



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 4

4th. Session

Number 2

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1975

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE M. JAMES RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

HON. F. D. MOORES (Premier): Mr. Speaker, because of events of recent days, I rise to give the following statement: I want to assure this House that the government have nothing to hide with respect to its leasing policies and in particular the negotiations with Mr. Craig Dobbin and others, and the government welcomes the opportunity to make its negotiations public.

First of all the Minister of Public Works and Services will table, as agreed last December, all proposals with reference to leasing of space by the government requested last fall, all relevant correspondence and the agreement to lease recommended to be entered into with the Dobbin interests who had at that time made the best proposal.

Secondly, the government have decided to issue a public call for tender proposals with reference to space needs so that every possible interested party should have the right to submit proposals, and in the hope that better terms and conditions may be received.

Thirdly, government will decide, when tender proposals are received in response to tender call, whether to proceed to rent or build to meet its additional space requirements.

Fourthly, the government felt, and still feels, that the Dobbin proposals were reasonable and competitive but because of strong views of some concerned parties will in all instances proceed by public tender on proposal calls for any long-term leases even though this procedure is not common practice elsewhere in Canada, either in the provinces or with the federal government.

Fifthly, the Public Tender Act, which is based primarily on the Federal Act, was fully complied with in the instances under discussion and insofar as the Trizec proposal is concerned, the government have not succeeded in obtaining from Trizec terms and conditions that

are satisfactory to government with the result that so far no agreement has been reached with that corporation.

HON. E. M. ROBERTS (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I, as all the people of the province, welcome the Premier's statement. I will have an opportunity to debate it at a later time. I do not propose to do so now. Of course, Sir, I think generally it is the right and proper thing to be done. We congratulate him on it. The one regret is that it cost the ministerial career of one minister to bring it to this, because the fact remains that a deal had been made for that space in Wedgewood Park. I am glad the government have cancelled that, and I am glad that they are now proceeding to public tenders. We will look forward with interest to the results of those public tenders being tabled.

I want to add one other thing, Sir. I am disappointed that the Premier made no reference to amending the Public Tenders Act. The time that act came in the House, those of us on this side said that it had a loophole in it big enough to drive a garbage truck through. It was not a garbage truck, Sir, it was \$900,000 a year that got driven through it. That loophole should be plugged and it should be plugged in this session, Sir.

PETITIONS:

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the people of Musgrave Harbour, Aspen Cove and Ladle Cove, and the prayer of this petition from the three communities is that our local development committee support this petition and rates it as a number one priority for this area for the following reasons: Better qualified product, gill nets are tended daily and the product can be processed fresh and in good condition. This area has never failed. During the past two years two million pounds were landed each year.

Employment, and I think this is the crux of the whole petition, Mr. Speaker, employment: this is the only industry in the area, and fishermen feel that a fish plant would employ our

young people and keep them at home and help to develop a positive attitude among our people. At the moment our fishermen know that the community is producing the fish but are not receiving the additional fish plant employment.

Mr. Speaker, the reason behind this petition is that the people of Aspen Cove, Ladle Cove and Musgrave Harbour feel that they have produced raw material, and raw material is exported out of that community which provides labour to other communities rather than the ones here mentioned. I do not think it is the intention of the petitioners that a fresh fish processing plant, as such, should be built there. However, I think what they have in mind is a building whereby if it is not feasible to install the necessary freezing equipment there, then perhaps the Salt Fish Corporation would be encouraged to buy and cure the fish from the fishermen and thereby producing the labour that they are so much concerned about. I

would ask, Mr. Speaker, that this petition be received and laid on the table of the House and have it referred to the department to which it relates.

HON. J.C. CROSBIE (MINISTER OF FISHERIES): Mr. Speaker, the government, of course, will receive and consider that petition and give it careful consideration. I think it has to be pointed out that it must be obvious that we cannot have, and it is not possible to have, a production of fish, production of processing plants, that it is not possible to have a fresh fish processing plant in every fishing community on the island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a point of order, Sir. Is Your Honour going to allow debate now, Sir, on this petition, because the minister is entering into a very controversial debate. I would submit to Your Honour that the minister is out of order, Sir, unless we are going to have a full-fledged debate on this matter here and now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It has always been the custom in this honourable House to permit a few remarks in reply to a petition in support of the prayer of the petition. It is the Chair's interpretation that the honourable Minister of Fisheries was doing that and it shall not hesitate to call him to order if he is out of order.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I am delighted - pleased, as a matter of fact - pleased and delighted that the honourable gentleman has brought up this point of order. I know -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: I am speaking on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Fisheries is speaking to a point of order.

MR. NEARY: Your Honour, I disposed of the point of order, Sir. and I would suggest that there is no longer any need for discussion on it. Your Honour has made a ruling.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, if I might be heard. There was a point of order raised in this House -

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: As Government House Leader I have the right to be heard on the point of order. I now wish to be heard on this point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour has made a ruling. Are we going to now carry on the discussion?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It is the feeling of the Chair that it has ruled on that particular point of order.

MR. CROSBIE: Am I permitted to continue, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair has already ruled on that particular point of order.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, on a point of order of my own, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that this opportunity has arisen because I think that we should stick to our Standing Orders, ninety to ninety-seven on the subject of petitions. Since this is the opening of a new session of the House of Assembly, I would like to draw Your Honour's attention to Standing Orders ninety to ninety-seven.

Standing Order ninety says, "A petition to the House shall be presented by a member in his place who shall be answerable that it does not contain impertinent or improper matter; and every member offering a petition to the House shall sign it with his own hand."

Standing Order ninety-two, "Every member offering a petition to the House shall confine himself to the statement of the parties from whom it comes, the number of signatures attached to it and the material allegations it contains. In no case shall such a member occupy more than five minutes in so doing, unless by permission of the House upon question put."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit and we are quite willing on this side to stick to the Standing Orders of this House, Standing Order ninety-two.

So that the only person who speaks on the petition is the member who presents it and that member confines himself to the statement and guides himself by what is stated in Standing Order ninety-two of the rules of the House. I would like Your Honour to rule on that.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may say a word, because I think this is an important matter and it is probably as well to have it disposed of at the start of a new session. First of all, just say, because I do not wish to be accused of having slept on our rights, that the honourable the House Leader has no right as House Leader to make any comments on points of order. Now, he has exactly the same right as any other member has to address points to Your Honour and to be heard if Your Honour so wishes, but there is no right vested in the House Leader to have any specific right with reference to this matter or this type of matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman did read the rule correctly and it does not require any further comment. I would think, however, it would be a retrograde step if we were to go through the procedure, the strict procedure, as laid down in the rules. The strict procedure would require, in fact, a change in the practice which has grown up in this House certainly during the eight or nine years of which I have been a member. As far as I know - I look to the gentleman from Bell Island and the gentleman from Fogo, the gentleman from Fortune Bay, all of whom have been in the House longer than I have, to contradict me if I am wrong, but the practice is well established.

Your Honour has ruled on a number of occasions - maybe it is such a ruling before Your Honour now - that no debate is allowed upon a petition. I would submit that is a very wise rule. Your Honour has consistently allowed, and so have Your Honour's predecessors, two or three or four or five members on occasion to stand and to address a few brief remarks in support of the petition. Now, I do not know whether that means they have to agree with the point of the petition or not, but certainly they cannot enter into a debate on the petition. The most that

could be allowed surely as a member to stand and say, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the petition, "I do not think it should be granted, you know, and here is why." But even that might verge on debate.

So I think our practice is a good one. I would be very regretful, and I think it would be a bad start for the new House Leader and his assistant, to go back to the strict letter of the law. The assistant is in the House, Sir, "God's in His Heaven, All's well with the world", as Browning said. The assistant is in his place in the House. You know the rules on this point have been encrusted upon by tradition and precedent, and I think the encrustation is well worth the preservation.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, if I might respond to the comments of the Leader of the Opposition. Firstly, I put to Your Honour, when a point of order is brought up in this House, Your Honour should hear from both sides on the point of order, and a few minutes ago you did not choose to hear from this side of the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not care -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: I have the right, Mr. Speaker, to be heard, and both sides have a right to be heard on points of order, and we intend to be heard on points of order from this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Bully Boy! Bully Boy!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: If the opposition can be heard, Mr. Speaker, the government can be heard. That is my first point. Secondly, on the point in connection with petitions: this is a new session of the House. There had been considerable trouble and difficulty in the House for the last two or three years in particular in connection with petitions and in connection with whether or not a debate is being conducted in connection with a petition. That difficulty arose in this House just a few minutes ago. If there are to be these constant difficulties I suggest to Your Honour, as far as this side of the House is concerned, we wish to stick to the rules, and insofar as petitions are concerned Standing Order 92 is very clear as to what should

happen with respect to petitions. There is no other House of Assembly that even has the procedure. It is a method whereby anyone can present a petition to bring any grievances before the House and explain what the petition is and who it has been signed by and bring it to the attention of the House.

MR. NEARY: Go back to -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: There is no need, Mr. Speaker, for there to be a debate on every petition. I submit that in our view Your Honour should consider this matter and decide whether or not we are going to follow the Standing Order.

MR. SPEAKER: The points made by honourable members are well taken. I would like to refer to a previous ruling that I made in a previous session, re the same matter. At that point I said that the custom of presenting petitions to parliament goes back to the earliest days of parliamentary history. The ordinary procedure in presenting petitions in this House is covered in Standing Orders 90, 91 and 92. These indicate that a petition may be presented and that the person presenting it may make a brief statement not to exceed five minutes on certain aspects of the petition set forth in Standing Order 92. The Standing Orders do not require a motion that the petition be received, nor is a motion required that it be referred to the department to which it relates since this is covered by Standing Order 95. In a case of petitions requesting expenditure of public money, which most, if not all, of the petitions presented in this House do involve such expenditure, Standing Order 97 says "There shall be no debate, unless the House has the petition under consideration." This should be read that Standing Order 96 provides for a procedure to be used only in cases of urgency. I should note however that over the years the custom of certain members sometimes making great comments on the petitions has grown up in this House. This is not sanctioned by any rule but it only occurs by leave of the House and it might be said to exist as rules of courtesy that honourable members accord each other. I do not propose to interfere with the extension of such courtesies

at this time but should the matter of speaking on presentation of petitions fear to get out of hand, I may have to reassess my position.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: It appears that if in this new session that it has gotten out of hand a little already, I shall certainly give careful thought over the next couple of days to not permitting any reply to presentation of petitions.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I - I had planned to say a word or two with reference in support of the petition, not debate it. May I do so? Your Honour, as I understand it has said, "Your Honour is going to take the matter under consideration." I would like to say a word or two in support of the prayer of the petition. Is it in order for me to do so, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to grant the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that courtesy.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you. Well,

Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to say that I support the prayer of the petition. I met on a number of occasions with the gentlemen who are responsible for organizing it and who are behind the effort to have these further facilities developed. I think they have a good point. I think they make a reasonable request and certainly it is one which they feel is essential to the development of the fishery in their area of Newfoundland in the Strait Shore and in particular the Musgrave Harbour and the Lumsden area.

It is not the place to debate fishery policy and I shall not, but I think this is a direction in which perhaps we should be moving and certainly it is the direction in which consideration should be given. So I support the petition and I hope it will receive full and thorough and sympathetic consideration. I do hope the people concerned will receive an answer reasonably soon.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other petitions?

