



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 78

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL



Page 1 of 1

Page 2 of 2

Page 3 of 3

Page 4 of 4

Page 5 of 5

Page 6 of 6

Page 7 of 7

Page 8 of 8

Page 9 of 9

Page 10 of 10

Page 11 of 11

Page 12 of 12

The House met at 3:00 P.M. pursuant to adjournment.

Mr. Sneaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Premier.

HON. F. D. MOOPES (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, first of all, since we last sat, the Chief Justice, the Hon. James D. Higgins has passed away and I would like at this time for the House to pay tribute to a very distinguished Newfoundlander.

Justice Higgins, as we know, was a member of this House of Assembly. He was a member of the City Council. He was a member of the Supreme Court. He was a man who had a very successful criminal law practice in this Province, a man who was involved in many community activities. Particularly in St John's, his name is associated with recreation and has been for the last many, many years before his death.

I would like to move that the House of Assembly go on record and express to his widow our deepest sympathy at his passing.

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

HON. E. M. ROBERTS (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I would like to be associated with the motion made by the Premier, that a resolution of sympathy be sent to Mrs. Higgins, the widow of the late Mr. Justice James D. Higgins, and to the other members of his family, I suppose in particular Dr. Bill Higgins; Mr. Brian Higgins, Councillor Higgins.

The Premier said Mr. Justice Higgins served in the House. He was here for eight years. He never sat in this Chamber but he was in the House. He was elected in 1951 and then again in 1956, in each case representing the then District of St. John's East. I think that district now is represented by two members, in effect the present Member for St. John's East Extern and the Member for St. John's East.

Mr. Justice Higgins was a man who felt his political principles very strongly and in 1959 he differed with many members of his party and he followed his political principles. I think that that was the mark of Jim Higgins as a man and as a lawyer and as a legislator and as a jurist. He went to the Bench in 1963 and in the last ten years served as a Member of the Supreme Court.

I know I have heard the lawyers who practiced before him speak with respect and with admiration of his conduct on the Bench and his character and the wisdom in his rulings.

It is a loss to Newfoundland that a man should die of his age so suddenly and so tragically. I think we are all the worst off because of it. It is entirely fitting that the motion should be made at the start of this session because later this day or tomorrow, whenever the order of business is called, we will be dealing with Jim Higgins' last contribution to public life in Newfoundland, the Report of the Commission on Redistribution, which, of course, he chaired. That report apparently is to form a major part of the business to be brought before the House in the next few days.

Jim Higgins served Newfoundland well, Sir. Most of us in this House I think were proud to call him a friend and many members could speak I am sure of personal anecdotes but, Sir, we have all lost something and the people of Newfoundland have lost something in his passing and above all his family have lost a very great deal. So my colleagues and I would like to be associated with the motion which the Premier has moved, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Premier.

MR. MOOPES: Once again, Mr. Speaker, it is very rare that one has an opportunity to thank a member of the staff of the House. In this case Miss Kit or Katherine Murnhy is a person whom I know you had paid honour to her to at the reception last evening but I think this House should go on record of someone in public service who has served this House so well. In recent years starting in 1950, but in recent years, as the Editor of Hansard, I think that she deserves the expression of appreciation from this House for a job that she has done exceptionally well.

During the years she gave assistance to a great many things that were happening in this province, the Royal Commission on Economic Prospects, the Royal Commission on Term 29, NALCO, BRINCO, Labour Department Hearings and many other functions of government that were above and beyond the call of her duty. But I think she has performed in this House and she has performed admirably.

I would like for the House to go on record in appreciation of the tremendous contribution she has made.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, we share the Premier's feelings. I think it is entirely appropriate and right that the House should pass - I would like to see it made a formal resolution recognizing Miss Murphy, (I am delighted to see that she is here in the gallery today) a formal resolution recognizing her unique contribution and her role over the years in this House.

I suppose that Miss Murphy has probably heard more debates than any member or any speaker or any person whoever attended the House. I think it is a tribute to her endurance and to her courage and to her devotion to Newfoundland that she was able to prepare and to read so many debates and still carry on with the work. The fact that in the last few years we have had a daily Hansard, it is an immense achievement. When we started I was not sure it could be done, but we do get a daily Hansard now. The printing is delayed but it is not the fault of the Editor of Debates and the girls who work with her in the Hansard Office; hangups in the Printing Department somewhere apparently. But it is an immense contribution, it is one which will help very much in the years to come. We now have the permanent record of the words of this House. Kit Murphy has set the standards by which all the Editors of Debates who will follow her in the years to come will be measured.

from the years to come, my wish they will be measured. I think we should pass a motion and it should be suitably presented to Miss Murphy. I think that is just the least we can do to recognize the contribution which she has made. I am delighted she is here with us today. We will miss her. We will miss the phone calls asking, "Mr." (blank), "just what was that word you used because the girls have not been able to puzzle it out." It turns out more often that the member could not puzzle it out either. So it goes in the Hansard as a deleted phrase. We will miss her very much. I hope that she will come back to see us once in a while. Now that she does not have to take it down and edit it back, perhaps she can enjoy the debates. Who knows, maybe if things go as the Premier seems to indicate and we have another reference to the country, well Kit Murphy will be back here and taking part in things. I think that would be great fun.

MR. EARL WINSOR (Fogo): Mr. Speaker, I think I would be remiss in my duty if I did not get up and join the Hon. Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in extending best wishes to Miss Murphy on her retirement. I am the only sitting member today who had the privilege of serving in the old (as we referred to it) House of Assembly, when Miss Murphy just sat there for hours as a stenotypist. During those days, Mr. Speaker, it was a practice that during the afternoon a recess of ten or fifteen minutes was taken. This always provided Miss Murphy with a little break. At the beginning she had a relief. However when we moved from that building to here we cancelled out for some reason or other the recess period and Miss Murphy used to sit there in that corner for hours and I have often wondered and I thought that Miss Murphy must have the best plumbing system that is known to man because she must have gone through some antagonizing hours sitting there with no relief, taking down all of the words, every word that was said in this honourable House, and I am sure many times she must have felt very confused.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly extend to Miss Murphy every good wish for a very deserving and enjoyable retirement.

MR. FINTON ALYWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few remarks to the mover and seconder of this motion. I can really speak with some knowledge of Miss Murphy's contribution because I was a member of the staff of the House of Assembly when she took the debates in the old Assembly. As the honourable gentleman from Fogo just said, we all wondered just how it was possible for one human being to record what took place down in that House, and this was Miss Murphy and entirely on her own. Anybody who like the members of the staff who worked closely with her is aware of what a wonderful woman she is really. She is a very, very intelligent person. Of course she comes from this ancient and honourable district of Placentia and I am sure heredity plays no small part in the brains of Miss Murphy. I am very, very pleased to learn that in her retirement she plans to take up residence in Southeast Placentia. I am sure she will make a great contribution to the social life and to the cultural life of Placentia. I can only say as other speakers have said that I think Miss Murphy has made a singular contribution to the public life of this Province. I think she is a woman who displayed the ability to work under great pressure. I am sure that when, as has often been the practice, immediate demands have been made for what members had just said and she found it necessary to go up to her room and get all of this typed up. We hardly realized at that time what pressure must be on Miss Murphy.

Well I am sure that each and every one of us appreciate it. Also I think she is a very, very intelligent woman. I listened last night with interest when she told us how at one time the Canadian Association of Hansard reporters wrote Miss Murphy for what was going on in Newfoundland and at that time we were in one of our sessions and she wrote back and said, "I am lost on a sea of verbiage and I cannot see land." So we are glad to see that she will see land and that land will be in Placentia. Once again I want to say thank you to Miss Murphy and wish her the best of luck in her years of retirement.

MR. A. MURPHY (Minister of Social Services): Mr. Speaker, members of the House of Assembly, I might say, Sir, that this is one of the proudest

moments of my life. I have very good news for thousands of our Newfoundlanders who are trying to manage the family budget on a fixed income in the face of skyrocketing cost of living. First let me go back to last year at approximately this time, Sir, when we introduced our new social assistance programme. Everyone will remember that people on social assistance had had only a seven per cent increase in their allowance over the previous six or seven years. This administration, Sir, through the new social assistance programme gave over ninety per cent of all social assistance recipients substantial increases in their allowances.

One of the features of the new social assistance programme was the commitment to index social assistance benefits in future to the cost of living, instead, Sir, of granting occasional raises on an ad hoc basis whenever political expedience required it. It therefore gives me very great joy to announce that affective January 1, 1975, 18,000 families, Sir, 55,000 fellow and sister Newfoundlanders will receive an across the board increase in their social assistance of approximately 12.7 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the national cost of living increase which is estimated at 10.4 per cent but the Newfoundland increase which is as we all know one of the highest in Canada. The promise we made, Sir, is being kept. Social assistance recipients should get their raises on their end of January cheque, Sir. All of them will get a raise and the reason I say end of January is because I think everybody is aware, Sir, that we brought in another great social advance. We now pay social assistance twice a month, not just monthly and unfortunately due to computerizing, so on and so forth, I do not believe the increases will be ready by the fifteenth of January.

It is going to cost \$6.5 million a year. That will be, Sir, a total of \$18.5 million

that this government has put in since we took over. This will mean that the Social Assistance Programme will now cost in excess of \$50 million a year, Sir, \$50 million a year.

This government, Sir, is very much concerned about poor people. This raise is tangible evidence of this concern. It is also tangible evidence, Sir, if I may be a little political, that we are a planning government, a government that does things systematically. So, I would say, Sir, let the message go out to all Newfoundlanders that we keep our promises.

In conclusion, Sir, and with your permission, may I at this time extend my deepest appreciation, Sir, to the members of my staff, both at headquarters and in the field, who have been subjected this year in particular, Sir, to most unreasonable, unjust criticisms - a group of people, Sir, who have worked their hearts out to try to meet the needs of our people and carry out the programme in the way that the law intends. Also, Sir, to thank my Premier, your Premier, our Premier for his humanity and my colleagues in the House of Assembly and all my colleagues. Sir, who agree to this, notwithstanding, Sir, the tremendous pressure that has been put on every department of government for dollars that are very hard to come by.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am very, very happy indeed to make this announcement. As I said earlier, this is one of the proudest days of my life. I thank you all very much.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may say just a word or so on that. Obviously, as far as the announcement goes, it is welcome and we should all welcome it. I think anybody who is the least bit aware of what is going on in Newfoundland today **know** people who, as the minister says, are trying to live on a fixed income and who must attempt to make ends meet on a fixed income - these people are people who get most cruelly hit by the - call it what you want - inflation or the rising cost of living, whatever one wants to call it. So, as far as it goes we welcome it.

Mr. Speaker, it is too little and it is too late. The most that the minister has done is to bring these people back to where they were twelve months ago. He talks about planning. The only planning the

minister has in mind. I would suggest, is the planning an appeal to the people in trying to get a few more votes. Well, if he does, more power to him if it will help people along the way.

When they talk about a commitment to indexing. Sir, if this government had any commitment at all to this concept of indexing, they would bring before this House this day or tomorrow a bill to amend the act under which this is paid and make that commitment to **indexing** statutory and to be carried out on a quarterly basis. That is what the government of Canada do with their social - Mr. Speaker, let the honourable gentleman - Mr. Speaker, do I have the floor?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. AVILARD: Is any member permitted to debate a ministerial statement?

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

The honourable Leader of the Opposition does have the floor and has the right to be heard in silence unless the honourable **member is** raising a point of order or something like that which he did not or I did not hear him.

MR. AVILARD: I am raising a point of order, Sir, that a ministerial statement cannot be debated. That is all I am saying. I may be wrong; I have been on a couple of occasions.

