chair I am afraid the hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) will not be permitted.

MR. J. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, shot down again. Sir, I want to table this document which is taken directly from the book by Michael Joseph, The Conveyancing Fraud. I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Consumer Affairs will take this matter under advisement and will undertake to treat this urgent matter as a number one priority in the minister's department and develop a process whereby people who want to can do their own conveyancing and can do so with assistance, if necessary, from counsellors in the Department of Consumer Affairs. Now that is a fair proposition, Sir, and I hope that the minister will not just shrug it off as being trivial, nonsensical, that the minister will take it seriously and will undertake, Sir, to make this a number one priority in the minister's department.

Mr. Speaker, before I dispose of the lawyers I want to talk about another matter, Sir, that came up last year and that is in connection with an amendment to the restrictive trade practices legislation of this country, to the Combines Investigation Act which is federal legislation, Sir.

MR. MORGAN: Also P.C. Federal legislation -

MR. NEARY: No, no, Sir, it is federal legislation and it applies to every province in Canada, the whole of Canada, the ten provinces and the territories.

MR. DOODY: It also applies to Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: And it applies to Bell Island too as my hon. friend -

AN HON. MEMBER: settled their disputes (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes. Anyway, Sir, last year the Government of Canada saw fit to amend the Federal Combines Investigation Act barring professionals from getting together to

MR. NEARY: set fees to the public. Section 32 of the Combines Investigations Act, to be precise, was the section of the Act that was amended.

MR. NEARY:

This measure, Mr. Speaker, was brought in by the Government of Canada to offer some real protection to the consumer and not to allow John Q. Citizen to be shafted by the lawyers and real estate firms as they have been in the past in this Province and that they could go and shop around. They could go now under this new amendment, they could go from lawyer to lawyer, from real estate firm to real estate firm, from real estate agent to real estate agent. This, Mr. Speaker, this law has been in effect since the 1st. of July, 1976, giving the consumer the right to shop around, and he was no longer bound to accept the first fee that was flung at him by the lawyers, he could shop around and try to get a better deal.

So since last July, Sir, it has been up to the consumer. The consumer is the one who has to do the shopping around. So it is up to the consumer in the first place and if he finds, Mr. Speaker, after shopping around, John Q. Citizen finds that he is getting the same quotation from certain groups or several individual lawyers or from several real estate men and he suspects that there is collusion or price fixing going on in violation of section 32 of The Federal Combines Act, then John Q. Citizen has the right to report this to the - we got another constitutional expert now going through the Standing Rules, the silent Minister of Municipal Affairs, the silent minister.

MR. DOODY: You are not going to be harrassed. Carry on.

MR. NEARY: "Is there really a Jerry Dinn?" So the newspaper asks.

Mr. Speaker, if John Q. Citizen suspects collusion or price fixing then he can report this matter and have it investigated

MR. NEARY: by the federal Department of Consumer Affairs, who now hold offices in this Province, in St. John's, Grand Falls, I believe, and Corner Brook. It is up to the individual to report this obvious violation to the proper official in this department, either in the Sir Humphrey Gilbert Building, or in the appropriate buildings in the other centres that I have mentioned.

Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, has provided the legislative protection for consumers, now it is up to the consumers to protect themselves from fleecing by wolves masquerading in professional and semi-professional clothing.

MR. DOODY: Author. Author. Author.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, here is the back-up information. The author was not Gary Callahan. It was not Dave Butler. It was not marvellous Youden.

MR. J. CARTER: Do not tell us who it was not. Tell us who it was.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, section 32 of the legislation, and it may be difficult for members of these groups that are mentioned, these groups to appreciate the fact. It may be difficult for the lawyers, they are saying here, it may be difficult. I will read the whole paragraph, Mr. Speaker, and then I will table the whole document if Your Honour wants me to. This is public information. I got the back-up information from the federal Department of Consumer Affairs, so I will read the whole thing.

MR. J. CARTER: Would the member consider tabling himself?

MR. NEARY: I would like to put the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) on the table, and have a sharp scalpel, Sir, so I could make an incision in the proper place.