The honourable Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 118 grade one to ten students at St. Peter's Academy, Westport, White Bay South. Sir, the prayer of the petition reads: "We, the undersigned students in grades one to ten at St. Peter's Academy, Westport, White Bay South, earnestly petition you to use your good offices to help us get a new school to replace our present outdated one. Our school is housed in two wooden structures, one of which is a converted dwelling house. The main three-room building is approximately thirty-five years old and badly needs replacement. In addition, the school is severely overcrowded. Our school board, the Green Bay Integrated School Board, has plans to replace our school but cannot possibly do so unless more money is forthcoming to finance its building programme. We respectfully urge you to spare no effort to see that we, the students, who are Newfoundland's future, get the additional facilities to enable us to get the additional education which is our birth right."

Sir, this is signed by 118 students from that school and it also, Sir, has the support of the Westport School Committee and the secretary has written the Minister of Education stating the conditions there and suggesting that, of course, the school is very old and is very uncomfortable and she states that it is in fact a fire trap, overcrowded, and the students in that school do not have the opportunity of availing themselves of academic courses that are offered in some other schools, and that they are denied the right to extend their education beyond or towards a technical or vocational level.

Sir, the secretary of the Westport School Committee also points out that the people of Westport will not allow the problem to be seemingly solved by the introduction of portable classrooms, since they think that this will only serve to prolong the building of a new school. Sir, the Parent and Teachers' Association of Westport also add their support to this particular petition.

Now, Sir, I know it is the Denominational Educational Committees that distribute the funds for such buildings. However, obviously it is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education. I ask that this petition be placed on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, while you still have this matter under advisement, I assume we are proceeding under the old procedure. In the absence of the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker, we just say that we are glad to receive the petition and to give it every consideration. Nevertheless, it must be pointed out, as the honourable gentleman has acknowledged, that this matter is under the direct jurisdiction of the school boards and the denominational educational committees who are responsible for the construction of schools in the Province largely through funds provided by the government. We are delighted, of course, that this government has increased substantially the amount of funds provided for school construction in many directions. It will be clear when the budget and the estimates are brought down.

We hope that the relevant D.E.C. and school board will have sufficient funds to do what the honourable gentleman's constituents want done in that area and which obviously is required and needs to be done.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other petitions?

The honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition on behalf of some residents of my district, 477 residents of Conne River, the Milltown Head of Bay D'Espoir, St. Joseph's, St. Veronica's, Swanger's Cove and St. Alban's, indeed Mr. Speaker, every community in the Bay D'Espoir Area.

The prayer of the petition relates to the need for a road connection, a causeway across Conne River. It may come as a surprise to some members of the House that a causeway has not been provided in that it was to have started, actually did start, according to stories by government spokesmen, in the fall of 1973.

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier personally promised it.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the petition because I think it sets forth pretty well the need.

"Whereas the Community of Conne River with a population of approximately 500 people, after more than 100 years is still isolated from the communities of Bay D'Espoir on which it depends for medical and other services by 800 feet of water, and whereas this proves extremely hazardous during wintertime and spring thaw especially for getting such essentials as food stuffs and for taking the sick to the doctor and hospital; whereas the high school students from the community find it impossible to return home, just eighteen miles by road, on weekends and for vacations; whereas during the November 1973 by-election in this district we were promised by the Premier a causeway across Conne River to relieve the long-endured isolation and a road to connect with the Harbour Breton road, and whereas to the present time the only action taken has been the sending of a drill to determine depth of bed rock and a few loads of fill on the side of the river opposite the community, therefore we the undersigned strongly appeal to our provincial and federal members to immediately act on our behalf to get the causeway started and not force us to live out

the hardships of another winter, cut off from the necessities of life."

It is signed by 477 people in that area, literally just about every person who lives in Conne River, plus a number from other communities in the bay.

Mr. Speaker, a moment ago as I was introducing a petition the Leader of the Opposition made reference to the Premier's promise. The petitioners are also aware, Mr. Speaker, of the Premier's promise. It was clearly and publicly made and indeed the impression was clearly given at that time by arranging to have the contractor who was working on a completely separate project in the area, by arranging to have him, or the government arranging to have him, to dump the excess rock immediately on top of the wharf opposite the Conne River Community to give the impression that the road was going through.

Not only was that criminal in its falseness and the false hopes it raised for the people, Mr. Speaker -

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order, the honourable gentleman is allowed to speak in support of this petition but this kind of political doggerel you know, and political irrelevancies are not allowed by the honourable gentleman to be carried on in connection with this petition. He can support the petition but not go into political diatribe as he is now.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage, I think, was straying somewhat from the prayer of the petition he was presenting.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, this is a touchy subject for the Minister of Fisheries. I shall restrain myself for the time being but the people of Conne River will not restrain themselves and if they do not get their causeway they will be not only Conne River but "Conned" River, conned by this government.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: Renamed "Conned" River.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to support the prayer of this petition because this government believes that there should be a causeway across Conne River and this government has made more effort in the last year or two, Mr. Speaker, to get that causeway than was done in all the previous twenty-three years of our history. The Indian residents of Conne River may rest assured.

MR. NEARY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Your Honour just ruled on political diatribe, Sir, and that is what we are getting from the new House Leader. I would suggest to Your Honour that the minister be ruled out of order, Sir, and learn the rules of the House if he is going to carry on in this job.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

I do feel that the Hon. House Leader was straying somewhat from the prayer of the petition.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, as always, I am ever cognizant of your every direction so I will simply say this; that we support the prayer of the petition.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: The position is - a very handsome picture of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in that magazine - the position is, Mr. Speaker, that we have taken this matter up with the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion of Canada -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: - in an attempt, Mr. Speaker, to have the Conne River causeway or bridge included under a DREE subsidiary agreement. That has not turned out to be possible, and that department feels that the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development should be approached.

We have, with the assistance of the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion, approached the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. However, the matters have not yet come to any fruition with them, but there seems to be a considerable degree of reluctance on the part of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to grapple with the issue of the causeway to Conne River. Now this is a fairly expensive project. We are hoping to get federal participation. If we are unsuccessful in any attempts to have federal participation, then the government will have to try to deal with the matter itself. It is under active and continued consideration, and it has not been forgotten, and it is not going to be forgotten, and even when the district has another member, a good P.C. member, it will still be proceeded with.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman forgot to thank us for the pavement of all the roads through St. Alban's, Milltown, and the other areas of the people who signed the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

It has been brought to my attention that we have in the galleries today the Mayor and some of his Councillors from Southern Harbour.

I would, on behalf of all honourable members, welcome them to the galleries today.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, there is no shortage of petitions from my district, all relating to unkept promises from the Hermitage by-election.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Ah! Ha! Ha!

Mr. Speaker, if the people we were dealing with were men of their word, we would have these things done, including the causeway, and including the subject of this petition as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

If the Hon. Member for Hermitage rises to present a petition, I would like for him to get on with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I remind honourable members to my left that he does have the right to be heard in silence as well.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I abjectly apologize. I was provoked by the letter writer from Clarendville.

I beg leave to present -

AN HON. MEMBER: You are in a packet of trouble.

MR. SIMMONS: A real packet of trouble, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: I hope you can for your sake.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of eighty-nine residents of the community of McCallum in my district. The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, relates to the need for a water system in the community. Again this is a matter which is certainly a need. There is no question about that in either

my case or in the case of the people who signed the petition. There is a very desperate need and if you lived there at this time of the year, you would appreciate how great the need is. That need is outlined in the wording of the petition.

We, the undersigned, voters of McCallum, demand that the government make a firm commitment to rectify the water situation here before yet another winter comes upon us. The government have been petitioned time and again, but still nothing is done. This present winter the situation is the worst ever. Everyone's well has gone dry and even the last resort for water, the spring, really only a mudhole, yields very little water. The men of the community have to go in a dory to Baleineau, a distance of four miles return from the community and fetch back drinking water by large buckets. At times we cannot get into Baleineau for the ice. We put it to the government that we deserved better than this - contaminated water in summer and no water at all in winter. We have to melt ice for domestic purposes. We want a firm commitment that something will be done about this urgent situation during the coming spring and summer.

Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this matter on a number of occasions with the former and now the present Minister of Municipal Affairs. Insofar as government involvement is concerned, it goes back again to a commitment of November, 1973, not only a verbal statement, but a letter from the then minister saying that the system would be installed for the winter of 1973 - I use the word, system, incorrectly - that the situation will be rectified and some water system would be provided during the winter of 1973-1974. Indeed the then minister, the present Minister of Finance, said in his letter to a resident of the community, "Before this winter sets in, the matter would be rectified."

Well as this petition

shows, Mr. Speaker, the matter has not been rectified. I intend to be in McCallum again either tomorrow, or Saturday rather, and at that time we will be actually setting up a water committee so that the people will have a formal voice to operated through at the community level. Of course, no amount of organization alone at the community level will do it. What is needed here, and this is the prayer of the petition, is the government come through on its commitment made a year and a half ago, a commitment if followed through would meet a very real need, Mr. Speaker, a very desperate need on behalf of or for, just about, 100 adult residents of that community. I have pleasure in requesting that this petition be placed on the table of the House.

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

HON. B. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on record as supporting the prayer of the petition just presented by the Member for Hermitage. Unfortunately he left out a few very vital facts. Number one was that the government has attempted to provide water for the people of McCallum and have spent over \$10,000 in so doing only to find no water; number one, which was blatantly omitted by the Member from Hermitage. Number two is the fact that the first thing that should be done in McCallum, as I have already indicated to the honourable member yesterday, was to form and organize a committee. I do not think it is the intention of this government nor should it be of any government to provide funds to any given community if they do not have the proper organization on the local scene to fully and most responsibly manage those funds.

So I would suggest very strongly to the honourable Member for Hermitage that if he wants to do something constructive for his district that he see to it posthaste that a committee is formed in McCallum to represent them in their request for water. Nevertheless, we have done our best to find water for the people of McCallum. We have not as yet. Give us another few years, Mr. Speaker. We have not yet been able to manufacture that kind of commodity. With some more time we might be able to. We are doing our best and will continue to do so.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, again I am in the mood to apologize. My humble apologies for not pointing out that there was a drill rig in there during November, 1973, during the by-election.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage has already spoken to his petition in presenting it.

The honourable Member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of some fifteen residents of my district: Thirteen of the residents are householders and two of the signatures are priests in that area.

The prayer of the petition reads, it is very brief: "We, the undersigned, want a house for a house." Mr. Speaker, this is rather a sore point with me and certainly it is with the inhabitants of my district, particularly those who are under the gun in the Mundy Pond Urban Renewal Scheme and are facing imminent expropriation. The petition is quite small because the number of people actually facing or potentially facing expropriation is also very small. In fact, I think that probably only half of these people may ever be expropriated and only one couple knows definitely that they will be. They have already been offered what I consider to be a most inadequate offer. They have given me permission to use their names. It is a Mr. and Mrs. Pauline Hayes of 40 New Pennywell Road. They have been offered the sum of \$15,000 for their house plus a \$5,000 building lot, that is a serviced building lot. That makes a total of \$20,000 or perhaps even \$21,000 if they can get more than \$5,000 for that building lot.