MR. SPEAKER: With regards to ministerial statements: It has been a custom, I think, at least since I have been here - it is not a rule but a custom that the Leader of the Opposition or a designated person in the opposition is permitted a few remarks with regards to ministerial statements but not debated as such. I think the honourable Leader of the Opposition should speak to the content of the statement.

MR. ROBERTS: I am, Mr. Speaker. I thank Your Honour for allowing me to continue despite the harassments from the honourable gentlemen on the other side.

The point I was making was that if this government and the minister referred to the commitment to indexing. The point that I was making was if the Tories have any commitment to the concept of indexing, they will bring in a bill to provide by statute that the social assistance payments are indexed. They can be tied to an arbitrary standard, Statistics Canada standards. It can be done automatically. That is what happens to family allowance. That is what happens to the old age pension. That is what happens to the veterans' allowance. That is what happens with the concept of indexing. All that we have here is the cabinet have decided, as cabinets have decided in the past, to increase the social assistance rates. Well, more power for that, full marks, full credit is due but no attempt to posture or to cloak one's self in a seamless garment.

While they are on the subject, Sir, would the minister consider as well restoring the family allowances? Because what this government did, twelve months past, with a great reform of which he boasted in his statement was one of the shoddiest and cheapest examples that I have ever seen of political chicanery.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MARSHALL: I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition understands that on ministerial statements he is entitled to make a few remarks, ask for a few explanations. There is to be no debate allowed. I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition must realize that he is now entering into an area of debate.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the point of order? I submit I was not entering into any debate. I was referring to remarks made by the gentleman from St. John's Centre in his ministerial statement

where he went so far in a ministerial statement to say, with no objection from the House Leader or anybody else, if I may be political, then he launched into a vicious little tirade as only the honourable gentleman from St. John's Centre can. I submit, Sir, that my remarks were not out of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I would like to conclude what I have to say, if I may.

MR. MARSHALL: If I may comment, Mr. Speaker, just for a moment on the remarks of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition on the point of order. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition does not obviously discern the difference between a ministerial statement and somebody replying. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition at one time was in a position to make ministerial statements but he is not likely to ever again. In the opposition, as Leader of the Opposition, he is only entitled, under the rules of Beauchesne, under the rules of this House, (This is new because it was not allowed before but this is new) to make a few remarks and explanations but not enter into debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order raised by the Hon. Member for St. John's East is well taken. I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was straying somewhat from the remarks via the content of the ministerial statement.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, if I may conclude, trying to stay within the rules, I am not so much concerned with the Hon. House Leader's interpretation of the rules. It is Your Honour who runs this House and interprets the rules for us.

The minister spoke about increasing the social assistance last year but let it be remembered again that they did that by taking into account the family allowance. I say again it was the shoddiest piece of political chicanery that I have ever seen. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member raising a point of order?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is obviously, deliberately ignoring Your Honour's ruling. Now Your Honour's ruling was that this matter was not to be debated. I know it has been a long, hot summer. It has been a long, hot summer for the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition is bound by Your Honour's ruling as well as anybody in this House and he is not allowed to debate it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition I feel was debating the ministerial statement. I think it probably should and now.

MR. ROBERTS: Sir, I was not debating it. If Your Honour should feel I was, I shall come back to it.

Let me just conclude by saying again that the Minister of Social Services says that they are raising this and then he refers to the family allowance being federal. He did not have the courage nor the integrity nor even the wisdom to say that of the \$6.5 million increase in allowances -

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is continuing to debate the ministerial statement and this will not be permitted. I shall now recognize somebody else.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is going much further than that. He is impugning the integrity of the Hon. Minister of Social Assistance. The record will show he has not got, I think it was "the guts" but certainly he used the word integrity. I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition should

be asked to retract such statements and such imputations against a member of this House.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, I was certainly impugning the political integrity of the gentleman from St. John's Centre and I -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Weasel.

MR. ROBERTS: There is nothing weasel about it, Sir. The gentleman from Placentia West has surfaced again. We will deal with him in due course.

I was impugning the political integrity of the gentleman from St. John's Centre because I believe that he has himself impugned it.

If that is out of order, if it is to be withdrawn, if Your Honour instructs me to, I shall of course withdraw it.

Let me say again, I have nothing against the gentleman's personal integrity but his political integrity I certainly do impugn.

MR. AYLWARD: I am so happy. I am really worried.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I shall read the Hansard as to what was actually said and rule on it later. Any other ministerial statements?

HON. J.C. CROSBIE (MINISTER OF FISHERIES): We are finished with this now. We are calling for new statements. I don't want to be controversial, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to report to the House: Honourable gentlemen opposite have already given me a pain in the neck and I may have to wear a collar here tomorrow. I would not even describe where the honourable Leader of the Opposition gives me a pain. It would be obscene.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the House that the report of Doctor Harris and the other members of the conciliation board, who were appointed to look into the dispute between the Newfoundland Fishermen Food and Allied Workers, Local 625, and B.C. Packers Limited, Atlantic Fish, National Sea Products Limited, Fishery Products Limited and Booth Fisheries in connection with the trawler fishery, will be tabled in the House tomorrow and released to the press and the public.

The reason that it has not been made public up to this time, Mr. Speaker, should be obvious in that it is a conciliation board report and primarily it is for the benefit of the two parties to the collective

dispute. One of those parties, Mr. Cashin, the president of the Newfoundland Union of Fishermen Food and Allied Workers, had requested that the report not be released until the fifteen days were up because he is meeting today with the Trawlers' Committee of the union here in St. John's and reviewing the report with them.

MR. WOODWARD: Who is going to be elected president, first.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, their convention is on Friday and Saturday and we are not going to worry who is elected president. That is up to the members of the union. It will be released tomorrow, Mr. Speaker. The reason why this report is being released publicly at all is that the terms of reference of the conciliation board were quite broad and all encompassing and it was asked to look into the present problems in the fishing industry and to look into the question of whether the fishing companies could afford to pay any more than the prices they were paying last July and look into the social requirements and needs of the trawler fishermen.

Because this report is of general interest to anybody who lives in Newfoundland and it certainly is of interest to both governments and because action has already been taken to look into what needs to be done now to assist the fishing industry by both governments, the report should be made public and it will be tomorrow.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, we are pleased that the report is to be made public. We have already publicly asked that it be made public. I do thank the minister for the information which I for one did not have before and I suspect many people did not, that it was being kept secret, kept private at the request of one of the parties to the dispute in respect of which the conciliation board has reported.

I wonder if the minister could undertake to ensure that in this session of the House, the next few days or whatever it is, we could have a debate on the report or, if he wish, on the fishing industry generally because the situation is more than serious and we have all heard time and time again - it was on the CBC last night, it was on the CJOX station earlier in the week - that we literally may have no trawlers sailing after Christmas out of the South Coast ports. This is a very serious situation and it

should be debated as quickly as possible, in my view.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for me to give a commitment without consulting the Premier and the rest of the members of the government. I would not be surprised if the time could be arranged. Even if it were not arranged in government time it can be arranged for Private Members' Day. So, I

cannot give a definitive answer until I check with the rest of my colleagues. As to whether of course the honourable gentleman understands that both governments are intensely studying this matter, Final solutions are not going to be able to be brought forward in this session if it only last two weeks but a debate of the whole situation might be useful. I have to give them a definitive answer tomorrow.

PETITIONS:

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

HON. L. R. BARRY (Minister of Mines and Energy): Mr. Speaker, I have a number of petitions here and shall present them in order, if I may. The first petition, Mr. Speaker, is from the residents of Mortier, who are mostly fishermen, who have signed the petition, approximately sixty-one signatures. It is the wish of these fishermen that the harbour at Mortier be dredged. There is a note to the effect that it is realized that this is the responsibility of the federal government. This is addressed to myself, "That you in your capacity as our MHA have been working in our behalf to have the project completed." And reference to the fact that the Council at Fox Cove, Mortier, it is a rural district council incorporating both communities of Mortier and Fox Cove, that they have been working on this matter since they were incorporated in 1970.

It is indicated that they have been receiving vague promises while their harbour is quickly filling up with silt. The Council endorses this petition and asks me to once again contact the appropriate officials on their behalf as well as tabling this petition. Mr. Speaker, on this matter, I have made representation many times since 1972, March 1972, when I was elected. It is becoming a serious situation. We have fishermen who are making a good living in the inshore fishery. When you consider the problems that are existing not just the inshore fishery but as the Minister of Fisheries just pointed out with respects to the trawler fishery also, it is important that wherever we can do something like this it is going to help a significant number of fishermen, it is going to enable them to carry on their livelihood properly without any great cost, without any great imaginative or innovated programmes on the part of the federal government. We are asking that a dredge, Mr. Speaker, be brought over to dredge out the harbour at Mortier. Now that is not too much to ask.

I received this petition, Mr. Speaker, almost two months ago, while the House was not in session, so I immediately contacted the federal officials again. I have to confess that the individuals that I speak to here in the St. John's office appear to be co-operative and have assured me that this dredging will take place. But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have this tabled and referred to the department to which it relates and I would think most probably the best place is for it to go to the Department of Fisheries so that we could have the pressure from the Provincial Department of Fisheries on the federal government to see that they do something for the fishermen of Newfoundland, particularly in this case for the fishermen of Mortier.

MR. E. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege for us on this side of the House to support the petition presented by the hon. Member for Placentia - is it East? West? It is surprising to me that the honourable member has to bring in such a petition and present it in this honourable House. Why was not the petition sent to their federal member?

MR. BARRY: Inaudible.

MR. WINSOR: Well there has been very little heard from him on that matter.

However, -

MR. NEARY: Is the petition in order? Is it a copy or is it the original?

MR. WINSOR: However, Mr. Speaker, for the fishermen's sake - and there are many, many other harbours around the coast of Newfoundland where such work is necessary. There are many shallow harbours around Newfoundland where the fishermen today are getting larger and bigger boats. The draft is not there in that harbour to take care of the larger boats. Therefore, I think it is a necessity that such work be done. So it is our privilege to support the petition and we trust that the honourable member will be successful in persuading the federal authorities to do this work and to do it this year.

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

MR. BARRY: I have another petition. I thank the honourable member opposite for his kind support. Mr. Speaker, this is a

to

petition with respect to the supplying of better pasture facilities, again from residents of Mortier. It is a petition with seventy-one signatures and they are pointing out that a number of residents, an ever increasing number of residents in the town are getting their own cattle. This is, I would say, one of the side effects of the increasing cost of living in Newfoundland that more of our people are realizing that it is desirable to supplement their incomes and to reduce their food bills by raising their own animals as they have done traditionally. There is some pressure on the community pasture in the area at Winterland and there is an indication that improved facilities might be necessary. I ask that this petition be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member from Bonavista North.

MR. P. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I on this side of the House would certainly like to support the prayer of the petition presented by the honourable member. Mr. Speaker, it was only last year that the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture increased the fees on provincial pastures in the Province. This, of course, has put an extra strain on the people, the cattlemen especially, throughout our Province.

I would like to see the Provincial Government increase the acreage of community pastures in the Province, not only the present pastures but also to create new ones in various areas where they are definitely needed. Of course, the Mortier is definitely such an area - as I know the area quite well, also the area of Winterland, and while in the area there is ample room for such pastures. I suppose the Burin Peninsula has one of the greatest pastures we own in Newfoundland today. Very little of it is utilized.

I would certainly support the petition, Mr. Speaker, and I pray that the government will sometime in the near futures drop the rates that they imposed last year which have set such a heavy burden upon the cattlemen of our Province.