"While it is important that the public be aware that the law now entitles them to compensation or to competition in such industries, it is equally important that the groups involved be aware of the new conditions under which they operate. While for many of the groups application of the law will make little

MR. NEARY: difference because the industry had no history of restrictive arrangements. "Where you have no groups who had any history of collusion or price fixing, it would not apply to them. They will have no problem. But where you have groups like the lawyers, so they say here, there is going to be problems. In some of these cases the public have been generally aware of the fact that the industry operated under an agreed upon schedule of fees and in others,

MR. NEARY:

while it may not have been generally known, no attempt was made to hide the fact that groups suggested charges were usually followed."

In other words, the charges suggested by the lawyers and the real estate firms, before this amendment came in, fixed prices, were usually followed. "It may be quite difficult for members of these groups to appreciate the fact that the rules have changed, and that behavior that was formerly perfectly legal may now amount to a criminal offense."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, it is now a criminal offense for the lawyers in this Province to get together, to band together and set legal fees for real estate transactions. It is a criminal offense, Sir. The lawyers if they do it are leaving themselves wide open to be prosecuted under the Criminal Code of Canada. "The office of the Director of Investigation and Research is making a concerted attempt to contact such groups - and I presume the group here has been contacted, at least I am told that they have been contacted and they were told that they come under this new amendment - making a concerted attempt to contact such groups with the co-operation of industrial organizations and to convey to the membership information which will assist them in avoiding the pitfalls that exist in the new environment."

"The Combines Investigation Act prohibits outright certain behavior that limits competition." Mr. Speaker, the lawyers - I checked this, Sir, in a phone call recently to Ottawa and was told that the legal profession in this Province as well as in the other provinces of Canada now come under the jurisdiction of this Act and the same thing applies to real estate agents and real estate firms. But, Sir, the lawyers are not prepared to admit in this Province that they come under this legislation.

They had a meeting of the Bar Society recently -

MR. DOODY: What about the undertakers?

MR. NEARY: The undertakers the same thing, Sir, only I do not think the undertakers fix their prices. They may. Well the undertakers, I believe, are set up under an act of this Legislature.

MR. NEAPY:

When you have organizations in society, Sir, such as the Law Society established under an act of this Province and they are subject to the regulations and the regulatory bodies of this Province, they can weasel their way out from under this legislation. I submit, Your Honour, that the lawyers in this Province are now in the process of doing just that and looking to their White Knight, the Minister of Justice, to bring a bill before this House, to bring a new bill before this House - I forget the title of it now, Sir, I had it written down here. I do not have the name of the bill. But I was told recently what the name of the bill that the lawyers hope - they are lobbying for it now. They have already started their lobby with the Minister of Justice. They had their Bar Society meeting recently.

MR. ROBERTS: That is the New Law Society Act.

MR. NEAPY: The New Law Society Act, that is it, written by the lawyers. They are not like the denturists. They are not like any other group, Sir. The New Law Society Act will be written by the lawyers themselves and passed over to the Minister of Justice who will rubber stamp it and bring it into the legislature and cram it down our throats, the great White Knight, the hon. gentleman who is always talking about upholding the administration of justice in this Province, will not discriminate against the lawyers, his buddies. His name is still on the door down in his law firm downtown.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MR. NEAPY: Yes, Sir, they had the best closed shop in the world. So, what they hope now, Mr. Speaker, under the new Newfoundland Law Society Act,

MR. NEARY: If they cannot get it passed and get the proper wording, the proper clauses included in that Act, that they could weasel their way out from under the Federal Combines Investigation Act.

AN HON. MEMBER. They cannot.

MR. NEARY: They can. Yes, they can. I checked it with Ottawa.

MR. ROBERTS: They should not.

MR. NEARY: They should not, no Sir, the hon. Leader of the Opposition and I completely agree, they should not be allowed to weasel their way out from under the Federal Combines Investigation Act. And they got together recently and they had a few drinks and a few cocktails. I met some of my buddies who are lawyers getting ready to go down dressed up in their morning suits, going down, Sir, to have their annual meeting, they were going to have their annual meeting and they are going to try to shaft the ordinary people of this province again.