A fairly detailed check with real estate agents around the city indicates that the cheapest inhabitable house that can be purchased within the boundaries of the city is of the order of \$35,000. There is therefore a short fall, a very unjustified short fall of about \$14,000 to \$15,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been a plank of this party that we would undertake to supply a house for a house, not the market value, but the replacement value. Mrs. Hayes does not want to leave where she is. If the government does not have the money to pay them a proper amount, let them leave them alone. They are quite happy to accept this alternative,

but if they are forced to move then they should be able to get into something decent. This lady is around seventy years old, and she is in no position to undertake a mortgage as she most surely will have to do if she accepts the present offer, which I think is totally inadequate. I therefore wish that this petition be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure on behalf of my colleagues and Her Majesty's loyal opposition to support the prayer of this petition. I may point out to the honourable House, Sir, for the benefit of those honourable members who did not have the privilege and the honour and the opportunity to sit in this honourable House, that there was at one time on the statutes of this Province a law compelling governments to give a house for a house. It was a new policy that was adopted, Sir, a few years back, but the then Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Sir, who is now the new House Leader, saw fit to have that law changed.

Now, Sir, the member who introduced the petition was good enough -

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The statement is irrelevant to this petition and the statement in fact, is false. So I have two objections to the statement. The honourable gentleman is not speaking in support of this petition. He is making a political speech, and he is using deceptive tactics in doing it.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order if I might, Mr. Speaker. The statement, I submit, is relevant. It is not false. The honourable gentleman from St. John's West sponsored the legislation which ended the house for a house principle in respect of the urban renewal areas in St. John's. That is what has caused the problem in Mundy Pond of which this petitioner complains.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Whether the statement is true or false perhaps is a difference of opinion between two honourable members. I

feel the honourable Member for Bell Island was not speaking directly to the prayer of the petition and he should get back to that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House of course support the prayer of the petition. The honourable member who introduced this petition, Sir, has on a number of occasions in this honourable House tried to persuade his colleagues on the government side of the House to bring in this - a bill to make it law to provide people with a house for a house. And although, Sir, it is legally right now what the position of the government is - they are in a legal position to force people to leave their homes - it is morally wrong, Sir. And I agree with the honourable member, that people should not be put into a position, Sir, the embarrassing position where they have to take on financial responsibilities with which they are unable to cope. Sometimes they are people who are senior citizens who are forced at a late stage of life to have to go out and take on a mortgage at high interest rates, Sir. This is morally wrong and the sooner it is changed the better.

So we take great pleasure, Sir, in supporting the prayer of the petition. I might add, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, and the member pointed this out, that this was one of the planks in the platform -

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. NEARY: One of the planks in the platform -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: Order, Mr. Speaker! This all is clearly outside the rules.

I would ask Your Honour to rule the honourable gentleman out of order.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The point raised by the honourable House Leader is well taken. I think the honourable Member for Bell Island was straying somewhat again from the prayer of the petition.

MR. NEARY: We can only concur, then, with the statement made by the honourable Member for St. John's North that it was a plank in the platform of his party before -

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

MR. NEARY: - the 1971 provincial general election.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair has already ruled on this matter.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the petition put before the House today we can all, of course, agree that this is certainly a very worthy matter for the honourable gentleman to bring before the House. The fact remains that the law of this Province dating from 1967, when it was introduced and passed by a Liberal majority in the House of Assembly, has been that in urban renewal areas, and urban renewal areas alone, the principle of the legislation that was passed providing compensation of a house for a house does not apply, the reasoning being that there was public housing - it does not apply so long as public housing is provided in the area, a subsidized rental housing for those people who might be displaced in an urban renewal area by the urban renewal activity.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I submit that the honourable member is engaging in debate right now rather than just restricting himself to a support of a petition. I suggest that he be drawn to this rule and that he either support the petition or cease with speaking.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I am simply attempting to point out what the law is today and why it is the law today.

MR. NEARY: The rules apply to both sides of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Honourable members are certainly making my decision to permit debate on petitions a little easier.

MR. CROSBIE: In any event, Mr. Speaker, that is the principle of the present law that applies today. It applies only in urban renewal areas, Mr. Speaker. This is obviously a matter that the government is considering or has been considering, but there are many arguments for and against any change and it will be given serious consideration.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and pleasure to present the report of the Select Committee on the Address in Reply to His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, Honourable Gordon A. Winter.

"May it please Your Honour, we, the commons of Newfoundland in Legislative Session assembled beg to thank Your Honour for the Gracious Speech which Your Honour has addressed to this House."
Signed; Brendan Howard, Frederick Stagg, Paul Thoms.

HON. H.R.V. EARLE (MINISTER OF FINANCE): Mr. Speaker, as required by me as law I wish to present to the House a summary of the special warrants issued in the current fiscal year consisting of warrants to several departments, a total of \$22,544,000 on current account and \$16,444,000 on capital account for a total of \$38,988,000. I might point out in so doing, Mr. Speaker, that of this amount \$10,500,000 is on the special forestry agreement with DREE where - we had to find the cash first of course - ninety per cent of which is recoverable from the federal government.

Now, \$3,500,000 of the special warrants is for special aid to fishermen due to the late ice conditions on the coast last year which, of course, could not be put -

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: Special warrants are contained in this folder.

MR. NEARY: Tell us about the other ones.

MR. EARLE: All right, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member for Bell Island wants me to read them. Education is \$3,200,000. We can take the whole afternoon if we wish, Mr. Speaker, to give the details. Education, \$3,200,000. Justice, \$1,234,000. Social Services, \$800,000. Rehabilitation and Recreation, \$750,000. Health, \$7,882,000. Mines and Energy, \$957,000. Forestry and Agriculture, \$10,500,000. Fisheries, \$8,650,000. Transportation and Communications, \$4,750,000. Municipal Affairs and Housing, \$150,000. Provincial Affairs and Environment, \$115,000. The details are contained in this folder.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow introduce the following resolution:

WHEREAS each year recently has seen a dramatic increase in the number of work stoppages through strikes and lock-outs both legal and illegal;
AND WHEREAS every work hour lost not only cripples both gross provincial and gross national products but hits directly the standard of living of those involved directly in such strikes and lock-outs;
AND WHEREAS through a reversed multiplier effect the loss to families directly involved in work stoppages affects the prosperity and standard of living of all members of the local community, the provincial community and the nation as a whole;
AND WHEREAS time, especially productive time, is one of those irreplaceable resources that once wasted or lost can never be replaced;
AND WHEREAS the present management labour confrontation tactics appear to be working to the disadvantage of both management and labour, both adversaries, and to the disadvantage of the nation and the province as a whole;

AND WHEREAS in its present primitive state industrial relations seems to be focusing on the negative objective of finding the least objectionable instead of the best solution to labour management stand-offs.

AND WHEREAS nowhere in Canada has our conventional education system come to grips with the problems and opportunities of training either the potential union member or the future manager in the common sense and absolute necessity for Canadian survival of alligning the best efforts of management and labour on the common goal of increased productivity by all so that all may live better;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the province of Newfoundland pioneer a positive step in the direction of restoring order to the industrial relations scene by appointing as quickly as possible a select committee of the House of Assembly to explore the possibilities and make recommendations upon the setting up of a provincial productivity council comprising representatives of labour, management and other sectors of the community, and such council in turn be charged with the responsibility of scanning the province for symptoms of possible trouble, determining and rooting out the causes before problems become confrontations, and marshall all segments of our provincial economy into a great crusade perhaps through a series of complex all-embracing five year plans to increase our productivity, at present the lowest per capita among the Canadian provinces so that, Mr. Speaker, by producing more there will be more for all to share so that by working together solutions may be found to eliminate present wasteful procedures so that all Newfoundlanders will earn a larger, better and higher standard of living by increasing the dollar value of all goods and services produced in Newfoundland and Labrador so that by producing more there will be more for all to share.

MR. SPEAKER: The notice of resolution by the honourable member for Bell Island appears to be unusually long. I shall certainly have to take it under advisement.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of

Provincial Affairs. Would the honourable minister care to inform the House what action the government have taken on the Food Price Review Report that was presented to the people of this province last fall?

HON. G. DAWE (MINISTER OF PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT): Mr. Speaker, we are still working on recommendations made by Mrs. Plumptre in the report. We have yet to set up any concrete workings to undertake such recommendations. Some of them are fairly good. There are others which are quite negative. So far no definite action has been taken.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am dissatisfied with the honourable minister's answer. I give Your Honour notice that during the late show this afternoon I wish to debate this matter.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications. I would like the minister to inform the House if it is the intention of his government to delete the name of Labrador from the official name of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and from government stationery in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

HON. J. ROUSSEAU (MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS):

Thank you very much. That was an unwelcomed gift. I am sure that I would like to have something to say on that because the honourable member has probably had something to say about it for a couple of weeks. An article appeared in "Decks Awash" which suggested to people that I wanted to drop the name Labrador, this is my personal opinion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: If you would listen and stop talking you would.

As far as I am concerned for my own personal feelings -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Look, shut up will you for a change. Do not be so nasty.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The House is now in the second day of the current session, Sir, and it seems that honourable gentlemen opposite, now I realize there are few saints on this side but, Sir, the rudeness which the gentleman for Labrador West has just evidenced has been echoed and previewed by a number of his colleagues opposite. Now if that is the way this House is to be carried on, Sir, we shall have to retaliate in kind. There is a great difference between repartee back and forth across the Chamber than that sort of deliberate and quite boorish rudeness, but I must say I am more surprised at the honourable gentleman than some of his other colleagues perhaps. But, I do not think, Sir, we are doing any service to the people of Newfoundland or to Your Honour or to this House if we carry on in this way. Now if the honourable gentleman has been touched on a sensitive nerve then I am deeply sorry for him, but that is a separate problem. Could we carry on this House, Sir, without this type of deliberate rudeness by ministers and other members?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. House Leader.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, you know we cannot sit by and hear these statements go across by the Leader of the Opposition without challenge. The Minister for Transportation and Communications and then the Member for Labrador West has a throat condition and speaks with a rasping and

husky quality to his voice. Now I could understand him, what he is saying, and I am no further away from him than the honourable gentleman for Labrador North. I could hear him quite plainly. There is no excuse for these statements of the Leader of the Opposition. The minister has been asked a question and he is answering. We were able to hear the answer here.

AN HON. MEMBER: We cannot hear him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

On many occasions prior to this and possibly in the future I would remind honourable members that when a member is speaking he does have the right to be heard in silence. On this particular occasion members both to my left and to my right were talking across the floor to each other, I am sure that would have some affect on the answer being given by the honourable minister. So I would again request from honourable members that they have a great deal of respect for this particular rule of the House.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to apologize to the House as I happen to be one who listens in silence and I would certainly appreciate it if I could be heard in silence. You know, if somebody cannot hear me then I would suggest that he would get one of these things, because I am getting a sore back bending over this. That is the best I can do.

Is it in my position you are asking, or the government's position?