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, one final petition and this is from residents of Petit Forte and South East Bight in Placentia Bay, two communities that are presently isolated, no road connections. This petition is signed by 104 residents. Mr. Speaker, there are still a few persons out in Placentia Bay despite the ravages caused by the policies of the previous administration.

Mr. Speaker, if I could just read out this petition: "We, the undersigned residents of Petit Forte and South East Bight in the district of Placentia West present this petition to you and to the House of Assembly. We need a road. We have no intention of moving our homes or relocating under any circumstances. We have a way of life that we intend to protect and develop but a road is essential. If the fishery is to grow and develop in this part of Placentia Bay, in South East Bight and Petit Forte and Paradise, a road is necessary. If we are to break out of our isolation we need easy access to medicine, doctors and a choice of work. Lack of a road should not deny us these rights which are enjoyed by all of our fellow Newfoundlanders and Canadians. We believe this to be a just and reasonable request."

Mr. Speaker, I again, since 1972, have many times had this matter raised by my constituents out in Placentia Bay. I was pleased last year to get a commitment from government to have a road put through to the community of Monkstown which is probably even more isolated in wintertime than Petit Forte and South East Bight because of the fact that you have Paradise Sound freezing up so that at times the coastal boat cannot even get in there and for the greater part of the winter they are just cut off totally.

This road is now well under way, Mr. Speaker. With respect to a road out to Petit Forte,

This is a more expensive, more costly project because a fair number of bridges may be required, at least this is my impression from looking at the map. It is difficult to see without actually travelling the country out there.

Mr. Speaker, one concept that I have raised in discussions with Mr. Jamieson, who is also the federal member for the district as well as being as you know the minister responsible for the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion, one concept that that minister has indicated an interest in is the concept of setting up a service centre for the fishermen in Placentia Bay. There are a considerable number of fishermen, not just from the communities of Petit Forte, South East Bight and Monkstown but from communities such as Arnold's Cove, Placentia and other places in the district of the Hon. Member for Placentia East, as well as places like Rushoon and Bane Harbour in my own district, where these people go out into Placentia Bay and make again a good living, fishing in the inshore fishery. A considerable amount of our inshore catch, Mr. Speaker, is obtained from Placentia Bay. Unfortunately, there are very primitive facilities out in the bay at the present time. After the ravages of resettlement, there was very little left out in Placentia Bay to provide services to fishermen when they go back there in the summertime. This is why I have tried to tie in this concept of a service centre, a fishing service centre for Placentia Bay. Petit Forte seems to me to be an ideal location for that.

Mr. Speaker, I suggested to Mr. Jamieson that possibly we can tie in some federal assistance for a road, call it a fisheries access road if one should wish to, tie in a road to Petit Forte, with a fishing service centre for the fishermen of Placentia West. I will continue to make representation to this effect. I have already requested the support of my colleague, the Provincial Minister of Fisheries. Mr. Speaker I ask that this petition be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House support the petition which was presented by the Member for Placentia West.

It appears quite obvious that the minister has not had much dialogue with his constituents this summer, they are sending in petitions.

MR. BARRY: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I suggest that a better inference might be this member instead of the one opposite doing a bit of work in his constituency.

MR. WOODWARD: Is that a point of order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. BARRY: Sit down! Sit down!

MR. WOODWARD: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRY: The point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that the honourable member opposite is impugning my integrity, my reputation. Mr. Speaker, I have to violently protest this. If the honourable member should feel that he can do a better job, I welcome him to come down to Placentia West or the new district the next time around and run against me if he should feel so inclined.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, is that a point of order?

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. First of all my colleague would not want to go to Placentia West. We have eighteen people at last count looking for the nomination to run against the honourable gentleman.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, they are going to eat each other. The only other thing that is going to get eaten down there is the gentleman from Placentia West when he dares show his nose west of Swift Current or wherever the boundary begins.

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, let me say my colleague from Labrador North was not impugning the integrity of the honourable gentleman, who violently protested it. If the honourable gentleman should feel that his integrity is being ravished, as it were, then all I can say is that his integrity is about as valuable in that instance as his virtue. I invite him to consider those remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: There is really no point of order. It is a difference of opinion between two honourable members.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, as I started to say, we on this side of the House support the petition. As I stated before, it is quite obvious that the minister has not had much dialogue with his constituents. They have sent him a number of petitions. I do not know if this is an indication that he has not visited the district during the recess of the House. This is all I want to make clear Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODWARD: We do indeed support roads. Listening to the policy of the Tory Administration and their new Minister of Transportation and Communications, as he indicated publicly through the media a few days ago as a matter of fact, a couple of weeks ago, that if we should get sufficient funds from the federal government in Ottawa that we will indeed be presenting a five year road paving programme and road reconstruction programme in this province. What I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is that I hope that the honourable minister gets in the good graces of his colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications, and can get some of

the federal funds, in the event that they do get them to help to build those particular roads that his constituents are requesting.

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

MR. WOODWARD: That is not a point of order. Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: A point of order. Without pushing this matter unduly, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that it will be a sorry time if members are going to be criticized for bringing petitions before this honourable House in an attempt to bring matters of concern to their constituents before this honourable House. If we are going to be subjected to the abuse such as we just heard, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this honourable House, the activity and what we can accomplish is going to be severely impaired.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I am sure the honourable minister is aware that it was not really a point of order which he had raised.

Are there any other petitions? The honourable member for Twillingate.

MR. GILLETTE: Mr. Speaker, may I take leave of the House to present a petition from the residents of Ragged Point which is a small settlement on Twillingate Island. The prayer of the petition is that they have their roads paved. I anticipate many more petitions coming to me from the Twillingate area this winter particularly because of the fact that the paving equipment is there on the island and the people are naturally expecting to have their roads paved while that equipment is there.

So, I would like to have this petition placed on the table and referred to the department to which it relates. We look forward to some action being taken this year completing the paving of the roads in the Twillingate area.

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

HON. T.A. HICKMAN (MINISTER OF JUSTICE): Mr. Speaker, I table the report of the Commission of Enquiry into certain matters pertaining to welfare and the disposition of DOSCO assets on Bell Island, Newfoundland, part one and presented by the commissioner, the honourable Mr. Justice Arthur Mifflin. This report has already been distributed to honourable members

and the public. I do it simply as a matter of record.

NOTICE OF MOTION:

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask the House to consider a resolution approving, with alterations, the recommendations of the Newfoundland Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission established by Section (4) of the Electoral Boundaries Elimination Act, 1973.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following Bills:

A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Securities Act".

A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Emergency Measures Act".

A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Condominium Act".

A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Attachment Of Wages Act".

A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Commissioner For Oaths Act".

On behalf of my colleague, the honourable the Minister of Transportation and Communications; a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Motorized Snow Vehicles And All Terrain Vehicles Act".

HON. DR. A.T. ROWE (MINISTER OF HEALTH): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce into this House an Act Respecting The Newfoundland Medical Association And Governing The Practice Of Medicine In The Province.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave of the House to introduce a Bill being an Act To Provide A Pension - not for myself unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, but for the last President of the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen and for other purposes.

HON. H.R.V. EARLE (MINISTER OF FINANCE): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave of the House to introduce the following Bills:

"An Act Further To Amend The Income Tax Act."

"An Act Further To Amend The Financial Administration Act, 1973"; and

"An Act To Amend The Increase of Pensions Act, 1974".

MR. BARRY: On behalf of the honourable Minister of Social Services -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I am sure the honourable minister

on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I am sure the honourable member is aware -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

AN HON. MEMBER: He will learn! He will learn!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills:

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Children Of Unmarried Parents Act, 1972,

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Adoption Of Children Act, 1972,"

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Child Welfare Act, 1972,"

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Social Assistance Act, 1971,"

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Social Services Act, 1973."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Health.

HON. DR. A. ROWE (MINISTER OF HEALTH): I beg leave to table in the honourable House the answer to the following questions on the Order Paper: Question No. 123: Question No. 119: Question No. 114: Question No. 113: Question No. 112: Question No. 67: Question No. 66: Question No. 64; Question No. 63: Question No. 62: and Question No. 65.

AN HON. MEMBER: Read them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Could the minister give the numbers?

DR. ROWE: I gave them. First No. 65 - May 15: No. 62 of May 15: No. 63 of May 15: No. 64 of May 15: No. 66 of May 15: No. 67 of May 15: No. 112 of 6th. of June: No. 113, 6th. of June: No. 114, 6th. of June: No. 119, 6th. of June and No. 123.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bell Island.

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Would the minister indicate to the House when he intends to make public the Henley Urban Region Report?

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

HON. A. B. PECKFORD (MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING): Mr. Speaker, that is the first phase of the report I think he is referring to that was presented a week or two weeks ago. I expect, Mr. Speaker, that report will be ready to be released to the public sometime next week after I have the consent of my colleagues.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the President of Treasury Board would inform the House if the government's redundancy policy has been implemented? And if so, if any employees of the government has had serves terminated? If so, has the Director - Mr. Speaker, I am asking a question of the President of the Treasury Board, Sir - and he has not manners enough to listen to -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Do not be so rude! Do not be so rude!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Let him control himself.

MR. NEARY: I am controlling myself.

MR. DOODY: He was up too late last night.

MR. NEARY: No.

I will have to repeat the question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister inform the House if the government's redundancy policy has yet been implemented? If so, how many employees have been terminated under this policy?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I will accept that as notice of question.

QUESTIONS:

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the President of Treasury Board could tell us if Mr. Nutbeam has yet unwound the Confederation Celebrations, if he is still on the payroll? Has he been terminated? If he is still on the payroll, what job is he doing right now? It is certainly a redundant position.

MR. J. CROSBIE: Accepted as notice of question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Provincial Affairs. I would like to ask the Minister of Provincial Affairs what steps his department have taken to implement the recommendations of the food prices review board that fall under provincial jurisdiction?

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment.

MR. G. DAWE: At this point, Mr. Speaker, we are intensely studying the report. Any recommendations in it, there are some good recommendations indeed, recommendations which will definitely help the consumers of this Province, help reduce the cost of living in the Province will certainly be implemented.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not satisfied with that answer given by the Minister of Provincial Affairs, Sir, and under the rules of the House, Sir, I wish to debate the matter later on this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bonavista North.

MR. P. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism. Could the Minister of Tourism inform this honourable House if it is correct that the Confederation Celebrations cost this Province between \$5 million and \$6 million?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. T. HICKEY: (First part inaudible.) That information, I assume is either guilty of wishfull thinking or they had a bad dream. That is about how far out they are, Mr. Speaker.

MR. THOMS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could the honourable minister inform this honourable House if there are any members of the Confederation Celebration Committees still on the payroll?

MR. HICKEY: I think, Mr. Speaker, I should take that question under

advisement. I could attempt to answer it but I am not quite sure that I could answer it accurately. I would rather check it out. I have certain information that I could give but certainly it would only be in part. I would rather get all of the details.

MR. THOMS: The honourable member will have the answer tomorrow?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, this is a poor way to start off the session. I did not say that.

MR. THOMS: I say, will the honourable member have the answer tomorrow? Will he have the answer tomorrow?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman will get the information as soon as I can get it.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Education. Thursday, the minister agreed with his colleague, the Minister of Fisheries, that the school boards are to blame for the present controversy and lack of understanding by the public with regard to the school tax authority proposals being proposed at the present time in the St. John's areas. It was carried by news reporters on CJON dinner-time.

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. CROSBIE: I have made no such statement. I cannot see how the honourable gentleman could be asking a question about it. The honourable gentleman should wait until Sunday afternoon at five o'clock when he will hear me in person on "Issues and Answers" say exactly what I said.