And, Mr. Speaker, do you know what they have done now? Do you know what they have done, Your Honour, they have set minimum prices so they say, minimum prices. They have still gotten together, Sir, and they have fixed their prices. There is still collusion and it is Combines Investigation Act, they have still done it. They are brazen enough to do it. And they are hoping that the great White Knight The Minister of Justice will come to their aid, their old buddy.

MR. HICKEY: How not to bury good ideas.

MR. NEARY: How not to bury good ideas, Am I burying a good idea?

MR. DOODY: If you ever had one it is in dire peril of dying.

MR. NEARY: Sir, I hope this House will not let the lawyers get away with it and that the Minister of Justice, who is supposed to be completely impartial, will not be conned by his colleagues in the best trade union in the world, the people who have the best closed shop, will not be conned into bringing in this act and allowing the lawyers to weasel out from under the terms and conditions of the Combines Investigation Act. Now, Mr. Speaker, if they violate this Act,

MR. NEARY: Section 32, they are liable for criminal charges. And, Sir, if we have any sense at all in this hon. House, any sense of decency and any regard for the ordinary people of this province we will not allow the Minister of Justice, just to please his buddies down in their law offices downtown, just to make himself look like a hero and a big shot in their eyes, he will not allow the ordinary people of this province, or his colleagues will not allow the consumers to get the shaft again.

This is what the lawyers are up to now, concerned about. First of all, Mr. Speaker, does Your Honour realize how highly overrated the lawyers are in this province? Just to show Your Honour how stund they are-

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that directed to the chair?

MR. NEARY: No, it is not directed to Your Honour but I am sure, Your Honour with his vast experience and the amount of travelling that Your Honour has done and the dealings that Your Honour has had with some people in the legal profession, that Your Honour knows that they are highly overrated. And, Your Honour, they did not know for the longest time, believe it or not in this province

AN HON. MEMBER: All of them?

MR. NEARY: Well there may be the odd one, there is always an exception to the rule, but generally speaking, Sir, generally speaking the lawyers did not know that they came under the Combines Investigation Act. They did not know.

MR. DOODY: If they did they would not have let it go through the House.

MR. NEARY: They did not know, now, Sir-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: You know my hon. friend in his wit, in his humour is so right, is so right. They did not realize what was happening in Canada, and they have been testing it ever since in the courts

MR. NEARY: and getting it flung out. The courts have been saying, "Yes, you are subject to the act." They have been defying the Parliament of Canada and my hon. White Knight now gazing at the lights up in, gazing heavenward, is wondering if that is true.

MR. NEARY:

Can it be true that this little fellow from Quigley's Line, that he is accusing my colleagues, my beloved brethren? Can it be true that they are that stunned that they did not know?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. NEARY: They did not know. Well my hon. White Knight -

MR. MORGAN: The Prime Minister of Canada is a lawyer, and he did not know it either.

MR. NEARY: The Prime Minister of Canada knew it. You need not worry about that. The Government of Canada knew what they were doing. The lawyers in the House of Commons knew what was happening. The lawyers out in British Columbia knew what was happening. Look at the backup information in this book. But the lawyers in Newfoundland did not know what was happening. It was too late when they found out. And now they are squealing like a stuck pig.

MR. DOODY: Collectively or individually?

MR. NEARY: Collectively and individually. They are trying to weasel their way out of it now, now that they are subject to the Combines Investigation Act, Mr. Speaker, and it will be a criminal offense for them, Sir, to try now to get together and fix prices as they did heretofore. But they are still going to try it

But now they are saying, "Well look it is only a suggestion." But it is a funny thing. It is a queer suggestion, Mr. Speaker, when you can go to three or four or five lawyers, unless you can meet one of the newer ones, one of the younger ones who is prepared to stick his neck out and give you a cut rate and then he is looked down on, Mr. Speaker, unless you come across a new one who is prepared to take on the old codgers head on, well then, Sir, I am afraid that you will get quoted the same rates from five or six lawyers. But they say, "Oh these are only recommended minimum charges."