AN HON. MEMBER: The government's position.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The government's position, as well as I understand it, the government's position is that the use of the term "Newfoundland and Labrador" will be retained by this government. The official name of the province, of course, on official documents is the Province of Newfoundland - on official documents because that was never changed. But the use of the term "Government of Newfoundland and Labrador" is one to which this government subscribes. The traditional use, although it is not official enough, and not legal, of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador is often used. I can assure the honourable

Member for Labrador North and I can assure all the people in Labrador that until they tell me otherwise, that they would rather see it Newfoundland, I will stand by my position that I would like to see the name "Newfoundland and Labrador" retained, officially in "Government of Newfoundland and Labrador" and unofficially to the use of it in the term "Province of Newfoundland and Labrador" and I have the support of my colleagues on this position.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, if I might. Could the minister tell us whether the government have rescinded the Order-in-Council of May, 1973, in which they took the decision to remove the name "Labrador" from all government stationery?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I have just given the government's position. The government's position is that it acknowledges the use of the term "Government of Newfoundland and Labrador" and it also accepts the unofficial use of the use term "Province of Newfoundland and Labrador".

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. Would the minister tell us whether the government have rescinded the Order-in-Council, which incidentally affects the House of Assembly and it is why our letterhead in the House reads "Newfoundland" when I submit it should read "Newfoundland and Labrador"? Has the order been rescinded or not, that is all I ask, Sir?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I will take notice. I really do not know.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the minister then confirm that the order is still in effect, that it has not been rescinded?

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh!

MR. ROBERTS: That was just another question. Why if your assistant -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Excuse me, just to clarify this, if I may, since it is a question. I just suggested to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition what the current government position is, so I assume that if that is a current government position then it is authorized by a Minute-in-Council or else I am misleading the House, right?

I really cannot answer that question at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a question for the honourable the Premier; I wonder if the honourable the Premier could inform the House if the honourable the Premier and the ministers who failed to meet the conflict of interest deadline have yet filed their statements to the Auditor General?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I can speak for myself and the answer is yes. As far as the other ministers are concerned I suggest the member for Bell Island spend his dollar and go down and find out. Everybody else can.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is why we are in this honourable House, Sir, to get information. Perhaps the Minister of Finance could tell us. The Minister of Finance is responsible, Sir, for enforcing this law.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. EARLE, Minister of Finance: As the question was directed to the Premier I did not catch it completely but was it ministers reported?

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: Oh yes, if it applies to the Premier and ministers, all have reported.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary; would the minister inform the House if there were any penalties placed on the Premier and the ministers who failed to meet the deadline in accordance with the law of this province?

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, not as yet, They are sort of out on probation at the moment. Actually I have been making enquiries as to the reasons why they were late or delinquent. My officials are getting the answers, When these are tabulated, sometime between now and 1990, we will probably make a decision.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary question; we saw what happened to The Public Tenders Act, now we are seeing what happened to the Conflict Of Interest Act.

MR. PECKFORD: Is that a question?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Poster Peckford.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the supplementary question to the Minister of Finance is first of all whether any members have not yet filed, because he carefully drew the distinction of ministers; secondly, whether he is prepared to table the answers, the information his officials are getting from ministers. Sir, this is not an act administered by the government as such, Sir, this act is one that affects the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, this is not a question. The honourable gentleman is lecturing the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking a question.

MR. CROSBIE: It is not a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I was about to rise when the honourable Minister of Fisheries did that and remind -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

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

MR. NEARY: Your pal John.

MR. SPEAKER: If honourable members insist on disregarding calls from the Chair then the Chair shall have to name them.

I was about to rise and remind the honourable Leader of the Opposition that he had not proceeded to ask a supplementary question, he was making a speech.

MR. ROBERTS: With respect, Sir, and I thank you for your ruling, I had asked two questions, Sir, if I may ask them again, whether any members have not as yet filed. The minister was very coy, as only the minister can be, and said that ministers did file. For all I know maybe all of us have not filed. The second question, Sir, is one the minister is prepared to table, the information which is being solicited from the Premier and the other delinquents, the men who breached this law, are prepared to table their reasons for not adhering to the terms of this law.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I have to check to be absolutely accurate on my reply, I believe that all members of the House have complied. The

people who were delinquent when I last checked, and I think there was something like four of these outstanding, were members of commissions who obviously were not aware - although they should have been, I admit - they were not aware that they had to comply, and they had to be written to and informed. The commissions thought that they were outside the orbit of the Civil Service, I think through a pure oversight. I think that the majority of these have put in their statements, if not all. But I can get the answer for the honourable Leader of the Opposition tomorrow.

AN HON. MEMBER: Second part of the question please.

MR. EARLE: Second part of the question was -

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair has recognized the honourable Member for Bell Island.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Justice, Sir; would the Minister of Justice care to inform the House who issued the orders or directions or directive or instructions to have the doors locked recently when a group of citizens of this province came up from the Burin Peninsula to visit Confederation Building?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! This question is out of order. It is not one that requires an urgent answer, an immediate answer.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may note my dissatisfaction with the lack of an answer by the Minister of Finance and request that that item to be entered for this afternoon's late show, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I wish to inform the honourable Leader of the Opposition that it should have been submitted to me in writing by five o'clock and I should have to announce by four o'clock (today).

MR. ROBERTS: No, Your Honour, the rule covers this. I forget the number of the rule and of course since we do not have any proper printed copies

of the new rules as yet it is a little difficult but there is a special case covering Thursday and am I to understand that it is in order for us to debate this issue at the late show this afternoon. Perhaps the clerk could help me with the number of the rule? Page twenty is it?

He says not later than four o'clock on any Thursday. The Speaker shall indicate the matters or matter to be raised at the time of the adjournment of that day. Your Honour then is in breach of the rule because Your Honour has not indicated any matters at this point so presumably I am still within the rule.

MR. SPEAKER: I was awaiting a lull in the question period because the honourable Member for Bell Island had only submitted his question to me about five minutes ago.

MR. ROBERTS: Well all I wanted to ask is whether I am to be allowed to submit mine as well, Sir. Thank you.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a question for the honourable the Premier, could the honourable the Premier inform the House if it is correct or incorrect that the Pyramid Homes Plant located at Argentia, in Placentia Bay, Newfoundland has taken a turn for the worse in recent weeks.

MR. MOORES: That question is properly directed to the Minister of Industrial Development, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Okay, Sir, I do not care who answers it as long as I get an answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. DOODY: That is a strangely worded question, Sir. What you mean is that there is less employment at the plant than there had been originally, is it?

MR. NEARY: What I am asking the minister, has the plant gone belly up? Is it closing down? Is it bankrupt? Is it going to carry on?

MR. DOODY: I see. No it is not -

MR. NEARY: Do I have to put it in baby talk for the minister?

MR. DOODY: Are you finished? Is it all right now?

MR. NEARY: Go ahead. Carry on.

MR. DOODY: The plant has not gone, excuse the expression, Sir, "belly-up" as it was. It is not in full production. It is not nearly in full production. Many people who were originally hired have been laid off. The management assure us that it is a market condition situation. The sales are not what they had anticipated they would be. They have every confidence in the viability of the operation. They are sure that they will get it moving again at the production which they had anticipated in the beginning. I have been assured both by the local manager and the head office in Winsor, Ontario, that they will continue to operate in Newfoundland and they are looking forward to a long and profitable operation here in the province.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: could the minister then inform the House when the management of the plant expects to rehire the workers who have been laid off?

MR. DOODY: The management of the plant

the plant had told us, Sir, that as soon as the fiscal policies of the federal government changed so that the necessary borrowing could be made by the prospective customers, and they would be only too happy to sell as many units and to build as many units as is possible. They would like to be in full production now but unfortunately they say that the interest rates are such - they have had no shortage of enquiries, no shortages of potential customers. What they have had is a shortage of customers who have access to funds to buy the product.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Would the minister care to inform the House if the management of Pyramid Homes have made representation to the provincial government to take some of these homes, surplus homes, off their hands for portable classrooms, for office buildings and to be put on the sites to be developed for mobile homes?

MR. DOODY: The company has been talking to government and government has been talking to the company about that very thing. Yes, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could be a little bit more specific and tell us what action his government have taken on this request?

MR. DOODY: No, Sir, I cannot be more specific than that except to say that we are looking as sympathetically and as favourably at it to the various departments as we can.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Would the minister care to inform the House when Pyramid Homes will get something definite from the government on this request?

MR. DOODY: After we get some final conclusion arranged we will inform the honourable House immediately.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Hon. the Premier care, Sir, to elaborate on a statement that he is alleged to have made back in January, I think it was, that unemployment in this province would not surpass the December figure? The latest Statistics Canada figures indicate otherwise.

MR. SPEAKER: That question is argumentative and has to be ruled out of order.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, would the Hon. the Premier care to indicate to the House what action his government have taken on record unemployment in this province?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, that question would take a great deal of time. When we talk about the various proposals that the government are trying to get underway through the various departments, and I am sure through the course of this session of the House the government plans as they are laid before this House will be self-explanatory in that regard.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister responsible for the Linerboard Mill out in Stephenville would care to indicate to the House if all the employees that have been laid off because of the down time in the mill have yet been rehired? And if not, when will they be rehired? Will the mill be operating at full capacity this year? Are there any problems anticipated in the markets and any other information that the minister could give us on this very, very urgent matter?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the last part of the question obviously is out of order. But as far as the first part is concerned, the position is, as far as I know, there are not any employees at the mill in Stephenville laid off because of any shut down or close down, certainly not in any substantial numbers. The position of the mill is that of one of the few, if not the only mill in North America that has not had, apart from over the Christmas period, a planned shut down at least one or two weeks every month because of the present condition of the linerboard market. There has been no shut down of the mill at Stephenville with the exception of over the Christmas and New Year period.

The position is, as long as there is no interruption due to any problem with the water supply at Stephenville, that there are enough orders for the mill to operate certainly during the first quarter of the year, to the end of March. The employees at the mill have been

told that it may be that during the year, depending on how the market situation develops, that there may be periodic shut downs during the remainder of the year depending on the state of the linerboard market.

The state of the linerboard market is that there are now very large inventories of linerboard held by the box companies and others who use linerboard. Because of the purchases they made last year, because of the U.S. recession they are not buying linerboard or further linerboard at this moment. The linerboard mills that do operate in the United States and Canada are having shut downs, a week or two each month. We are not at this stage but we may have to later in the year. The prices for linerboard have held up in the meantime. The prices have not dropped because the linerboard mills are restricting their production rather than dropping the price. The prices in Europe have also stayed firm because the American companies are not yet dumping their linerboard in Europe.

So the position is at the moment that so long as we do not have further trouble with the water supply at Stephenville, the mill should certainly be operating until the end of March.

Another problem is now occurring at Stephenville. The management of the mill at Stephenville, Mr. Speaker, did a magnificent job and they have had dozens and dozens of horrendous problems to overcome. Unfortunately, every time they start to overcome them and surmount them some other natural event occurs which gives them difficulty. The present difficulty, several weeks ago, was the water supply. The weather had been so cold in the Stephenville area, as it has been all over the province, that they are having problems with the water supply, and there was not going to be sufficient water and they might have had to close down. But they have overcome that at the moment.

The problem that they are now experiencing is a problem with getting ships into Stephenville. Stephenville, which was advertised in the good old days by the Javelin regime as ice-free, has had great difficulty in the last several years with ice. It is having great difficulty now with ice at the moment. Ships cannot get in or out of Stephenville Harbour.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: I am not sure whether it is the Arctic ice also. I do not know if the Arctic ice has been down yet. But the local ice is bad there.