MR. ROWE: I heard the honourable the minister and that was enough. I do not want to see him on Sunday afternoon. I will rephrase the question, Mr. Speaker. Does the Minister of Education agree with the Minister of Fisheries, and I cannot understand why he is speaking out on matters of education, does he agree with the Minister of Fisheries that the school boards should have given more publicity or should have put on an advertising campaign to publicize and explain the school tax authorities proposals?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: The minister agrees. The Minister of Fisheries -

MR. CROSBIE: I agree entirely.

MR. ROWE: He agrees. In other words, the Minister of Fisheries agrees with the concept of taking the taxpayers money to explain to the people of Newfoundland how to get more money out of them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: Is that correct, Mr. Speaker?

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is entering into the realm of debate and is making imputations inconsistent with - he is entirely out of order.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I submit I was asking a question. I was not debating. I asked the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Education, since the Minister of Fisheries decided to enter into the debate. It was the Minister of Fisheries who was debating, not this honourable member. I asked the honourable Minister of Education if he agreed with the concept of spending the taxpayers' money to explain to them how they are going to collect further taxes from them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Education.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I would question whether that question is in order. I understand that the purpose of questions is to ask a minister an explanation of government policy or to ask him what is government policy in a particular respect, not to ask him if he should agree with this or that or if somebody may have said that or reputed to have said that. As I understand it, it is a specific question with respect to government policy. I would submit that that kind of questioning is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure the Hon. Member for St. Barbe North is aware that the purpose of the question period is really to ask questions that demand and require an immediate answer and is of urgent importance. I suspect that his question really to the minister did not require an immediate and an urgent answer.

MR. F. B. ROWE: I respect your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I thought that in view of the bussing controversy presently existing that it certainly might be a relatively urgent question.

I have a question for the Hon. Minister of Fisheries. Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that I am getting so many inquiries from my district, I would like to ask the minister if he still intends to get the compensation payments out to the fishermen for loss of gear experienced during the early part of the fishing season and whether these payments will be made by the end of December as he indicated to me in some correspondence, because I am still getting a fair volume of mail in that respect? I am also getting a fair volume of mail indicating that the fisheries' personnel are not getting around and asking -

MR. MARSHALL: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The question period is for the purpose of asking questions. They cannot be prefixed by opinion; they cannot be prefixed or suffixed or what have you by remarks and comments. If the honourable member should wish to ask a question, let him ask a question. There are others of us who may wish to ask questions of ministers on this side of the House as well. We only have thirty minutes.

MR. F. B. ROWE: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I can understand the House Leader's anxiety, Mr. Speaker, but I was just trying to explain the situation to the Minister of Fisheries to enable him to answer the question. It was just a matter of ten or fifteen seconds. I do not know what the Hon. House Leader is so edgy about.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

I think it has been stated many times that oral questions should be very precise and to the point. I feel too that the honourable member was having a preamble of some length before he reached his question.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, it was an excellent point that our House Leader brought up. He is an astute parliamentarian, very, very, astute.

The answer to the first part of his question - he does not want the answer? I do not think so, Mr. Speaker. The answer to the first part of his question is that I have not been informed of anything that should disrupt that. The honourable gentleman knows the plan was first to replace the gill nets and so on for the men who could get back fishing this year. That should practically be over. A few people may have been missed. There are a number of claims coming in. It was widely announced. I believe 15,000 fishermen were sent letters advising them that they had to have their claims in, I think it was by September 1. There are still some claims coming in from the people who claim they did not know about that date. They are being reviewed now. Then the plan is to deal with salmon nets and lobster pots because their season was already over. It was too late for them to get back into that fishery. That is underway now and cod traps during the winter, so that everybody will have their gear replaced by the spring.

Now I am not been informed if there is going to be any other delay. My reply in my letter to the honourable gentleman

should still be accurate. However, I will check and see, to make sure that that is still the case. That was the first part of his question.

The second part of his question I will answer this way and say that I have had more correspondence from the honourable gentleman - where is it he is from?

AN HON. MEMBER: St. Barbe North.

MR. CROSBIE: St. Barbe North. I have had more correspondence from the honourable gentleman than any other member. I trust that I am keeping him happy with the flow back. There is a constant flow back.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I recognize the Hon. Member for St. Barbe North, I will allow an extra few minutes for the question period. According to our new rules, what we commonly refer to as the late show, at 5:30 P.M. on Thursdays, I am supposed to inform the House what questions will be debated by 4:00 P.M. on Thursday. The question period was in progress and I did not want to interrupt the honourable members. For today I have one question just passed to me before 4:00 P.M. by the Hon. Member for Bell Island who wishes to debate the question asked of the Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment. This is the one question which will be debated today.

MR. F. B. ROWE: I thank the Hon. Minister of Fisheries for his concise answer, Mr. Speaker.

Could the Minister of Education inform this honourable House, Mr. Speaker, as to what happened to the Harris Report on Education, Youth and Human Resources? Was it buried, cremated or was it aborted? What happened to that particular report?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, it has been received and is being studied. It has been the source of certain policy changes.

That along with other information and other recommendations that the department has will be part of the type of reference for various developments in the area of education.

MR. F. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It has not been made public I take it, Mr. Speaker? It will be tabled in the House, this particular report?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, yes I see no reason not to have it tabled in the House.

MR. F. ROWE: Could the minister give a definite commitment, Mr. Speaker, on that particular point?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, as a matter of fact I think I have said previously that I am willing to table it in the House.

MR. ROWE: When?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Within the near future.

MR. ROWE: Could he be a little more precise, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for St. John's North.

MR. J. A. CAPTER: I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. In the matter of expropriation of private homes under his jurisdiction, will the minister assure this House that the principle to be applied in awarding compensation will be replacement cost rather market value?

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, that is a problem that the department is presently looking into. When we have some definitive policy on the matter we shall inform the honourable member and the honourable House on it. I cannot assure him of anything else at this time, only when we have looked at it again and made up our minds on it, we will let him know.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bonavista North.

MR. P. S. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Could the minister inform this House if he has supplied the Burnside Water Committee with \$20,000 that was promised them in June?

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

MR. P. S. THOMS: Promised them by letter. Does he want a copy of it?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, can I be permitted to answer the honourable Member for Bonavista North, if he would just keep quite for a second.

MR. P. S. THOMS: If his own -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, this whole matter of the Burnside thing was gone over with the federal member for the area of Gander/Twillingate, under which Burnside comes. It was gone over with the people, the water committee of Burnside and the decision was made. The honourable member is well aware of what that decision is, based on the climate, the time of the year and so on regarding these funds. The Community of Burnside were informed about the \$20,000 early in the summer. They were later informed by letter that this money would no longer be theirs because they had not taken advantage of it under the conditions laid down by the department. So as it stands right now, the Community of Burnside will not receive the \$20,000 that was allocated earlier in the year for legitimate sound reasons, as the people of Burnside are now quite familiar with, and the member of parliament for Gander/Twillingate totally agrees with the decision taken by the department.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, for the third time I am going to ask the Minister of Mines and Energy, and for the third time in as many years, I might say, Sir, when the people of Bell Island can expect to receive the benefits of a surplus of \$35,000 as has been accumulated in the minister's department and in the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation? This \$35,000 results from rentals of houses and sale of DOSCO assets. Would the minister inform the House when the government intend to distribute this amount of money to the people of Bell Island.

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned the last time the Member for Bell Island asked this question originally, right at the present time there are funds in both the St. John's Housing Corporation and possibly still some in the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. I wrote again just a little over a week ago to get their position on the final amounts.

The funds that went into the St. John's Housing Corporation,
I have to confess, is one of these mysteries that we have remaining with
us from the last administration. I do not know why the money ever went
into the St. John's Housing

Corporation. At the time the honourable member was in government. He and his colleagues were in the administration. Mr. Vardy, O.L. Vardy, at the time, I believe, had something to do with the direction of the funds to this corporation. Not knowing the gentlemen and not having anything to do with them, I do not know the reason why it went to the St. John's Housing Corporation.

Our position is, Mr. Speaker, that any funds that remain after the homes that are now being rented on Bell Island have been renovated and brought up to acceptable standards - one second, Mr. Speaker, if I might finish - this work may be finished now and this was the purpose of my last letter to the Housing Corporation, to find this out. Once the Housing Corporation has finished its work, if there are funds remaining, then it is my intention to bring to cabinet a proposal with respect to the surplus funds.

I am sure that I can say without any hesitation, Mr. Speaker, that it will be this government's view that the people of Bell Island should get the benefit of the funds remaining. Mr. Speaker, these funds will go through proper channels. Mr. Speaker, I would say that if any funds go, if any surplus funds remain, they will go through the normal channels, through the Town Council of Wabana or any other properly set up organization that is in a position to receive them.

Mr. Speaker, the first thing we have to determine is just what the surplus is or will be once these renovations are completed. At that time I will then have further information for the honourable member.

MR. NEARY: I thank the honourable minister for his answer.

Now, Sir, I wonder if I could direct a question to the Minister of Education. Would the Minister of Education inform the House if a bulldozer that was removed from the Bell Island District Vocational School over almost a year ago, by Mr. Bernard Fitzpatrick, former Tory candidate in the district of Bell Island, has yet been returned to the school?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I will have to say that I obviously will have to check and see where the exact placement of a bulldozer at the vocational school at Bell Island is. Quite frankly I do not know. I

should say that there is - because there is a certain close to inference there that there is a policy with respect to equipment at any district vocational school. That is that it is available to a person in private enterprise outside of the district vocational school if it is properly insured and the rate of remuneration is set which covers the expenses involved in presumably a certain amount of wear and tear. This is applied universally and this is only after and if the school does not have use for it for that period of time.

As to the particular location of that bulldozer now, I will have to undertake to find out and let the honourable gentleman know tomorrow.

MR. NEARY: I thank the minister, and the minister will provide the House with the information tomorrow.

Now, Sir, I would like to direct a question to the honourable the Premier. Now that we have a brand new ferry, Sir, just arrived in Newfoundland, operating between Bell Island and Portugal Cove - I made the maiden trip on her today on her maiden voyage - would the Premier inform the House what steps his government is taking to provide the people of Bell Island with free ferry service as promised by the Premier in two provincial general elections, by making the Bell Island tickle, the ferry service between Bell Island and the Mainland a part of our provincial road network?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the situation is on Bell Island as with the other ferries in the province and as well as, for that matter, the desirability of having this ferry service from Sydney to the island of Newfoundland being considered as part of the road network - I would like to think that between the federal government and ourselves that all these ferry services could be corrected as soon as possible.

Referring to the one on Bell Island, the need is there. The need is great and certainly we will do all possible to fulfill that commitment.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier would answer another question for me. Would the Premier indicate if the answer to my letter that I wrote to the Premier recently inviting the cabinet to hold their next cabinet meeting on Bell Island, if the answer will be in the affirmative

or in the negative?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the next cabinet meeting, as was announced somewhat previously, is going to be in Gander. Certainly the invitation, the request to have a meeting on Bell Island will be taken into consideration because we would like to go to as many parts of the province as we can and certainly Bell Island would be one of them.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, before I get away from Bell Island, I wonder if the Minister of Justice, now that I have been cleared of any wrongdoing in the welfare part, first phase of the Mifflin Report, now that I have been completely exonerated -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Would the minister indicate to the House -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Would the minister indicate to the House -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: To a point of order - in

that statement, he reflects on my character and the charges that I made in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: The honourable gentleman from Bonavista North laughs. If we want to take this report and go through it page by page, the laugh will be on the other side of his face. Now if the honourable gentleman wants to do that, whenever the honourable gentleman wants to do that -

MR. THOMS: That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKEY: Yes, it is a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The point of order is that the honourable member for Bell Island in making the statement as he has made outside this chamber which I have really no control over but Your Honour has control over every word he says in this House. He now makes that statement in the House again wherein he says he has been cleared. He has not been cleared, Mr. Speaker. He has been found guilty by that commission report. I ask him further, Mr. Speaker, to resign.