So my advice, Sir, to the consumer is to shop around. If he wants to get a solicitor to help him with his conveyancing - and he does not have to - but if he wants to, shop around and say, "No I am not satisfied with your quotation. I am going to go down to So-and-So down the street, down on the next block."

MR. NEARY:

Not only that, Sir, but this nonsense about lawyers not being allowed to advertise, I think it is time to get over that foolish nonsense too. They should publish their rates in the newspaper. Mr. Speaker, before I forget it can I table this document in case the Minister of Justice, Sir, may want to learn something.

MR. HICKMAN: I want the book tabled too.

MR. NEARY: Yes I am tabling the whole book now! The book is not going to be tabled. I table the excerpts from the book. I did not quote from the book.

MR. HICKMAN: A point of order. I distinctly saw the hon. member reading from a book written by an English solicitor named Somebody. I must ask the rules of the House to be observed and that it be tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: The point at issue as I see it is whether the entire book or the portions of it need to be tabled. So rather than interrupt the hon. gentleman perhaps I will give a ruling on that later on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: No, I am not gone yet, Mr. Speaker, I am just getting ready to go on to another topic. I am almost finished with the lawyers Sir, now that I have had my annual go at them, made minced meat out of them again, I will be looking forward to their defense. We will hear all the same tired old counter arguments and 101 reasons and the old snow job will start again and the great White Knight, the defender of the legal profession will be on his feet lashing it out. "The hon. member for LaPoile does not know what he is talking about." And by and by this piece of legislation, this Newfoundland Law Society Act will rear its ugly head and it will be rushed through the Legislature sometime when I am out in - just like the Mortgage Brokers Act. The moment I turned my back and I left the House to go out on a commitment that I had in my district they rammed the Mortgage Brokers Act through the House.

I call upon my colleagues, the members of the official Opposition to keep an eye on it and do not allow it to happen this time when I am out of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: They will wait for them to leave too.

MR. NEAPY: Well, that could be. It could be.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. NEAPY: I doubt it very much. I doubt it very much, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is a very valid point and one I hope that the various media will take note of as it is now a criminal offence. Number one, people can shop around, they can go from insurance salesman to insurance salesman, from real estate agent to real estate agent and they can go from lawyer to lawyer, and if they find they are getting the some prices quoted and they suspect collusion they can report it to the Federal Department of Consumer Affairs and charge that crowd or individual, whichever the case may be, charge them under the Criminal Code of Canada. I would like to see a test case, Sir, on this here in this Province in the very near future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to switch to another topic.

MR. DOODY: You better wait for them to change the tape.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with the hon. members they are getting so jumpy and jittery, Sir? Here we are, it is only a week and-a-half, the session is only a week and-a-half old and they are shellshocked already. They are over there like they are pooped. They are beaten. They are like an hon. crowd of beaten men. They are docile, they are like a bunch of pussycats, they cannot take it. We are only getting warmed up now, Sir. We are only getting started.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Justice, the government House Leader, Sir, has threatened me with night sittings of the House if I keep going. Well, on this side I have hon. members telling me, keep going for a week and I have an obligation to these gentlemen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: I have an obligation to these gentlemen because they were good enough to second my motion, my vote of non-confidence in the government.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, "And the House regrets that which hath been done hath been done poorly and that which hath not been done hath brought sorrow to every corner of this land."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Right on, Sir! Right on target. Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of kowtowing to the government House Leader and the hon. gentleman can threaten night sittings on me all he likes. Sir, if we are going to go into night sittings it will not be my fault. We are going to have them anyway, and do not try to blame it on the hon. the member for LaPoile. Night sittings are not necessary at this stage of the game. We could follow the same hours, Sir, as the ordinary worker. We could come to work in the morning at eight-thirty or eight o'clock, stay in the House until twelve o'clock or one o'clock, go to lunch for an hour and come back again. I am satisfied to do that.

MR. MURPHY: Would we have your consent then?

MR. NEARY: If the hon. gentleman wants my consent we will go to work the same hours as everybody else while the House is sitting. Never mind these foolish night sittings that are only meant to try to rush the House to get her closed.