My honourable colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications, just told me this afternoon he has wired Halifax in an attempt to get an icebreaker over to Stephenville. The problems that will cause is that if the ships do not soon get in they will run out of space to warehouse the inventory. There was a ship in about one week ago that took 5,000 tons. Well, that space will soon be used up again. If that happened, and if ships cannot get in or out, at some point they might have to close because they would not be able to store any more inventory. That is about a synopsis of it at the moment.

Certainly for this first quarter it is not the intention to have any shut down unless some natural unavoidable events such as I have described occurs.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications: What is the position now concerning the Harbour arterial road? Has the province reached an agreement with Ottawa? And if so, how much money is expected to be out into the completion of this project by the province?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: The agreement has been reached in principle, I think, between my colleague the Hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs Department and DREE as to the funding, but I do not think yet the agreement has been signed. I think signing is imminent and as soon as it is we will make the proper announcement at that time.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question: is it on a fifty-fifty basis? Ninety-ten? You know, what arrangement? The minister must be able to tell the House what the arrangement is.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Or perhaps the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs could answer the question.

MR. CROSBIE: I will expand on that, Mr. Speaker. Their agreement has been reached in principle with the Department of DREE in connection with not just the St. John's Harbour arterial road but the St. John's regional system also. The agreement of principle reached is that the federal government will fund seventy per cent of the cost of the water system, by a way of grant, and seventy-five per cent, I believe it is, of the cost of the Harbour arterial road. This will be done as one subsidiary agreement for the St. John's Metropolitan Area Region because both of these projects are not just for St. John's, they are for the whole region which comprises about a fifth of the population of Newfoundland.

In addition, it has been agreed by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion that this has no connection with, and will have no affect upon, DREE spending for highways in Newfoundland. That is an entirely separate matter. We are also negotiating with them for a subsidiary agreement for next year on certain roads in Newfoundland we hope that DREE will participate in. That is not signed yet. We have discussed -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not want to give the estimated cost, Mr. Speaker, because the federal government likes to make a joint announcement on when the agreement is completed with them. The cost figures and the division will be given then. As we are very conscious of the sensibilities of the Hon. Mr. Jamieson, with whom we have had great co-operation, we want to do the proper thing and wait for a joint announcement which will give all the necessary details.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what about the St. John's dry dock down here. Would the Hon. Premier inform the House if the provincial government of the province have made any approach towards Ottawa to try and advert either phasing out the CN dry dock or cutting it back or closing it down altogether or improving it?

The Premier is indicating, Sir, that the Minister of Industrial Development may care to answer that question, so I direct my question to that minister.

HON. C. W. DOODY (Minister of Industrial Development): Mr. Speaker, we have been working with the management of the local dry dock, Mr. Ken Woods, and his people. I have jointly made representation to the federal government with the co-operation of CN, with a view to expanding the existing facility in St. John's. We feel that there is a tremendous potential for a repair dock facility here, and with the co-operation that we would like to receive, I think that this end can be accomplished. The management of the dock is very enthusiastic about it, and we have had correspondence with Ottawa toward this end. I think it would be premature to go any further at this time in discussing it. The situation is one that we are working on right now.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister care to table the correspondence between the province and Ottawa?

MR. DOODY: No, Sir, we have intergovernmental correspondence that is restricted to the various departments, and I do not think it would be appropriate or fair, either to the people who work at the dry dock, or to the government officials in Ottawa, or in St. John's, to table correspondence until - certainly, not to table the correspondence at all. If an agreement is reached, I would be only too happy to table the agreement. If an agreement is not reached, then we will explain why it was not reached. We certainly do not have any intention of trundling the department's files into the House of Assembly for people to look at whom the people of Newfoundland decided they did not want in these departments.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Would the minister indicate whether the correspondence is between the provincial government and the federal government, between the province and the unions down at the dry dock, between the province and CN, or just who is the correspondence with?

MR. DOODY: Maybe if you check Hansard, you will see that I have already told you. We have had correspondence with the management of the dry dock,

with CN, and with the Government of Canada toward this. We have not had correspondence with the union on it, although I have been talking with Mr. Bren Healey, who is the manager, or the local chairman of the union, and he is aware of the situation and knows what we are trying to do. We have not had correspondence. I can probably table him if its, you know -

MR. SPEAKER: The thirty minutes for the oral question period has expired. I would like to inform the honourable members that this afternoon, being Thursday, we shall have two questions debated; one with the Hon. Member for Bell Island to the Hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment, and one with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to the Hon. Minister of Finance with regard to conflict of interest.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro-Electric Corporation," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The District Courts Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Parliamentary Commissioner (Ombudsman) Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Companies Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Insurance Companies Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Conditional Sales Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Solemnization of Marriage Act, 1975," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Constabulary (Pensions) Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

ADDRESS IN REPLY:

HON. B. PECKFORD (Municipal Affairs and Housing): Mr. Speaker, before I really begin and get into the main part of the Speech from the Throne, let me first of all compliment the Hon. Member for Bay de Verde and the Hon. Member for Port au Port on their speeches yesterday in this honourable House. I think that most of the comments made by the Hon. Member for Bay de Verde can be reiterated by just about every member of the House because he made some extremely valid ones as did Your Honour. (Mr. Stagg).

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that in the last three or four years in this province that most people continued to look upon the whole province, its economy, the society that we live in and so on, in much the same way as it was looked upon in the 1950's and the 1960's. That is to say that with each new Speech from the Throne, it is felt by most people that they want to get that great psychological lift, to have the government of the day produce a document somewhat visionary and imaginative to indicate to the people of the province, in a general way, because that is all the Speech from the Throne is -

MR. THOMS: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Could we have a quorum call? There are only ten of us in the Chamber at the present time. We need fourteen.

MR. SPEAKER: We have a quorum.

MR. PECKFORD: I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this will not become a regular occurrence in the next half hour so that I have to try to collect my thoughts at each time there is a quorum call.

I am trying to make the point, Mr. Speaker, that during the last five or ten years, most people have looked upon the government and the Speech from the Throne, at the beginning of each session,

and as has happened previously, especially in the fifties and sixties. There could be fairly grandiose and visionary concepts paraded by the Lieutenant-Governor concerning the development of this Province, and this has gone on all during the fifties, all during the sixties. It is sufficient to say that it has stopped in the seventies because I think that this administration realizes that we have to recognize the realities that we find ourselves in, that it is of no use pretending to the public of this Province, and I think they would reject it if we did pretend, to try to march out some new ideas in industrial development, some new ideas in rural development, and so on, without any intention of being able to live up to those promises.

So I think that the document that was presented, that was read yesterday by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor is a fairly sound and realistic appraisal of the administration of where we are and where we intend to go in the next twelve months or so. I think for too long, and I think perhaps even the press reaction now to the Speech from the Throne captures that kind of attitude that has been prevalent over the last five years, the attitude that unless you can come out with a government document indicating that some great new industrial development is going to occur, unless you can get some statement whereby you are going to attract hundreds of millions of dollars into the Province for some kind of a project that has no feasibility study done on it, that has no planning done on it, and unless you come out with that kind of a speech, it is then felt by a large segment of the population that the government is either, or the administration is either inept, incompetent or irresponsible or some other kind of term.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is far from the truth and that what we are trying to do is to indicate to the people of the Province in a real way, in a realistic way and in a sound way just exactly what we intend to do in the next twelve months, leaving aside those grandiose schemes and so on. It is a well known fact that we are in the process of attempting to develop the Gull Island site. Of course, now that is a

concept that has been around for quite some time. I remember, as a matter of fact, not too long ago seeing some correspondence from some individual whose name I do not remember back in the twenties, the late teens and the early twenties, 1920's, talking about the Upper Churchill River and the Gull Island site and what a fantastic thing it would be if that power could only be harnessed. So, albeit, it is no new idea, not only to this administration but to the previous one and I suggest for decades and decades past. The realization of that dream, of that idea is another thing. As the honourable Premier mentioned yesterday, it is one thing to have the ideas; it is another thing to be able to make them become realities. As one takes a good, hard and objective look at this Province, its development not only in rural Newfoundland but industrially, just about in any other sphere we have a number of ideas that are presently being developed like the Lower Churchill, like the offshore resources.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that we must get on with the development of these which the administration is now trying to do before we start jumping ahead as was fairly prevalent in the past, in the former administration, with new grandiose ideas which will divert our attention and perhaps some of our resources from the ones that are presently on the table. So I suggest that this whole document, this whole Speech from the Throne is a realistic and sound appraisal of where we find ourselves and what we intend to do in a real, tangible way in the next twelve months, rather than to spend our time dealing in many, very visionary ideas which have no hope or prospect of being realized for a decade or two.

It is much better to take it one step at a time. And if you look, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, at any jurisdiction, not only in North America but in the western world in the past six months, and I suggest for the next six or twelve, at any of their general guidelines, their Speeches from the Throne or any of their policies, that you will find an extremely cautious approach being taken because of the inflationary situation we now find ourselves in, that it would be somewhat irresponsible to try to suggest and perhaps in the inflationary psychology, that times might even add fire

to it if we were to indicate some great new ideas which involved hundreds of millions of dollars. It might even hinge on being somewhat irresponsible to the people whom we serve.

So all of these jurisdictions, anybody who has picked up a paper recently or a magazine can find this, that it is time to be rather cautious in where we go and how we intend to get there in raising funds and in developing new projects for that jurisdiction. I think in the context of the times and being aware that we have a number of very major developments about to occur like the Lower Churchill and our jurisdictional dispute with the Federal Government, that it is a time for us to examine carefully these projects and to be aware that these must bear some fruition and reality before we push on to newer and greater things.

I do not think it is fair to say that we lack the imagination on this side of the House to concoct or come up with new ideas for the Province, but I think on balance it is fair to say that when you are dealing with problems of the 1975 inflation, etc. that one has to be careful and to be sure of where you are going.

So in that context, Mr. Speaker, I say that the Speech from the Throne is a sound and realistic appraisal of the administration, of its policies, and indicating in a general way where we intend to go in the next year. We have, Mr. Speaker, and it has been said now in a number of cases in the last three months, done a fair amount in this Province since 1972, since March, 1972. Talk about new concepts and imaginative programmes and so on, for three or four years, more than that I suppose, five or six years in the former administration, they talked about the Department of Community and Social Development and they had some pretty high paying experts in here to develop some great schemes for this Province, for rural Newfoundland. It always amazed me then, and it still amazes me now, I do not know if there is any information down there and if one could get it, what these people did for all those years. But these so called academics and people who were going to set rural Newfoundland straight, all that came out of it really was increasing the population of Normans Cove and a few other centralized locations, that all it boiled down to was a matter of

centralization and resettlement. Very little came out of all those whiz kids that were hired down in the Department of Community and Social Development and stayed.

So if you want to talk about new ideas and new approaches towards traditional problems, the Department of Rural Development, as it is now devised, has done a fair amount in that regard. It will always be debated, I suppose, that to some degree that department has moved in too practical a way, but I would suggest that we really tried to do deeds rather than to just concoct ideas of some sort. Hence, we have, I think in this past year, lent something like over \$5 million to rural parts of the Province to try to encourage local industry. Hence, if one wants to get into the idea of something different, I think that we did, rather than just let a bunch of experts who were brought in, of course from outside, who knew very little about rural Newfoundland in the first instance, rather than go that approach, we did take a new approach. I think overall it has been to the benefit of most parts of rural Newfoundland.