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

MR. HICKEY: Resign.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. HICKEY: Resign.

MR. NEARY: Speaking to that point of order, Sir. That gutless wonder from St. John's East Extern has done it again, Sir, and I demand that Your Honour, ask that scum -

MR. HICKEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Your Honour ask the scum from St. John's East Extern to retract that statement that I am not guilty, Sir. I am not guilty of any wrongdoing and that scum, that scum, Sir, that rotten scum -

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member for Bell Island -

MR. NEARY: Should retract his statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member for Bell Island please take his seat? The point of order raised by the Minister of Tourism: I feel

the debate is a difference of opinion between two honourable members. However the remarks just made, some words and remarks made by the honourable member for Bell Island a moment ago, certainly are unparliamentary and I would ask him to retract them.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Hickey is guilty.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was in the process of directing a question to the Minister of Justice.

MR. ROBERTS: This is your thing, Tom baby, not mine.

MR. NEARY: I was asking the Minister of Justice, Sir, now that I have been completely cleared, completely exonerated of any wrongdoing -

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

MR. NEARY: What is happening to the -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable member for Bell Island is referring to an instance already dealt with and he is entering into a long preamble in asking a question. If he has a question I suggest that he ask it and be very precise.

MR. NEARY: What happens in the phase (2) of the report, that is all I want to know, Sir.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, phase (2) of the report of the judicial inquiry into matters on Bell Island deals with the Dosco assets and it has been indicated to me by Mr. Justice Mifflin that he seriously doubts that he is going to have the time to be able to direct his attention to it but when he arrives at that conclusion he will formally advise me. I have not yet heard from him.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have one final question for the Minister of Manpower, I guess it is. The Government of Canada, Sir, has made available another gift to the Province of \$2.5 million for retraining the chronically unemployed.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: \$3.5 million.

MR. NEARY: \$3.5 million? Excuse me, Sir, \$3.5 million to the Province to try to retrain the chronically unemployed. Would the minister care to tell the House what kind of a programme his government intend to implement

to retrain the chronically unemployed? Have any plans yet been determined on this? Would the minister care to inform the House of what the plans are?

MR. E. MAYNARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I cannot outline the plans but I can say that the federal and provincial people who are responsible for manpower and responsible for the administration of the programme are meeting today and tomorrow to iron out the details of the programme. The only thing that has been given to us at this time is that there is going to be \$3.5 million available and it will be left up to the federal/provincial committee that is meeting over the next two days to iron out the specific details of how the money will be used.

MR. A. MURPHY: May I inform the House a bit further on that? Sir, during my recent visit to Ottawa this matter was broached by Mr. Andras, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration -

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Your Honour, I asked

Mr. Andras, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Your Honour. I asked the Minister of Manpower a question, Sir, now the Minister of Social Services wants to get up to make a speech. So do we all have the same privilege, Sir? But in the meantime if the minister wants to make a speech I will ask him a question. Would the minister inform the House how much of the \$6.5 million increase in social assistance programme he announced this afternoon - how much of that \$6.5 million comes from the Government of Canada?

MR. MURPHY: Oh my what a leading question. Fifty per cent.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see. No mention -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MURPHY: Divide \$6,500,000 by 2 and you will arrive at -

MR. NEARY: There is no mention in that statement about the fifty per cent.

MR. MURPHY: I would ask the press and anybody present if it would put a by-line, Mr. Murphy says "That half of this is coming from Ottawa."

AN HON. MEMBER: Good.

MR. MURPHY: It is not a new procedure.

MR. NEARY: It is not out of his own pocket.

MR. MURPHY: It has been accepted for many. On the instigation of the Member for Bell Island, I will not use any other terms, just Member for Bell Island, that is inserted there. But if the House would like, Sir, and I would very much like in connection with this Manpower thing notwithstanding the Member for Bell Island, when in Ottawa Mr. Andras announced this programme of \$3.5 million and through my urging being a good Minister of Welfare and Social Assistance, one-third of that money, Sir, will be spent not only on the chronically unemployed but on the chronic poor guy who has been on welfare for years cannot even get unemployment insurance. One-third of that -

MR. NEARY: What a Liberal Government up in Ottawa. A great Liberal Government.

MR. MURPHY: is for training and retraining. A great Liberal Government in Ottawa and if we can keep him there and keep him as far away from Newfoundland the better off we are going to be, Sir. Thanks.

MR. ROBERTS: Before we go into orders may I ask leave under Standing Order 23. I believe this is the appropriate moment to raise it, to move the adjournment of the House to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely: the present crisis in the fishing industry. The crisis, of course, affects every part of the industry but it is particularly urgent and particularly serious with reference to the trawler based operations along the South Coast of the Island of Newfoundland.

I do have a statement here for Your Honour, Sir, and in view of the inability, for the reason which he explained, of the Minister of Fisheries to tell us earlier that we could have a debate on this, this is now the only procedure open to us so I ask leave to make this motion now.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour knows, Your Honour has to decide whether, in accordance with Beauchesne, this is a matter of urgency or debate or not, and not whether there is a critical condition prevailing in the country or not.

MR. ROBERTS: The urgency of the debate.

MR. CROSBIE: The urgency of the debate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no urgency for such a debate in this House today. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, when the honourable the Premier appointed me as Minister of Fisheries, the honourable gentleman opposite thought so little of the fisheries that he said, it was a demotion and that I have been appointed to some minor post.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Because the honourable gentleman did not think much of the fishery and thought that it was unimportant to this province. Yet today because he thinks there is some kind of crisis in the industry he moves this motion which he knows will be ruled out of order.

Mr. Speaker, in Beauchesne, page 89 "The "definite matter of urgent public importance" for which the adjournment of the House may be moved..." It goes on in Beauchesne, "It must be so pressing that public interest will suffer if it is not given immediate attention by debate in the House." On page 90, "Urgency" within this rule does not apply to the matter itself, but it means "urgency of the debate", when the ordinary opportunities provided by the rules of the House do not permit the subject to be brought on early

enough and public interest demands that discussion take place immediately." That is not the position here today, Mr. Speaker, we are just starting now a session that is going to last several weeks. Private Member's Day is next Wednesday, the honourable gentleman can put a motion down for Private Member's Day if he wishes.

In addition, I would like to refer to the middle of page 90.

"The adjournment of the House cannot be moved with reference to critical conditions generally prevailing in certain parts of the country and so on."

Mr. Speaker, the House well knows that the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland at this very moment appointed on November 18, have a committee of top officials of both governments studying the Dr. Harris's Report on the trawler fishing industry generally.

that they are to bring recommendations in by December 15th, that the matter is well in hand. I therefore submit, for all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that you should rule this motion out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: If I may speak to that point. I quite agree with the honourable gentleman - indeed his point is not new, it is well established - that the only question to be considered by Your Honour at this stage in this procedure is the question of urgency of debate. I do not think there is any problem of the definite matter part of it. That has been sufficiently established, I submit, in the motion.

The question of urgency of debate, Sir - I submit that unless this procedure, in which Your Honour rules that it is an urgent matter and allows debate to proceed according to the procedure in our rules, that there will be no debate.

Let me deal first, very briefly, with the private members' point. There are, on the Order Paper, Sir, eight private members' motions, two of which do deal with the fisheries, one standing in the name of the gentleman from Bonavista South dealing specifically with the Hamilton Banks, the other, a more general motion, dealing with the fisheries in general, moved by my colleague the gentleman from Fogo.

Sir, there are four motions which must be heard, three which must be discussed before either of those can be, due to the fact we took the entire last part of this session, six months, to deal with just two motions. I do not think that the urgency of debate need will be met by the Private Members' Day, one day a week. Indeed the government deliberately choose to have the House meet Thursday so they could avoid a Private Members' Day. That is why we are meeting today and not yesterday or the day before.

As far as urgency other than that, Sir, goes, I submit that no matter is more urgent. The government have refused to give us a debate on the Harris Report. They have announced they are going to table it. I asked if we could have a debate but they refused it -

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. That is a deliberate misstatement of fact.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, do I have the floor?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Do I have the floor, Your Honour?

MR. CROSBIE: In other words, it is a damned lie.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to a point of order, I cannot be interrupted. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to a point of order. The only person who can interrupt a gentleman speaking to a point of order is Your Honour.

Now, the honourable gentleman said what I said was a damned lie. Well, I say, in that case, Sir, he is a damned liar because what I said and I will say again -

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I cannot be interrupted. The honourable gentleman from Placentia West -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Will Your Honour enforce Your Honour's ruling?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair recognizes the honourable Leader of the Opposition who is now speaking to a point of order.

MR. BARRY: But one cannot break the rules of the House under guise of a point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the gentleman for Placentia West say that we cannot break the rules of the House under guise of a point of order. He has developed that part to a very high peak.

Now, Sir, as I was saying with respect to the point of order. The government have refused to give us, the House, a debate on this question of the fishery. They may tomorrow change their mind. They may change their mind in two seconds but as of this moment in time - I asked them earlier in a question and the Minister of Fisheries said he could not say he would have to consult. Nothing has happened since. As of this point, they have refused. So, I say that there is urgency of

the subject matter. I say that unless the matter can be debated now, there is no opportunity to debate it in this session. No bill has been given notice under which it would properly fall. The Private Members practice will not suffice in this instance. Indeed it is farcical to suggest it. I say that if the ministry will not permit this, Sir, assuming Your Honour rules it in order, it will be contemptuous of them and will show their contempt for the problems of the fishery.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, if I could just respond before you rule there. Mr. Speaker, Private Members' Day already has a motion that applies to the fishery on it, set down.

When the question was asked earlier today, I said I would have to consult with my colleagues as to whether a debate can be arranged in the fisheries. The point, Mr. Speaker, today is that what would be the point of a debate on the fishery today when tomorrow honourable gentlemen are going to be provided with a copy of the Conciliation Board Report reporting on this very situation. What would the benefit of a debate even tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, until honourable gentlemen had a chance to peruse the report?

So, for all of those reasons - it does not fall within the rules as being an urgent matter to be debated today - I again submit, Your Honour, that it should be ruled out.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure all members of the honourable House are aware of the problems facing the fishery in the province today. I feel I must rule that this matter is not one that demands the adjournment of this House to debate the topic at this time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting
The Licencing Of Trust Companies And Loan Companies,"

HON. T. A. HICKMAN (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, this might not be the most crucial issue facing the Province of Newfoundland today but it is a bill designed to protect the investor and the borrower in the Province of Newfoundland and a bill, I would hope, that would commend itself to all honourable members. I gave notice of this bill earlier in the session and it was not debated because some honourable gentlemen had asked that consideration be given to protecting legitimate companies that are presently in business in Newfoundland and against whom there has been no complaint. I think, Mr. Speaker, we have, when we move into committee, an amendment which will provide for that kind of protection. We propose to ask this House to approve an amendment to the effect that this bill will not relate to a trust company that has been actively engaged in business of a loan company for a period of not less than two years immediately prior to the March 31, 1974.