Mr. Speaker, here we are a week and-a-half old and members are shellshocked already.

MR. DOODY: I am, I feel like thirty cents.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, does Your Honour realize when I take my seat that there are twenty others, I think, on this side of the House who are going to get up and have a go at the administration?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: There are going to be amendments and sub-amendments and if we have to stay here, Sir, until August or September or Christmas of this year, we are prepared to do it to make our point, to get our message across?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: We are not going to be stampeded into closing this House down because the hon. the Premier does not like the House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - and the hon. ministry cannot accept the criticism. We are going to carry on, Sir, if we have to bring our beds in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And if the hon. member, the hon. government House Leader thinks that I will cave in if we have three hours tonight, I am good for three hours tonight, Sir, tomorrow is Private Members' Day, I will have a rest, I will go on again on Thursday and I cannot go on on Friday unfortunately because I am going down to Labrador West, down to my hon. friend's district. I am going down, Sir, I hope there will be other members of the legislature go. I know there are other members who have been invited. I am not the only one. I am not the Lone Ranger in this hon. House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Neary:

Mr. Speaker, there are other members that the ordinary people, the working people of this Province have a high regard for, apart from myself, and I am going down to my hon. friend's district on Friday, Friday morning, and then I am due to speak over in the Premier's district, I think it is, on Saturday night. I am speaking to the Kinsmen Club in Corner Brook.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The establishment.

MR. NEARY: The establishment, The Kinsmen Club is the establishment.

MR. MURPHY: There are going to be lawyers there.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, two of the gentlemen that have been in on this delegation trying to browbeat the Minister of Justice into changing this Act to include mobile homes -

MR. MURPHY: No, they are not true.

MR. NEARY: They are not true. They are Kinsmen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: They are Kinsmen, Sir. I do not think they represent the establishment. And I am sure they will be very interested to hear the Premier's remarks that they represent. I will certainly convey that message on Saturday Night, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - when I am speaking to the Kinsmen. And if the hon. Premier would like to come along and make a -

PREMIER MOORES: I got another speaking engagement in Corner Brook the same night.

MR. NEARY: The same night? The hon. Premier is going to help roast the Leader of the Opposition I presume.

PREMIER MOORES: No.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, I would submit now to the hon. the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition is going to be there on Saturday night too -

AN HON. MEMBER: A crisis.

MR. NEARY: - in Corner Brook.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is going to be roasted.

MR. NEARY: Yes, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is going to roasted, and the hon. Premier is going to be guest speaker - at what? - the Chamber of Commerce, the Winter Carnival?

MR. MURPHY: The Ladies Aid.

MR. NEARY: The Ladies Aid Society, I see. Well I wish the hon. Premier would tell me because I would like for the hon. the Premier to come and hear me, and then I will go and hear the hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I am some glad now that they are not in the same week.

MR. NEARY: And then perhaps we can get together after, and the Premier could give me a tour of his district, we could go out together and have a look around.

PREMIER MOORES: People will wonder if you want to go out with me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, how can you dislike the hon. the Premier, Sir. How can you dislike him he is such a charming gentleman, such a charmer. He comes on the television tells us that we should not expect too much, and then can sit back and not do anything, because now we have been convinced.

PREMIER MOORES: I will look after you in Corner Brook.

MR. NEARY: The Premier will look after me in Corner Brook. Well I am certainly glad to hear that, Sir.

PREMIER MOORES: The people will look after you.

MR. NEARY: I will be staying at the Glynmill Inn in Corner Brook on Saturday night, and I look forward to having a call from the hon. - you know the three leaders are - the three leaders of this Province -

PREMIER MOORES: What room sweetheart?

MR. NEARY: - the three leaders, the Leader of the official Opposition, the Leader of the Administration, and the Leader of the Independent Liberal Party, we are all going to be in Corner Brook on Saturday night.

MR. LUSH: That will be a great weekend.

MR. NEARY: And I guarantee you she is going to be a great weekend, and we will all be up on Marble Mountain, I hope, with our skies on.

PREMIER MOORES: A real host.

MR. NEARY: The main problem I will have now is keeping an eye on the Premier.