On the fisheries, Mr. Speaker, as mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, what can you do with this kind of an industry which finds itself in the delicate position right now? On the one hand you must have the raw material which is difficult to come by. What kind of an idea or concept can one propose to insure that fish are going to continue to come off our shores? The only thing I can come up with is what is presently in the speech, is to insure that our Continental Shelf and the areas that create, produce the fish, raw material, that we have good control over them, sound control over them as a country, so that they can continue to reproduce and come to our shores or our trawlers go out and get them.

In these difficult times of the fishery - I do not think, I have not heard any, across the way here, a former Minister of Fisheries - I have not heard him in recent times come up with any glowing alternatives to what is presently being proposed for the fishery, a man who spent a long time in politics in this Province. Surely, if he had some better ideas than we are presently using or trying to develop, then he would come forward

February 27, 1975.

Tape 46

RH - 5

with them. Neither have I heard the Leader of the Opposition bring in any alternative solutions to the present fisheries problem. It is not an easy one. So, when you talk about the Speech from the Throne not having anything, as I think the papers have, anything new, my suggestion would be that when you analyze and take a good look at the fishery, what is proposed to do here with new marine service centres to help the fishermen with their boats, when you

talk about gear subsidization and helping out when gear loss has occurred besides trying to safeguard the depleted resources through the Law of the Sea. It is difficult to know what else one has to do to ensure that that industry continues to thrive in this province. So, you must look at the problem as it now exists and look for practical ways out of it rather than any grandiose schemes. One could be easily reminded of years ago: often when one sector of the economy got into trouble the Premier of the day, one of his nice techniques - it was politically wise at the time, I suppose, if somewhat irresponsible - was to call a big conference. Perhaps that is what we should do; have a big conference and have all the fishermen of the province congregate here in Confederation Building or over to the Arts and Culture Center; sit down, and, of course, have a full session of two or three days and end up just as far behind as we were when we started. That was just before an election, I guess, that that was supposed to be done.

On the service end of government anyway - if you eliminate the Department of Mines and Energy when we are pushing ahead with offshore, pushing ahead with the Lower Churchill and this kind of thing and industrial development and some of the more resource based industries - on the service side of it, all government can do is to continue to try to pump more money each year into those departments to ensure that additional water and sewer systems are installed, that additional roads are upgraded and paved, that additional hospitals are built to service the sick of the province and additional schools are built, and this kind of thing. You can only continue to increase the amount of expenditure each year that is to be expended on those various departments, and surely that is what we have been doing over the last two or three years.

Hence, the Premier mentioned yesterday about somewhat over 300 miles of pavement being laid last year. Of course this kind of thing will continue. For the first time the government is proposing a five year programme in highways so that each part of the province will know just exactly when a given section of road is to be

upgraded and when a given section of road is to be paved.

While on that subject, Mr. Speaker, it might be of interest to the honourable House that the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing are also trying to develop a five to seven year programme, like the programme in Transportation and Communications, for water and sewer systems, water systems or water and partial sewer or water and sewer. In some areas it is most wise to put in water and sewer. In some other areas they can go with water and partial sewer, if we have a spread out community where health and environment will go along.

I was interested, in that regard, talking about the department for which I am responsible, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Leader of the Opposition say yesterday about municipalities complaining about the fact that a lot of people in municipalities are complaining about increased taxes and the reason why they are complaining about increased taxes and why the different local jurisdictions had to increase their taxes is because they could not get any more money from government. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that is a very irresponsible statement, extremely irresponsible. I think most people realize today that in many municipalities where they are asking huge sums of money to come forward, \$1.5 million, \$2 million for a water system or a water and sewer system, when that municipality has a tax rate of twelve or fifteen dollars per year per person who is working, then it is unrealistic to conclude that under that tax arrangement that the government is going to be able to support that kind of a system. Both must go hand in hand. There must be a greater responsibility on the part of the municipality and simultaneously still a great responsibility on the part of government.

To say that the only reason why a municipality is putting up taxes is because the government will not give it any more money, that sounds like ten or fifteen years ago when it was quite current for a given community council or a local improvement district to come in and get its special grant of \$2,000 and walk away until the next year came around. I hope that we are getting away from that

kind of thing, that we are beginning to realize that there must be a pretty real partnership between the Department of Municipal Affairs and the local jurisdiction and that some means must be worked out to ensure that at least a municipality can, through its own tax revenue, raise enough to maintain the kind of system that they want the government to put in.

Right now we are hearing from many areas where they cannot even maintain that huge system. When you talk about millions of dollars, you are talking about a pretty sophisticated system which will take \$50,000 or \$60,000 per year just to maintain, let alone paying off the interest on the \$2 million. I think that the Leader of the Opposition's comments there were quite irresponsible, and I am sure that he really does not believe what he said yesterday but was just trying to make some political points because the television cameras were here.

Mr. Speaker, take, for example, in the area of forestry and agriculture, you talk about no new ideas. It is not new in this Speech from the Throne but it is new for this administration. For years the companies and so on could get away with almost murder as far as using up the forestry resources of this province where they could cut or not cut whenever they saw fit. Now, it is proposed under an act passed by this administration to put all the forest land in the province under some kind of management control whereby the company will have to indicate to government and government will indicate to the company that in this unit they must cut X number of cords because it is for the benefit of that block of timber, that those trees are overmatured and must be cut. This area now must be reforested because it has been cut out. Under this management plan that is now going into existence in a number of units, the company will have to show government how it intends to cut and utilize the forestry resources on that block of land. If government is not satisfied with that and goes back to the company, and the company does not comply, then the government can charge a tax on that particular part of that management unit.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: And reforestation is in it as well. That is right. There will be many - I do not know how many units there are now, thirty or forty management units around the province. That is a whole new idea. You talk about giving away resources and giving away the Lower Churchill and giving away, almost, on the Linerboard Mill until we took over power. Now, the same thing with giving away our forest resources. Now, we have attempted to bring some sanity into the forest sector. I do not think it is fully realized by many people, especially people who are not involved directly into the forest resource, just how much that will mean forty or fifty years from now. Because we have areas in my district of Green Bay where under this new management area, the company involved is going to be forced to cut 20,000 or 30,000 cords of wood per year because the block of timber of 250,000 or 300,000 cords demands that if we are going to have a productive forestry or trees in that area ad infinitum, you must cut X number of cords each year to keep the whole block moving and new trees coming up and the overmatured ones being cut down.

In generations to come people will say in this honourable House that one of the most significant acts ever undertaken by the administration of that day, along with the buy back of the Upper Churchill and perhaps how the jurisdictional dispute on offshore is arranged, one of the most significant acts will be that forestry legislation. Because very often our eyes are focused, because of the public and because of the fishery, upon the fishery, and that aspect of our economy is also important, that they fail to realize very often that the forest industry plays a very major role in the economy of this province and that it could only continue to do so in the future on a large scale by having this kind of control through the act that has been proclaimed.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, talking to officials in the Government of Saskatchewan and officials in the Government of New Brunswick and the Minister for Northern Saskatchewan. There is a ministry for that

in Saskatchewan. A lot of Northern Saskatchewan is somewhat similar to Newfoundland in its climate, in some of its geography and topography and in its resources.

He was mentioning to me that he had requested one of his officials, a few weeks previous to that, to obtain a copy of the Forestry Act that was recently passed in Newfoundland because they had heard about it. In New Brunswick, likewise, they had taken similar action. We have copied some of their ideas, and they have copied some of ours. I cannot stress, Mr. Speaker, talking about things being done differently and being done constructively, that a very responsible act was passed in this House for which people from generations hence will be very grateful to us that it was done.

Before I leave, just, Mr. Speaker, talking about Municipal Affairs a few minutes ago, it is mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, and I would just like to reiterate it here, that one of the major things now in the Department of Municipal Affairs is the Whelan's Royal Commission Report on Local Government in the province, that that report has been received and has been studied, almost clause by clause, by officials not only of the Department of Municipal Affairs but other departments, and that that report has now gone to the printers, and when we have sufficient copies, that will be released to the public through the medium of this House, if it is open, and I am sure it will be because that will not be too far in the future. I think that here again that this will form the basis of some fairly radical changes in the local government structure, taxation system, etc., the structure of the Department of Municipal Affairs and so on in the next two or three years.

Mr. Speaker, these are the kinds of things that you just do not do overnight. These are the kinds of things that must be worked out through having these kinds of commissions, letting them report and then getting public reaction to it, and then developing policies based on the report and the public reactions. That takes time. In the long run, it is worth it. It is worth the time.

I remember being somewhat anxious three years ago about the forestry policy, for instance, and was constantly told, well, you know, we want to get all kinds of opinions on this before we really go ahead with it, and in the final analysis, it was a better act

because it was allowed to take the normal, evolutionary flow of things rather than to hasten it just because of some political expediency.

I look forward with great anticipation to the release of this report and to obtaining public reaction to it because there are many, many recommendations in it that are somewhat a departure from the way the whole system of local government has operated so far in the province.

I should also mention, of course, the St. John's Region Urban Study and how that has progressed, and how we have seen by this process of enquiries and reports and so on that we are now getting a far better concept of how the whole St. John's region should be developed, because without the Henley Report, i.e., that second phase that has been in and released to the public, which indicates a more flexible attitude towards the rural parts of the whole region, you know, as opposed to what came before, there were quite a few rural parts of this region who were very concerned but the Henley Commission took a somewhat different approach and recognized the unique character of some of these more rural parts of the region, and so it is worthwhile.

Of course, it should also be mentioned that it is proposed in the Speech from the Throne, and I am sure that many of the municipalities in the province will be glad to hear that it is the intention of the government to improve the programme, the street-paving programme, which is now a fifty-fifty deal, fifty per cent of the money being funded by the department and fifty per cent by the municipality, that it is the intention of the government to increase the government's share to sixty per cent so that many other municipalities, smaller municipalities that could not afford, perhaps, fifty per cent of the share, could possibly find the resources to find forty per cent of the share. This has been an extremely successful programme and here is an

attempt by the P. C. Administration to improve it, to make it better.

In the field of housing, Mr. Speaker, suffice it to say, at a recent meeting in Ottawa of housing ministers, most of them were startled to find that the housing starts in this province were well up over what they had been the previous year, that we had a record housing start year, and they could hardly believe it, and were astounded. I think it was Saskatchewan or one of the western provinces who went to make a point at the national conference about, well, they had not had all that much success in housing but compared with British Columbia, and blah, blah, blah, you know, they thought they were doing all right until such time I quickly pointed out to that gentleman that, you know, albeit, he did fairly well or his province did fairly well, but we could boast of much better. I am pleased that through the efforts of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation that 4,911 starts last year were able to be made. It is anticipated in the present year, with the mortgage rates now starting to dip somewhat, that we will be able to improve on that.

The problem in housing, Mr. Speaker, is a very complex one, and land not being the least factor in it, especially as you get into the semi-urban and urban areas of the province, and the servicing of that land so that the building lots can be sold for a reasonable price. Perhaps that is the most important part.