What the principle of the bill is designed to do, Mr. Speaker, is this: It is designed to compel, in future, any trust company or any group of individuals coming into Newfoundland, who wish to go into the business of a trust and loan company, who wish to go out and sell debentures or bonds to the public, to file with the superintendent of insurance, a statement showing that that company has sufficient assets to cover the amounts of any debentures that they will sell in the province. This, I believe, is a very prudent piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, when we look at some of the problems and some of the scandals and near scandals that have occurred in other provinces and resulting therefrom these provinces have been compelled to bring in legislation but it is sort of locking the barn door after the horse has escaped.

People will recall some of the problems in the Province of Ontario, in particular, with some trust company or companies in the Niagra Peninsula and the major losses that were sustained by bondholders and investors as a result that following this the Ontario Legislature brought in legislation.

I think one would have to agree with the wisdom of our bringing this legislation before the House now. Hopefully, it will become law so that in this province we will not have to wait until some difficulty arises but rather we have the protection now.

The principle of the bill will require any of these people to file with the superintendent of insurance annually a detailed statement of the company's assets, etc., based upon which a licence can then be issued. It will also require that any new company starting business as a loan or trust company must have unimpaired paid up capital and surplus of that company of not less than \$1 million. Also that it has insurance with the Canada Insurance Fund, which is a fund that is administered by the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation, which is a federal organization.

We, as I say, have in this province some reputable companies. We have provided that the minister, if he should be satisfied that these companies have sufficient assets to cover and they have been in business for two years immediately prior to March 31, that if these companies have assets to cover their outstanding debentures that he shall then weigh the requirements of the \$1 million and shall issue the necessary certificate.

Mr. Speaker, this is primarily a piece of legislation to protect Newfoundlanders in the future, to protect future investors, to try as far as is legislatively possible to prevent any such scandals and difficulties arising in this province that plagued, as I say, Ontario and also the Provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan. We fortunately have not had this difficulty to face but from time to time the Registrar of Securities has had inquiries and fortunately

those inquiries were never pursued because he felt that he would have been at a loss if they had insisted upon being registered as a trust company in this province, when he knew full well that these were people from outside Newfoundland and that they may not have had the expertise nor the qualifications nor the money in order to sustain that kind of operation. This bill is designed to correct that defect. I commend it to honourable members and I move second reading.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this piece of legislation. I think it is very closely related, Sir, to something that I said before the House adjourned in connection with the Companies Act that certain individuals were hiding behind the law, ripping off the poor, ordinary little Newfoundlander, Sir, and then declaring bankruptcy. We have had a number of examples of this over the past eight or ten years in this province. It has probably been going on much longer than that, Sir, but I think it only really has hit home in the last few years. I am glad, Sir, now that we have a bill before this House respecting the licencing of trust companies and loan companies and that they must now, when they register, when they apply for a licence, have paid up capital in that trust company or in that loan company. That is a big reform, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the minister can make this bill retroactive or not. There are a number of cases now, I understand outstanding. Under Section (19) it says: "This act or any provision of this act shall come into force on a day to be proclaimed by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council." The date of coming into force would be very important, Sir. There are a number of people, personal friends of mine, at the present time, asking to have a certain company investigated in this province. I understand that because of some technicalities, some legal point, that it is impossible to get at this company. I would like for the minister to consider making this bill retroactive, say, for about two years back.

Another reason that I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that the minister has brought this bill into the House (I do not know whether members are aware of it or not, Mr. Speaker) is that most of these trust companies and loan companies are being operated by doctors and lawyers, well-to-do doctors and well-to-do lawyers. If one should go downtown, Sir, to get a mortgage on one's home, if one should go to CMHC, one is pawned off on one of the lawyers whose name is on the list and then, nine chances out of ten, Sir, he will direct him towards his loan company. In the case of a second mortgage, some of these loans go up as high as twenty-five per cent I am told. There are lawyers sitting in this honourable House today, Sir, who are members of loan companies and trust companies. They are loan sharks. They are nothing but loan sharks, Sir, sitting in this honourable House today.

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

I suggest that the honourable member is impugning the integrity of honourable members by inference, by grouping them together collectively. I feel impelled to bring it to his attention. He is on shaky ground. If he should wish to make his accusations specific, then I suggest that he do so.

MR. NEARY: Sir, that is an invitation that I would like to take Your Honour up on. I have no intention of doing it this afternoon. I may do it at a later date, Sir. If Your Honour should want I shall

do it at a later date, Sir. As Your Honour well knows, that most of the people involved in the companies that will have to apply for licenses under this act are doctors and lawyers. They are the ones who are ripping off the public and the poor old public have no protection up this moment, up to the time of bringing this act into the House, Sir, they had no protection against these loan sharks.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why did the honourable member not do something about it?

MR. NEARY: Why did I not do something about it? I am amazed, Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely amazed that this piece of legislation was able to get through Cabinet.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, I tell you, all we are going to do now, Sir, all they are going to do now, Mr. Speaker, they are going to legalize it now. They are going to legalize the loan sharks and all the well to do lawyers who have these loan companies that the minister is going to license now. They are going to legalize them. There is no protection in here for the consumer and that is what there is not.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Investors.

MR. NEARY: Investors. Yes. There is no limitation placed on the amount of interest.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is federal.

MR. NEARY: Ah! Federal, federal, pawn everything off on Ottawa. The minister has been following the example of his Premier, pawn everything off on Ottawa, pass the buck to Ottawa.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: The minister who just interjected that witty remark, Sir, has had his arm down in a pickle barrel now I suppose for the last couple of years before he became Minister of Industrial Development. The minister should stand in his place in this House, forget about his pickle barrels over at the supermarket.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He must have read the redistribution act.

MR. NEARY: Pickle barrel Bill. Stand up in the House -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, while I agree with the legislation I do not think it goes half far enough. It does not go half far enough, Sir. I do not think for one moment it is going to do any good for the consumer, for the ordinary Newfoundlander. I do not think it will help him one bit. It may protect to a certain degree some investors who have been taken to the cleaners, heretofore, it may, it may not.

The only thing that I can see it does, Sir, is that it makes it legal. Now when a company -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear my ears. Old blabber mouth over there, Sir, old blabber mouth -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Yes, let us talk about it. Does the honourable member want to debate it? Does he want to debate it? Let us talk about Spencer Lake down in Burgeo.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Yes, what about him? What about him?

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): I suggest that honourable members talk about the bill that is supposed to be under discussion.

MR. NEARY: Unfortunately, Sir, this bill does not include land speculators or we would catch up the Minister of Provincial Affairs in our dragnet who is ripping off the consumers and the people of this Province.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The honourable member is casting innuendoes and implications against a member of the honourable House. I think he should be invited to withdraw it.

MR. NEARY: What was the point of order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): The honourable member professes not to have heard or actually did not hear, I am not sure which, the phrase ripping off. It is certainly not a complimentary phrase. I believe that it does impugn the integrity of a honourable member of the House. I suggest the honourable member for Bell Island may have phrases that are parliamentary yet as descriptive and I call upon him to rephrase his remarks.

MR. NEARY: Rephrase it. Yes, Sir, I withdraw and I rephrase by stating that maybe these land speculators are profiteering slightly, a little bit. That has nothing to do with this act anyway, Sir. The only thing is that I would like to see land speculators thrown in here. Maybe we would catch a few more members on the other side in our dragnet.

Anyway, Sir, it is not a bad piece of legislation.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Go back to your supermarket, boy, your twenty-five per cent discount.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Old Pickle Barrel Doody.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Pickle barrel.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! I am sure that the honourable member for Bell Island realizes that honourable members are to be described as honourable members in the House and the phrase in which he described the Minister of Industrial Development is inappropriate.

MR. NEARY: Your Honour, I know if one is going to refer to the honourable gentleman, one has to refer to him as honourable pickle barrel Doody. I apologize to the Chair, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): The honourable member likes to make light the remarks of the Chairman or the Speaker at times. At certain times maybe the Speaker may make light the honourable member's remarks. The point being made by the Chair is that an honourable member is not to be referred to by his surname which the honourable member then did in defiance of the ruling of the Chair.

MR. NEARY: Your Honour, I withdraw and I apologize and I rephrase by referring to the honourable member as the honourable junior pickle barrel member from Harbour Main. How is that Your Honour? Is that better?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Now, Sir, the only -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The minister has had his arm down in a barrel of pickle now

long enough. He should know. He has his finger into more than that.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I should like the honourable Minister of Justice to consider my suggestion.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: That the Minister of Justice consider, Sir, making this bill, perhaps the House Leader would take the suggestions, I do not know if the Minister of Justice, but make this bill retroactive, say, for about two years. Can the minister do that? Could we amend the bill in committee? Is it possible to do it? Is it legally possible? Is it technically feasible? Can it be done? Okay, Sir, thanks very much.

MR. MARSHALL: If I may say a few words on the bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Two honourable members have risen at the same time. If one choses to yield.

The member for Bonavista South.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a reservation with regards to this bill which I would like to put forward. The bill I think is designed to protect the person who is investing funds into a company like a trust company or a loan company, making small deposits. On the other hand it is also going to cancel out many of the small loan companies which are now making second mortgages to people who are in desperate need of funds whether to build homes or to start a new business or whether it may be, mainly because of Section 5. Section 5 stipulates "A license shall not be granted to a company if the unimpaired paid up capital and surplus of the company is less than \$1 million." This means that the law firms as mentioned by the opposition member, and other loan companies, for example, like associations or societies. My reservation is with regards to these people who are now making loans available, like co-op loans. Teachers' associations and other groups around the Province, are making loans available for second mortgage purposes, and these loan companies will now be ruled out because many of them have not got that \$1 million in capital. If that happens we are going to see many sources of funds that are now available to people for second mortgages purposes no longer available.

So I have a very strong reservation on that. I think the bill is a good bill with regards to protecting the investor. We need protection for the investors and we saw too many trust companies in the past and so-called loan companies go bankrupt and the people who invested their small deposits over years lose all of their investments. But the bill in that regard is good but I think we should take a second look at the elimination of many small loan companies which will now not qualify to be licensed in this Province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): The Minister without Portfolio.

HON. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the points raised by the honourable member for Bonavista South and the honourable member for Bell Island will be answered I know in the main by my colleague, the Minister of Justice. There are a few things that I want to point out about this bill. This bill, first of all, is supposed to be designed to protect the small investor who is putting money in the companies and the companies go bankrupt and there is nothing left. Now, fortunately this has not occurred to any Newfoundland companies but it

has occurred in other provincial areas. The reason the \$1 million is there of paid up capital is to give protection to these investors.

The point brought up by the member for Bonavista South certainly has some substance. I think really what we are trying to do is to protect the person, the general public, whose investment is being solicited by certain companies. In other words, certain companies go out and they invite people to invest money in them for the purpose of reinvestment. They give bonds or debentures. They give promissory notes or evidences of debt. The precaution that we want to take is against these companies.

As bad and all as the lawyers are, as the honourable member from Bell Island will tell us from time to time, I do not think even he is attempting to state that if individuals themselves, whether they be lawyers or whoever they may be, if they happen to be lending their own money, that is their own concern. If they go up the spout, I am sure the member for Bell Island would applaud. While the individual himself would feel some grief, it is not going to hurt the general public because his company has not solicited loans.

What we are trying to do is we are trying to protect, as I say, the widow. We are trying to protect the small time investor who puts \$100, \$1,000 or \$5,000 in an investment and for which he or she gets a bond or a debenture.

Now, I do not know whether my colleague will perhaps consider - of course when we are in the House this is the place for the consideration of the bills. Perhaps the definition of a loan company itself might be changed somewhat to take in the situation where it applies to companies who solicit either in the future or now, monies from individuals or accept deposits of any nature. This is not the way as I see this definition here of loan company.