MR. DOODY: When you get up on the mountain will you bring down the tablet?

MR. NEARY: My hon. friend better roll out the red carpet, the President of the Council. We will all be there with bells on this weekend. But anyway, Sir, I will not be able to carry on, I will not be able to carry on on Friday, I have to finish Thursday anyway because I am going to Labrador City down where this unfortunate confrontation is going on between the employees of Iron Ore Company of Canada and the union. And I want to say, Sir, I want to say that I am grossly disappointed, personally speaking, Sir, with the way that this situation has been handled. And I am not saying that for a political purpose, I do not need any political mileage in Labrador West, Sir, but I am genuinely concerned about this situation, because I have seen these situations swept under the rug and brushed aside so often before and I can speak from experience, having worked for a mining company. The company should have better sense, and this is very poor relations on their part to threaten their workers with lawsuits and court injunctions. That is no way to settle the problem.

Mr. Speaker, where do they learn their industrial relations to, and their public relations,[?] And they have high paid experts on their payroll. Is that typical of the arrogance of that company? It does not give the minister much of a chance to try and persuade the workers of that company, who are on a wildcat strike, to go back to work when they are threatened with lawsuits that you are going to have to pay for the loss of production for the last week or so, several hundreds of thousands of dollars, perhaps millions of dollars

Mr. Neary:

and every man thinking he is going to lose his home.

MR. NOLAN: \$400,000 a day.

MR. NEARY: \$400,000

MR. NEARY: a day or something I think. How foolish! And court injunctions ordering them back to work when all these men want, Sir, all they want is to be able to sit down with a top ranking representative of government and of the company, to sit around the table and say, "Look, thank you for setting up this judicial enquiry but we want a short-term plan of safety to protect the lives of our members. That is what we want of the employees of that company."

Mr. Speaker, that is not asking too much is it? Is it? I ask the hon. the Premier. Is that asking too much? Three men lost their lives in less than ten days and the men become very concerned about it, and they go off on an illegal strike and the company answers it, retaliates by throwing a court injunction at them, and then threatens them with law suits. And all they are doing is trying to draw to the attention of the company and the government and the people of this Province the unsafe working conditions in the plant, and in that mine. Is that any way to answer them? And I am not justifying wildcat strikes, but I am sure the company, if they were thinking straight, would have said, "Boys what is your trouble? What is the problem? We realize there has been a bit of negligence here. We realize there are unsafe conditions, and we want to do something about it so come on and sit down and let us talk about it." No, none of that. I am going down on Friday, myself, to take a first-hand look at the situation. And I am not going to run against the hon. member. I am not looking for any political points to score. I am genuinely concerned about the situation. I have gone through it myself. Many the time I was on the picket line, and I know, Sir, I know what happens.

This just did not happen overnight. This is frustration that has been built up for the last year or two. It started off,

MR. NEARY: Sir, with importing labour from Europe and then the PR men of IOC told the whole world, all the people of this Province, that there was no silicosis in Labrador City. And what happens? The next thing we discover there is twenty-seven cases I believe. Is it twenty-seven?

MR. FLIGHT: Forty-two.

MR. NEARY: Forty-two now. After being told, after this company coming out and saying, "No, there is no silicosis in Labrador City." And the next thing you know is you have twenty-seven and then forty-two cases. It is pretty hard to trust a group like that.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to adjourn the debate.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow at three of the clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Before putting the motion for adjournment with respect to the point of order brought up by the hon. Minister of Justice on the tabling of documents, Beauchesne, page 134, paragraph 159, sub-section 3 states:

"It has been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the table of the House, if it can be done without injury to the public interest." Now I would suggest that this is a published book and obviously there can be no question of the public interest being at stake. So that is what the rule is that it should be tabled.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the book belongs to the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood). I do not own the book, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

MR. NEARY: It is on the member's desk. If the page wants to come and take it away, Sir, I will certainly try to explain it to the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood). But I am afraid there is going to be an awful row.

MR. HICKEY: Is the book a published document?

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday at 3:00 P.M. Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay", carried.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow Wednesday, 3:00 P.M.