I should like to say that I am somewhat disturbed that the federal government apparently does not fully appreciate the housing problem in this country. In recent meetings with officials of CMHC and of the Urban Affairs Office in Ottawa, we were astounded, and just about every province in Canada, to learn that the federal government were only going to increase the budget for housing in all of Canada from \$1.2 - \$1.4 billion, which means that they are not even going to take care of the inflation factor involved in housing, seeing that the costs have gone up so much,

which means that in this province, under the AHOP programme, which is the one that affects largely St. John's and a few of the more urban centres of the province, that if we do not get any more AHOP funds this year than we did last year, it is going to hurt the housing situation in St. John's.

In any event, we have requested CMHC officials, and the Hon. Barney Danson, to try to improve the financial contribution that CMHC intends to give to this province this year. We will be going back to Ottawa if our negotiations on the regional level do not prove fruitful.

These are all measures that are mentioned here in the Speech from the Throne. These are wonderful tidbits that we are showing the opposition of what this government are trying to do. Once again it is not what one would classify as grandiose. We should not come out in the Speech from the Throne and say about a great new residential programme that we are going to try to develop, using hundreds of millions of dollars, when in actual fact it is impossible to try to develop that kind of a programme in today's financial climate, in today's economic climate. It is an impossibility, and it is a dream, so hence we must look realistically at what is needed, and then how much we can do.

I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the business of the Lower Churchill and of the offshore rights. Suffice it to say, just last night, I was reading Section 37 of the Terms of Union, I think it is, in which it very clearly states that case that we are going to put before the federal government if and when we can no longer negotiate with them on who should have primary jurisdiction over that vital area of our province.

Overall, Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that this document, this Speech from the Throne, is a sound and realistic one, one that tries to deal and grapple with the real problems of the province today, not trying to blindfold the devil in the dark in trying to indicate that there are no problems, that we can continue to sound off with grandiose phrases about the kinds of developments that should happen

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: That is why they are going to heave you out down there.

MR. EVANS: Do not sweat about that. You will be hove out first.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, the record of this government this last three years is indeed a dismal failure. Every person in this province that I speak to are asking me, "What are they doing? What are they doing with the money? They are spending more money than ever before in this island province of ours and they are only spending it on the island section of the province." The member for Labrador West will agree with me on that.

Last year they spent two-thirds of the provincial budget this side of the Donovans Overpass alone. It appears that the same policy will be implemented this year.

MR. NEARY: How much are they spending getting from continent to continent.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, the record of this government is certainly a disgrace to any democratic, elected government that I know. They continue as they have done this past three years, and apparently are going to continue to run this province as a business and, Mr. Speaker, unless they can find a profit in this government they will not run it. But may I remind them that a business is run for profit alone where a province or a government is run for the benefit of the people. And the people of this province are not getting very much benefit from the government of the province.

Mr. Speaker, if ever the time comes when the Premier has got the intestinal fortitude to call an election he will definitely and very clearly find that out. The needs of our people in this province today are very simple. They are very basic, and they are very real.

Our needs are water and sewer, roads and jobs. There are many people throughout the province today, there are hundreds of communities where thousands upon thousands of people have not got a drop of water to drink. This is not only in my district. It is in possibly two-thirds of the districts in the province and still this government,

Mr. Speaker, and the present Minister of Municipal Affairs, fails to come to grips with this problem, fails to realize that our people need a drop of water to drink.

Mr. Speaker, this serious condition, this serious situation, continues to go on. The present administration apparently is quite happy to allow it to continue and the Premier just simply shoves it one side and hopes that it will go away, like he does the trawlermen's strike. He just simply hopes that the problems of this province will disappear.

But, Mr. Speaker, the problems of our people today will not disappear. They are real. They are there. They have to be faced. Solutions have to be found and the problem has to be overcome. Unless this government realizes that it is elected to solve the problems of our people then they will never be overcome, not until after the next general election and we are all hoping that this election will come very soon, Mr. Speaker, very soon indeed. Ninety per cent of our people are just waiting, waiting with anticipation to get into the polling booth to mark their "x".

It is a funny thing, you know, Mr. Speaker, Toryism in Newfoundland looks like some kind of foreign disease. It only happens every forty years, and thank God for that.

MR. NEARY: It is a cancer on our society.

MR. THOMS: However, our people are willing to suffer out this unhappy political situation we have until the next general election, which is not too far off, Mr. Speaker, not too far off.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. THOMS: The present administration, Mr. Speaker, was elected by the people but they are certainly not accessible to the people. Our people today find it very hard to reach the various ministers, although I must say this last three months, for some reason or other, it is possible now to get a scattered appointment. You can even get some of

Like 3,000 people altogether, the spin-off jobs were tremendous. Because we have not got these projects or new projects to take their place we are finding that the spin-off jobs were even greater than we anticipated.

When the government finds that in a labour force of only 187,000 you have 43,000 unemployed, it should certainly be concerned. They allowed the House of Assembly to lie idly by all during the month of January and February without reopening it to discuss this very serious situation, to try and come up with some solutions to solve the problems that face our unemployed, 43,000 people today.

Mr. Speaker, while this is a figure published by Statistics Canada it is not at all a true picture because many of our unemployed people today are on welfare. I would submit to you that eighty per cent of the people on welfare today, that is, the able-bodied section of it, would be all too happy to go to work on a paying job tomorrow morning, if the job was available. But the job is not available. From this document, if this is the intention of the present administration's next twelve months, which it is supposed to be, it is certainly not coming to grips with the problem of the unemployment in our province today. This is a disgraceful situation, the most disgraceful situation of our whole recorded history.

Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech of 1974, I asked the present government then if it would consider some kind of a plan to overcome at least part of the problem of unemployment. I believe at that time I was talking about something like 26,000 people unemployed, where today it is even more urgent when we have 43,000 people unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, this last four winter seasons now the federal government have seen fit to implement a Local Initiative Programme. Mr. Speaker, it has been very successful because it has created a number of direct jobs, basic employment. I am sure that one considers that if you create five jobs there are at least three spin-off jobs from it. So if the federal government creates 1,000 jobs directly it is possibly creating something between 1,600 and 1,700 jobs indirectly.

So, Mr. Speaker, during the Throne Speech debate 1974, I asked the provincial government if they would copy from the federal government and come up with a LIP programme of their own, and if they did not want to do that would they co-operate with the federal government and have both governments come up with a massive LIP programme. Because this is what we need in Newfoundland today, We need some kind of a massive creating programme to produce jobs for our people. If our people are given the chance to work, they will work.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I asked the government last year and I will repeat that request today, and I ask them, if they would consider and implement a crash programme to alleviate the massive unemployment that we have in our province today. This is one of the greatest problems we have. It is one of the greatest problems we ever had. It is with us today. It is real. Our people are suffering because this problem is not faced and a solution is not found. This should be the government's top priority today to eliminate, if at all possible, unemployment in Newfoundland, if not completely then partially. I fail to see, Mr. Speaker, why the present administration does not take upon itself the responsibility of trying to solve this very serious problem which we have with us today. It will not go away. It is not something that will disappear when the tide goes out. When the political tide goes out it will, most definitely.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the present administration have not implemented any programmes that would even partially alleviate this situation which we find ourselves in today. But, I believe, Mr. Speaker, and many of our people believe, that some kind of a massive work programme should be implemented, should be initiated by the provincial government.

If the present administration had any concern whatsoever for the people of this province, they would certainly follow my advice. Mr. Speaker, the federal government this year is spending over \$8 million to create jobs during the winter months for the people of Newfoundland. This is indeed a wonderful help. Had not we had this programme from the federal government we would very likely reach the 50,000 unemployment mark this year.

Mr. Speaker, the only small happy note that one can possibly find in the Throne Speech is under the heading of "Forestry" on page thirteen. Let me read it for you, Mr. Speaker.

"Newfoundland lumber will be able to compete effectively with mainland products as a result of new modern mills brought into operation in the last two years. Our own lumber will be used for provincial construction throughout the Province."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope the administration realizes what it has stated in the Speech From the Throne. I trust they will stick to their commitment, because, Mr. Speaker, it is a commitment to the lumbering industry of this province that in all provincial construction, that is, construction carried out by the provincial government, that local lumber wherever possible will be used. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that during the season of 1975 I will not be able to walk up to a provincial building and find that number two grade mainland lumber is being used in that building. I trust that I will be able to find that lumber produced in Newfoundland is used. I will certainly watch closely any government projects that have been carried out and are carrying out. I will indeed bring it to the attention of this House if I find anything amiss.

The present situation in the lumbering industry at the present time, Mr. Speaker, is indeed a very serious one. All of our sawmills, big and small, are in trouble. Bankruptcy is a common word.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. THOMS: Maybe some in British Columbia, but I am more particularly

worried about the ones in Newfoundland. We at the present time in Newfoundland are importing lumber from the mainland. All we are doing is supporting the sawmills on the mainland. We are allowing our own people to face bankruptcy. All of our mills, most of them, are at the present time closed down. Many of them that I know are not cutting at the present time because the inventories which they have on hand at the present time will suffice them for the coming season.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious situation and many of these loggers and many of these sawmill operators who are idle today will stay idle during the spring and summer months. I trust and I want the provincial government to make sure that these words in the Throne Speech are implemented and acted upon and enforced. I would like to see the provincial government give our small sawmill operators every protection possible from any dumping from the mainland portion of this nation of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, our whole agricultural industry is in trouble. Our hog industry, if it is to continue, must expand. At the present time, particularly on the east coast of Newfoundland, there is no room for expansion because of killing facilities. The same thing is true for the broiler industry. There is a little bit of hope on the west coast of the province because of the new facilities that were started there by the previous Liberal Administration some years ago, frozen for a time by the present administration but now it is continuing. When this comes into full operation this should place the hog and broiler industry on the west coast of the province in a very healthy condition, but still it leaves a vast problem on the east coast where our hog industry and our broiler industry, if not allowed to expand, well, I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, some of these operators will have to bow out to make room for others to expand. This is indeed a very serious situation.

The situation in our dairy industry is possibly the worst as far as any of the basic industries in our land is concerned. We have a continual flow of dairymen leaving the industry in Newfoundland

today. Some of them are leaving the industry altogether. Others are selling out and going to the mainland of Canada and setting up business. There are various problems involved there. The high cost of feed is one of the major problems. The absolute disregard for these problems by the present administration is a disgrace. They have not taken the bull by the horns. They have not met the problems. They have not come up with any solutions. They have ignored the problems in the broiler industry, the hog industry and the dairy industry completely. They just hoped that it would go away. Disgraceful, Mr. Speaker.

Unless we can allow our broiler and hog industries to expand they will die. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, we in Newfoundland are only producing fifteen per cent of our total consumption in the broiler industry and in the hog industry. There is a vast new area here for us to expand. Thousands and thousands of jobs can be created if we only could get the attitude of the present administration to change so that it can put some incentive and allow these producers to expand so that they can supply the local market.