I would think that if any person or any company should go out soliciting investments from people, there should be a certain amount of security there. Now, we have to distinguish that and between investments that are made by people who have an interest in the company, such as paid up share capital. If they are putting their money into it and they lose it, well that is their

funeral. We are not too concerned about them. What we are concerned with is a person who makes an investment in a company, has no say whatever in the management of that company and how it operates, has no say with respect to how the money is to be loaned, on what security and cannot see where it is going and is dependant then upon the people who are managing the company itself. These people should be entitled to some type of security. This act proports to do it by having \$1 million paid up capital behind it. That in itself is fairly good security I would say.

These figures are arbitrary, \$1 million or \$500,000 or what have you. Certainly there should be a certain amount of money, of paid up capital. I just wonder whether - of course it has been two, three or four months now since we have been at legislation and I know the Minister of Justice will want to explain it when he gets up. Perhaps the loan company definition could be included to extend it to include all companies who solicit money as I say from people who are not shareholders and that this definition should apply, not only to companies in the future but to any existing companies who are soliciting.

I do not see any company really being given grandfather rights because the position is too delicate. What we are trying to do is - you know, it would be a catastrophe if, as I say, large amounts of money were lost to the same investor. So, I think it should apply to every company, both present and future and perhaps, as I say, by way of suggestion that we could make it apply to companies who solicit funds for the purpose of investment. These investments are made without any person having any interest in the paid up shared capital of the company.

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, may I assure first the honourable gentleman from Bonavista South that this act applies to companies incorporated under either the Canada Companies Act or the Newfoundland Companies Act and would not apply to that kind of association that the honourable gentleman has referred to.

Secondly, the association such as the NTA, which is already in business, would not be covered by it because they too are excluded having

been in business for more than two years, from March 31, 1974.

I see some difficulty with the question raised by the honourable the House Leader insofar as the definition of the loan company is concerned. We have to be abundantly clear and certain that anyone who invests money in a company, that type of trust or loan company, can rest assured that there are sufficient assets to cover them in the event that company goes in default or finds itself bankrupt.

It is equally clear that trust companies that sometimes may start out simply lending money - they may put in their own money. If I had a trust company, I might take my own money and put it in it and lend it to someone. If that occurred, if I went bankrupt, I would be the loser. The person who borrowed would not be because he simply would continue to pay off his mortgage to the trustee in bankruptcy and when it is paid off, he would get his release of mortgage.

There seems to be an increasing tendency today on the part of trust companies in Canada to suddenly expand the business beyond that and start receiving deposits from the general public. There again there must be sufficient financial assets or assets readily convertible to cash to cover them.

I will undertake, Mr. Speaker, before we go into committee to have another look at the definition of company as it defines trust and loan company. The other section, I think, that is quite acceptable, is the one that deals with existing loan companies that are in the debenture business now where the minister has the responsibility or the right to waive if they have sufficient assets to cover their outstanding debentures.

On motion a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Licensing Of Trust Companies And Loan Companies," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL: At this stage we are not ready to go ahead with the few other - there are only a few other bills really on the Order Paper. Normally, I will be making a motion of adjournment as the government is entitled to do now. It is Thursday, I would suggest - I know I will get the concurrence of the honourable member for Bell Island - that

we call it now five thirty so that Your Honour can then put the motion to the House that we now adjourn and the honourable member for Bell Island can get up with his debate on the matter that he wanted raised on the adjournment of the House. The honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs can answer for five minutes under the Standing Order and then at ten after five we can go home because I know all members are anxious to study the Redistribution Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall take it as being five thirty and the motion to adjourn has been made and recognize the honourable member for Bell Island who has five minutes to speak to the question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, for the last three years in this province we have heard the Premier and his ministers when referring to the high cost of living in Newfoundland repeatedly pass the buck to Ottawa. We heard the Premier and the ministers state publicly time and time again that there is nothing that the provincial government can do about the high cost of living. "It is an international problem" they kept telling us. It is an national problem. It is a problem for the United Nations.

Well, Sir, the Food Prices Review Board which is made up of completely independant people who answer to nobody but the public, who answer to nobody but the taxpayers of Canada, disagree with the Premier and the ministers in the present Tory Administration. The board, Sir, has pinpointed beyond any doubt the cause of high food prices in this province.

The next step, Mr. Speaker, is to discuss measures that can be taken by this government, the government of this province, the provincial government, the Moores Administration, to discuss measures, Sir,

that can be taken to eliminate the chief cause of high food prices in this province, pinpointed by the Food Prices Review Board. One of the chief reasons we are told by this group of independent Canadian, one of the chief reasons for the high food prices in Newfoundland and Labrador is because of the superfluous levels of distribution of food products. My honourable pickle barrel Member for Harbour Main should well know being a supermarket man, in his heyday. We are probably justifiable in the past but can no longer be considered justifiable today. Ways and means, Mr. Speaker, must be found by which the government of this province can encourage if necessary through a special crown corporation some way, Sir, of eliminating double handling, double markups, the middle man and carry out some of the recommendations, implement some of the recommendations of the Food Prices Review Board.

Here we are, Mr. Speaker, on November 28, 1974, brought back to this House to discuss matters that are supposed to be concerned about the ordinary person of this province. What do we find, Mr. Speaker? We are forced, the Opposition is forced to frizzle away its time on foolish nonsense like a Redistribution Bill that will add nine more members to the House of Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER: He voted for it.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I did not vote for it. To add nine more members.

Mr. -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Not a beep, not a beep, Sir, not a sound about the high cost of living. No indication whatsoever of what the government are going to do about the Food Prices Review Board's recommendations, they want to talk about adding another ten districts.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Oh hold it now, Mr.-

MR. W. W. MARSHALL: I mean that has got nothing to do with the matter now before the Chair, the Redistribution Bill. I suggest the honourable Member for Bell Island get on with his debate and perhaps go up and visit Harbour Main tonight and see if he can meet a few people.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, all that is, is just to use up some of my five minutes, Sir. That is all that is.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: But, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I feel that the honourable Member for Bell Island was not being relevant to the topics in question but he may continue.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the point that I am making here is that instead of frivolling away our time on foolish nonsense like redistribution bills that are inflationary in themselves, Sir, because if we pass that bill, it will add \$250,000 to election expenses in this province and the running of this House, Sir. What we should be doing, Mr. Speaker, is trying to find some ways and means by which we can implement some of the recommendations of the Food Price Review Board. This is what we should be doing in this House at this particular time, Sir, on November 28, 1974, trying to do something for the ordinary people.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that because of the harassing from the Member for St. John's East that the Member for Bell Island be allowed to continue.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The rule is very clear that each person is allowed five minutes and the honourable Member for Bell Island has less than one minute left.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to wind up by saying that before this honourable crowd, Sir, formed the government of this province, do you remember all the chaw and all the chatter and all the old lip about priorities. Well where are their priorities now, Sir, when they drag us back to this House to discuss redistribution and ignore completely, Sir, recommendations of a Food Price Review Board that could be so beneficial to the ordinary people of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment.

HON. W. G. DAVE (MINISTER OF PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT): I am just wondering what the question on redistribution was, Your Honour? Was it redistribution of Food Prices Review Board Report?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. DAVE: Who can comprehend anything he says?

Mr. Speaker, since taking office the Moores Administration have not been lying idly by and not doing anything as far as the consumers are concerned. I would just like to go over a few programmes that we have instituted so far, since taking over only a couple of years ago. We have accomplished more in these two years than the Grits did in twenty-three. Everybody in Newfoundland knows that and many people in Gander last weekend gave us quite a vote of confidence when we had a turnout of almost 700 people, jammed the halls.

Since taking over, Mr. Speaker, we have increased the minimum wage from the measly \$1.10 which the Grits had up until 1972, we have increased it to \$2.20 an hour, it will be \$2.20 an hour in January. That is exactly double. We have also done something which the Grits said that could not be done. The Leader of the Opposition said, they cannot do it, it is impossible. We took the SSA tax off children's clothing, despite the fact it would not be done. It is working well, and many parents are benefiting from it. We have removed the SSA tax from home heating fuel. We have brought in a programme where children's school books are free up to Grade VI, and we will be extending that to Grade IX in the year coming. We have brought in a new social assistance programme, which was announced in this House last year by the Hon. Minister of Social Services. And, again today we learned from that same honourable gentleman that we are increasing these benefits again in January of next year by twelve point seven per cent.

We have taken this Food Prices Review Report, Mr. Speaker, and we are presently analyzing it, as I said publicly, there are good recommendations in it. There is one there in particular where it is recommended that there be a subsidy on evaporated milk coming into the province, another one recommending the upgrading of CN service, the Gulf service and so on. These are all good positive recommendations but they are recommendations which can only be affected by and instituted by the federal government.

Instead of doing what the Food Prices Review Board Report recommends, Mr. Speaker, they are doing exactly the opposite. They are removing the five per cent milk subsidy on fresh milk (five cents per gallon, I believe, it is).

AN HON. MEMBER: A quart.

MR. DAWE: Five cents a quart. I am told. That is coming off instead of putting it on and increasing it, they are taking it off. They are reducing the federal freight subsidy in the Atlantic Region from seventeen per cent to fifteen per cent, when that goes into effect I do not know, I heard it today on the radio. They are reducing that by two per cent. It is speculated that this would increase the cost of living here in the province by two per cent.

The CN service itself leaves much to be desired, that has been a net issue with me for the last couple of years.

Now we have the honourable Member for Bell Island standing up today and wondering what we are doing for consumer affairs. We have not been sitting idly by. We are presently working with a committee now made up of university people, people from P. & P. and my own department analyzing this report and they are to come up with some suggested legislation for the following session of the House of Assembly.

We got the honourable Member for Bell Island standing up wondering what we are doing. What did he do? What did his administration do when he was in? What did they do for the people of Bell Island, himself, in his own district while he was Minister of Welfare allowing Mr. Kelloway, the local grocer over there, L.T. Kelloway to charge twenty per cent service charge just to cash a welfare cheque? That is good stuff for consumerism. It is great stuff. He got the gall to stand here today and ask me what we are doing with regard to the Food Prices Review Board and consumer matters in general.

MR. SPEAKER: I hate to interrupt the honourable minister but his five minutes have elapsed.

MR. DAWE: Well I think I have answered quite adequately, Mr. Speaker. We will be working on this. Just to summarize it briefly, we are working on the report. We are coming up with legislation which we are certainly going to implement anything positive that we can, to help reduce the cost of living in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded that the House do now adjourn.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday,
November 29, 1974, at 3:00 P.M.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

NOVEMBER 28, 1974

NOV 28 1974

Ministerial Statement

by

Hon. A. J. Murphy

Minister of Social Services

To House of Assembly - November 28, 1974.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House of Assembly

This is the proudest moment of my life! I have good news for thousands of Newfoundlanders who are trying to manage the family budget on a fixed income in the face of a skyrocketing cost of living.

But first let me go back to last year at approximately this time when we introduced our new Social Assistance Program. Everyone will remember that people on Social Assistance had only a 7% increase in their allowance over the previous seven years. This administration, through the New Social Assistance Program, gave over 90% of all Social Assistance recipients substantial increases in their allowances.

One of the features of the new Social Assistance Program was the commitment to index Social Assistance benefits in future to the cost of living instead of granting occasional raises on an ad hoc basis for political expedience. It therefore gives me great joy to announce that, effective January 1, 1975, 18,000 families - 55,000 persons - will receive an across the board increase in their Social Assistance of approximately 12.7%.

7229

This is not the national cost of living increase
but the Newfoundland increase which is one of the highest
in Canada.

The promise we made is being kept!

Social Assistance recipients should get their raises
on their end of January cheques. All of them will get a
raise.

It's going to cost 6½ million dollars a year.
This will mean that the Social Assistance Program will now
cost in excess of 50 million dollars next year.

This Government is concerned about poor people!
This raise is tangible evidence of this concern. It is
also tangible evidence that we are a planning Government.
A Government that does things systematically.

Let the message go out to all needy Newfoundlanders
that we keep our promises.

7230

NOV 28 1974

THE HONOURABLE DR. A. T. ROWE, MINISTER OF HEALTH,
IN REPLY TO QUESTION NUMBER 123 OF ORDER PAPER OF
JUNE 6, 1974

From January 18, 1972 to May 16, 1974 the Department of Health made no payments for advertising in the publication formerly known as "The Town Crier".

As well, there were no payments by any Crown Corporate Agency or Authority within the jurisdiction of the Department for advertising in The Town Crier.

* * * * *

NOV 28 1974

THE HONOURABLE DR. A. T. ROWE, MINISTER OF HEALTH,
IN REPLY TO QUESTION NUMBER 119 OF ORDER PAPER OF
JUNE 6, 1974

From January 18, 1972 to May 16, 1974 the Department of Health made no payments for advertising in the publication formerly known as "The Newfoundland Express".

The only payment by any Crown Corporate Agency or Authority within the jurisdiction of the Department for advertising in The Newfoundland Express was one amount, in the sum of \$27.60, paid by The Newfoundland Medical Care Commission.

* * * * *

7232

THE HONOURABLE DR. A.T. ROWE, MINISTER OF HEALTH, IN
REPLY TO QUESTION NUMBER 114 OF ORDER PAPER OF JUNE 6, 1974.

For the period from March 31, 1972 to May 31, 1974 (the date of the question was May 16, 1974), neither the Newfoundland Medical Care Commission nor the Department of Health paid fees or retainers to legal counsel.

However, under Hospital Insurance legislation, where an injured person is taking legal action to obtain a settlement by virtue of third party liability, the rights of the individual are subrogated to the Minister of Health. Some legal fees are paid through the Department of Health by virtue of that procedure, but action is not originated by the Department. An injured party who engages legal counsel is required by our legislation to include in his claim costs the Province has incurred through payment of doctors' bills and hospitalization. For settlements reached either in Court or out of Court on such cases the Department pays current rates on that portion of the settlement which will revert to the Province.

NOV 28 1974

THE HONOURABLE DR. A. T. ROWE, MINISTER OF HEALTH, IN
REPLY TO QUESTION NUMBER 113 OF ORDER PAPER OF JUNE 6, 1974.

<u>PERIOD</u>	<u>Number of Children Treated</u>
Sept. 1, 1970 to Aug. 31, 1971	20,178
Sept. 1, 1971 to Aug. 31, 1972	30,256
Sept. 1, 1972 to April 30, 1973	22,693
Sept. 1, 1973 to April 30, 1974	24,880

Note:

Because of the manner in which children's dental treatment records are maintained, it would be virtually impossible to supply the information on a monthly basis by individual treatment. To do so would require an extensive analysis of over 200,000 charts. The information given above is for a one year period in respect of the years 1970-71 and 1971-72, and for an eight month period for the years 1972-73 and 1973-74. The above information shows the number of children treated as opposed to the number of individual treatments given. A particular child's treatment may have consisted of one to seven visits to a dentist in a given period.

7234

NOV 28 1974

THE HONOURABLE DR. A.T. ROWE, MINISTER OF HEALTH, IN
REPLY TO QUESTION NUMBER 112 OF ORDER PAPER OF JUNE 6, 1974.

(a)	April 1, 1971 to March 31, 1972	---	\$628,541
(b)	April 1, 1972 to March 31, 1973	---	\$804,474
(c)	April 1, 1973 to March 31, 1974	---	\$960,368

7235

THE HONOURABLE DR. A. T. ROWE, MINISTER OF HEALTH, IN REPLY TO
QUESTION NUMBER 67 OF ORDER PAPER OF MAY 15th, 1974.

NOV 20 1974

1.

<u>Date of Representation</u>	<u>Name of Representative</u>	<u>Response</u>
January 5, 1973	Mr. Fred Beauchamp, Channel	This representation, which was in the form of a brief, was acknowledged indicating that conditions would be studied and improvements made.
February 1, 1973	Channel-Port aux Basques Lions Club	The Minister of Health attended a meeting of Lions Club on February 7, 1973.
January, 1974	Channel-Port aux Basques Lionettes Club	*
January 20, 1974	Channel-Port aux Basques Town Council	*
January 22, 1974	Channel-Port aux Basques Kinsmen Club	*
January 23, 1974	Channel-Port aux Basques Kinnette Club	*
January 23, 1974	Channel-Port aux Basques Lions Club	*
February 9, 1974	Codroy Valley Area Development Association	*

*These representations were in the form of briefs submitted to the Health Planning and Development Committee when it visited the area to obtain information about available hospital and health services. The briefs were acknowledged with appreciation by the Committee, and they were considered by the Committee in the preparation of its recommendations.

7236

2. Government has considered the recommendations of the Health Planning and Development Committee with regard to hospital facilities at Channel, Port aux Basques. Funds have been provided for immediate improvements and plans have been formulated for the replacement of the present facility.

REC-28 1974

THE HONOURABLE DR. A. T. ROWE, MINISTER OF HEALTH, IN REPLY TO
QUESTION NUMBER 66 OF ORDER PAPER OF MAY 15th, 1974.

1.

<u>Date of Representation</u>	<u>Name of Representative</u>	<u>Response</u>
March, 1973	Seventh Day Adventist Church of Newfoundland	Approval could not be given in respect of the proposal on the basis that it was not considered financially viable.
September, 1973	Burin Peninsula Hospital Committee	This was a brief to the Health Planning and Development Committee. Receipt of brief was acknowledged.
October, 1973	Holy Name Society, Burin	This was a communication supporting an earlier announcement by Government to construct a new hospital on the Burin Peninsula.

2. Government has committed itself to construct a new hospital facility to serve the people of the Burin Peninsula Area. Funds were approved in the 1974-75 budget for the commencement of planning for the proposed hospital facility.

7238

NOV 28 1974

THE HONOURABLE DR. A. T. ROWE, MINISTER OF HEALTH, IN REPLY
TO QUESTION NUMBER 62 OF ORDER PAPER OF MAY 15, 1974.

(a) 1,582

(b) 609

Note:

This question is difficult to answer as there are very few communities or towns in the Province which are served entirely by a single water supply. The above figures reflect the number of samples taken from community water supplies. These water supplies were not necessarily the only water supplies in the community. Ten or more samples may have been taken from a given community water supply, and experience has shown that five samples taken on one date may be satisfactory, while five samples taken on another date may be unsatisfactory.

7239

NOV 28 1974

THE HONOURABLE DR. A. T. ROWE, MINISTER OF HEALTH, IN REPLY TO
QUESTION NUMBER 65 OF ORDER PAPER OF MAY 15th, 1974.

<u>Date of Representation</u>	<u>Name of Representative</u>	<u>Response</u>
1. September 25, 1972	Dr. H. F. L. Pollett	Dr. Pollett was advised that improvements would be made to the Bonavista Hospital as soon as the funds were available.
November 7, 1972	Bonavista Committee for Improved Medical Services	The Committee was advised that improvements in health services available to the people of the Bonavista area were a priority and such improvements would be effected as soon as funds were available.
September, 1973	Bonavista Committee for Improved Medical Services	This Committee presented a brief to the Health Planning and Development Committee which was conducting a study of the Health requirements of the Bonavista Area. The brief was acknowledged with thanks by the Committee.
February 16, 1974	Bonavista Committee for Improved Medical Services	The Honourable the Premier attended a meeting at Bonavista at which time a subsequent meeting was arranged with him and other Members of Cabinet for April 10, 1974.
May 3, 1974	Bonavista Committee for Improved Medical Services	This was a follow-up meeting with the Minister of Health and his officials as a result of the April 10 meeting with the Honourable the Premier.

7240

<u>Date of Representation</u>	<u>Name of Representative</u>	<u>Response</u>
May 28, 1974	Bonavista Committee for Improved Medical Services	This was a public meeting at Bonavista attended by the Member of the House of Assembly for Bonavista South, and officials of the Department of Health. The purpose of the meeting was to outline progress of discussions relating to the proposed new hospital facility for the area. Government's proposed hospital facility was accepted by the Committee and the citizens attending the meeting.

(2) Government has announced and is committed to the construction of a new hospital facility at Bonavista, together with out-patient facilities. Construction is planned to start on the out-patient facilities during the last quarter of 1974.

7241

THE HONOURABLE DR. A.T. ROWE, MINISTER OF HEALTH IN REPLY
TO QUESTION NUMBER 64 OF ORDER PAPER OF MAY 15, 1974

- (1) The cost to the Government of the Province, to March 31, 1974, was \$215,000.
- (2) The project was directed by a local committee of citizens with technical assistance from the International Grenfell Association and the Departments of Public Works and Services and Health. Tenders were invited by the Committee from interested suppliers within the area. If tenders were not available within the area, they were invited from interested suppliers from within a reasonable distance

(3)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>Amount</u> \$
Lockes Electric, Corner Brook.	Electrical material and labour.	43,829
Gullages Ltd., Corner Brook.	Plumbing contract	32,247
Billards Electric, Corner Brook.	Building materials	22,010
James Biggin & Son, Port au Choix.	Building materials	31,766
Forest Products, Hawkes Bay.	Building materials	5,786
* Bishop & Forbes, St. John's.	Engineering services	3,184
Mr. Llewelyn Carter, Corner Brook.	Plastering services	4,750
H. House & Son, Port Saunders.	Building materials	2,107
Lundrigans Ltd., Corner Brook.	Building materials	3,532
* Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission, Port Saunders.	Electrical services	1,280

NOV 28 1974

7242

<u>Name</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>Amount</u> \$
Walter Biggin, Port Saunders.	Truck hire	1,393
Atlantic Rentals, Corner Brook.	Equipment rental	1,624
McNamara Construction, St. John's.	Equipment rental	3,868
Mr. Clarence Lidstone, Corner Brook.	Equipment rental	486
Mr. William Payne, Corner Brook.	Tractor hire	180
Spence's Equipment, Port au Choix.	Equipment hire	701
Moulands Ltd., Hawkes Bay.	Building materials	1,875
* C.N.T.	Telephone	1,633
Provincial Business Equipment, Corner Brook.	Office equipment	203
Crowns Sales & Service, Corner Brook.	Office equipment	220
* Imperial Oil, Port Saunders.	Heating fuel	500
Don Benson Ltd., Corner Brook.	Chlorinator	419
* Roy Gould, Corner Brook.	Freight	630
Mrs. G. Plowman, Port Saunders.	Board & lodging for electricians	803
Mrs. Clara Lavers, Port Saunders.	Board & lodging for electricians	442
* Labour	L.I.P. funds	66,418
* Labour	Provincial funds	49,532

7243

NOV 28 1974

<u>Name</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>Amount</u>
*	Travelling expenses - various employees	\$ 1,788

* Tenders were not invited on these items because there was only one source of supply or because it was not practical to do so.

NOV 28 1974

7244

THE HONOURABLE DR. A. T. ROWE, MINISTER OF HEALTH, IN REPLY
TO QUESTION NUMBER 63 OF ORDER PAPER OF WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 1974

1. (a) 1,312

(b) 1,404

Note:

The above figures reflect the number of samples taken from wells, etc., used by individuals. On a number of occasions more than one sample has been taken in respect of a particular well.

NOV 28 1974

7245

100

100

100