The total revenue from our agricultural produce last year was something like \$11 million. The possible revenue is something over \$100 million. So, we are only taking advantage of ten per cent of jobs that could be created in this industry alone. Mr. Speaker, unless the attitude of this present administration changes and unless we can get a good minister in that portfolio, then we are going to be in trouble.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I wonder if the honourable member would like to adjourn the debate as it is five-thirty.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move adjournment of this debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bonavista North has adjourned the debate and will be given the opportunity to proceed next day. It is now five-thirty and I recognize the honourable member for Bell Island. The honourable member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, February 26, 1975 will go down in history in this Province as a sad, sad day for Newfoundlanders, a sad, sad day, Mr. Speaker, for Newfoundlanders who had hoped that their government, Sir, was going to outline specific plans if they had any, to implement some of the recommendations of the Food Price Review Report that come under the control of the Provincial Government. The programme for the session, Sir, which was opened yesterday, did not include one single item, did not include, Mr. Speaker, anything in the way of action on this report to help the hard pressed taxpayers of this Province. Why on earth, Mr. Speaker, would there not be anything in the Throne Speech about the Food Price Review Report?

I think, Sir, the reason for not seeing anything in the gracious Speech from the Throne is really because the Premier and his colleagues, during the past three years, Sir, in office have grown even more remotely removed from the people than we had suspected and we had thought all along. Yesterday's Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, should have contained some measures, if not solutions, to deal with the number one problem in this Province today, the high cost of living and galloping inflation. That Throne Speech, Sir, should have contained plans to deal with those factors, Mr. Speaker, in our cost of living that fall within provincial government control. We can talk all we like, Sir, about inflation affecting other parts of the world, the United States and Canada, but remember, Mr. Speaker, remember this, that the Food Price Review Board made ten recommendations and said that eight of those recommendations fall under provincial control. For example, Mr. Speaker, the Food Price Review Board in their report pointed out that there was unnecessary profit taking middle-men in the food industry in this Province and suggested that some action should be taken to correct this situation.

Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable, Sir, it is unbelievable, I could hardly hear or believe my ears yesterday, Sir, when His Honour read the gracious Speech from the Throne and not one single proposal to implement any of the plans or any of the recommendations that were proposed in that Food Price Review Report which was presented last November.

Mr. Speaker, everybody, everybody in this Province knows that the number one problem that we have facing us in Newfoundland today, the monkey on all our backs, Sir, is the oppressive provincial cost of living. I can promise this honourable House, Mr. Speaker, that those of us who sit over here in opposition, Sir, are going to use every means at our disposal, every parliamentary trick that we know, Sir, including the late show that we have on Thursday afternoon, we will do our best, Mr. Speaker, in this session to force the government to introduce measures to take some kind of action on the eight recommendations in the Food Price Review Report, Sir, that fall under provincial government control.

MR. ROBERTS: Well said.

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

HON. W.G. DAWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, since receiving this report from Food Prices Review Board we have been studying it and we have been consulting with other people on it, including the Board of Trade, and some of the recommendations, although they are very good ones, one recommendation in particular is that the report suggests that the Gulf service be upgraded and that the CN service in the Province be upgraded. I have written federal authorities with regard to this requesting that they accept their responsibility for the upgrading of the service in this Province and suggesting that they undertake immediately to upgrade the service, as recommended in the Food Prices Review Board Report. I have also written the Minister of Consumer Affairs in Ottawa requesting him to take the necessary action under recommendation number six where the report suggests that evaporated milk imported into the Province should be subsidized by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, one recommendation in this report suggests that there should be a more integrated and more competitive system of food marketing within Newfoundland, while at the same time contradicting itself by saying, referring to the present brokers system we have here, it is possible that this particular processor might actually - well, in relation to the broker system here in the Province, as opposed to having national wholesalers

sending goods into the Province from the mainland; and it suggests in the back of the report that because of the system we have at the present time, the brokerage system--it says it might actually have to raise the prices in Newfoundland if this system were dispensed with. So it is rather contradictory.

On the mainland they have national wholesalers which operate in various provinces. Well, practically all the provinces on the mainland, because they are linked by road, have these national wholesalers operating within their provinces. Because we have such a small population in Newfoundland and because we are not connected by road, we do not have the national wholesalers here in this Province. If we were to dispense with the local brokerage system and distribution system and leave it to these national distributors, then we would find that many hundreds of local Newfoundlanders would have to be laid off, the salesmen, the support staff of the brokers and distributors, and they would have to be replaced by mainlanders who would be hired by mainland firms and sent down here to do the actual work that these people are performing in the Province today. They would have to set up their own sales force and this would result, of course, since our retailers here by and large are small outlets and do not have the capability financially to order in large lots. We would find that less than carload lots would be coming into the Province, higher freight rates would be applied and, of course, this would be passed on to the consumer and our cost of living here would go even higher than it is at the present time.

The present system that we have, the brokers bring in huge lots of goods, whether it is food or dry goods or what have you, and as a result they get the advantage of having the full car loads and lower freight rates. We are also faced with, Mr. Speaker, the problem of expensive transportation through CN because of their dilapidated rail system. The fact that they are having so many derailments and the fact that the road bed is not in a good condition, in good repair, and also because of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that they are trying to operate mainland cars on our tracks, which adds to

administrative costs, it adds to maintenance costs. Our rails are narrow gauged. They were designed for cars with weights not to exceed 24,000 pounds. CN today are bringing in mainland cars loaded down to 70,000 pounds per car. This is tearing up the road bed. It is causing derailments. It is causing higher costs of maintenance and all of this, of course, has to be passed on and the consumer in the end has to pay the shot.

Mr. Speaker, we are attempting to do what we can on a provincial basis to ease the burden on consumers in this Province. As the Throne Speech said, we cannot impose price controls. That can only be done from a national level. If we cannot impose price controls then what else can we do? That is the question we are faced with.

MR. NEARY: - recommendations in the Food Price Review Report. There is what -

MR. DAWE: We have -The recommendations in the Food Prices Review Board, Mr. Speaker, do not adequately cover this problem.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I wish to inform the honourable minister that his five minutes have elapsed.

MR. DAWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Sit down, boy, and do not be making a fool of yourself.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, we are not letting the problem lie there.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Sit down - your time is up!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible

MR. ROBERTS: Senior member.

from Harbour Main. I mean does Your Honour - no, no, he is not in there, he is in the land development business not the bus business. I mean, you know what I mean, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is a teddy bear.

MR. SPEAKER: Anyway five minutes have elapsed. I recognize the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I must say, you know I have never been as thankful to have time elapse as after - I can see why the honourable gentleman is in charge of garbage.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the matter which I have asked to raise under this late show provision is a dereliction of duty and an example of hypocrisy by the gentleman for Fortune Bay who currently and tentatively holds the position of Minister of Finance. He at least holds the position, Sir, He may or may not be performing the duties.

Now, Sir, the law of this province in The Conflict Of Interest Act is quite clear. I would invite Your Honour, in case Your Honour has not memorized the relevant provisions, to consult No. 113 of the 1973 Statutes. It is found on page 1021 of that best selling volume, Volume 2 of the Statutes of Newfoundland, 1973. Article (4) or section (4), subsection (6) of that Statute requires that "The Auditor General has a duty to perform". The Minister of Finance is charged with the administration of the act, but this is not one of the duties that he is responsible for performing. He is responsible for ensuring that it be performed. It says that - I read subsection (6), Sir, "Unless the Auditor General is satisfied that there is a reasonable excuse for late filing and certifies so in writing, a failure to file a disclosure statement as required by this section renders the member who so fails ineligible for the remuneration to which he would normally be entitled for the period of failure. It is then up to the minister to administer that section."

Now, Sir, seven honourable gentlemen, all of whom have currently graced the opposite side of the House, neglected to honour the law, and neglected to follow the dictates of the law. This role of delinquents of men who think they are above the law includes the Premier; the Minister without Portfolio, as he then was, the Member for St. John's East; the junior Member for Harbour Main, the Minister of Industrial Development; the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Posters, the Premier's parliament assistant being the gentleman for Trinity North -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition or any other member should refer to an honourable member by his right position and title.

MR. ROBERTS: Why I did, Sir, with respect. I may have added a word or two which I thought was further descriptive of the gentlemen's duties. I thank Your Honour.

The gentleman for Placentia East who is a learned member, the gentleman for St. John's South who is a learned member, and the gentleman for Port de Grave who is not a learned member of the House. Sir, these seven men did not file within the terms laid down by the law. They may or may not have reasons. They may or may not have filed by now. That I do not know. What I do know was that the Minister of Finance has not lived up to his duty under the act. He has not told us whether these seven gentlemen have filed. I assume they all have. He has not told us whether the Auditor General has certified in writing that there was a reasonable excuse for late filing, There may have been. The Minister of Finance has said nothing. The press cuttings reveal that the Minister of Finance indeed is trying to say nothing, but he may or may not know what is happening. I suspect, he is once again showing us his well known lack of courage, the courage to do the right and proper thing. I think, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance should tell this House whether he proposes to enforce this law or not. The law says that "The honourable gentleman must certify". What must he certify? He certifies what he finds. If he finds that there is a reasonable excuse for late filing then the failure to file a disclosure statement does not attract the loss in remuneration. But if he does not so certify

then the penalties must be implied. It is a serious matter, Sir.

The minister can make sport of it. He can talk about 1996, and he can talk about delinquents and haw-haw. But there used to be a time when the minister was a man of principles. I would hope there still is. We will have an opportunity to look at that a little later when we come to look at the newest version of lease scandals involving an administration of which the minister is a member. He is the only man who has been in both administrations to have lease scandal.

Now I say, Sir, the minister has got to live up to his duty as laid down in this act. I say to the minister now -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: May I have the right to -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I wish to advise the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that he has used his five minutes.

MR. ROBERTS: May I finish the sentence, Sir, without the interruptions from the honourable gentlemen opposite.

HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: Not likely.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has used up his time. The Hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I think earlier in the afternoon I treated this question in a rather lighthearted manner. There is reason for it being that since the 15th. of January this issue which, in my opinion, is a virtual molehill has been tried to be made by somebody into a tremendous mountain, right from twenty-four hours after the reports were due the conflict of interest forms should have been in. There is continual barrage on me as to what was happening with this particular thing. My officials and myself were continuously checking into what was actually occurring. We had numerous letters from the Auditor General on this. Actually as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said, "There were seven members of the House who were late in filing".

MR. CROSBIE: Shame!

MR. EARLE: Now I should point out that this is a comparatively new piece of legislation, This is the second year of the enforcement of this legislation. I am afraid that not many members or a lot of members simply overlooked it. In other cases, and in fact in two cases of members of the House, they did not actually receive the reporting forms until two days after they were due. I do not know what happened to them in the mail, but in a couple of cases they were sent to the House of Assembly and the gentlemen did not pick up their mail here, and they did not even know that the forms were mailed to them. But quite apart from that the actual delinquency of these people was that there were four people who were a day late, four members who were a day late, There were three members who were four days late, and there was one member who was five days late.

MR. CROSBIE: Dock their pay.

MR. EARLE: Now I advised the Auditor General, as I was required, that we had written these people and asked them to give their excuse. And as the Act demands the Auditor General is suppose to write to me and let me know if the excuses were legitimate or otherwise or were acceptable to him. Up to this point I have not heard from the Auditor General as to whether or not the excuses are acceptable to him, so I cannot act on it. I cannot take any action on it until I hear from the Auditor General. The Auditor General has not informed me as to whether the excuses which he has received were legitimate or not. I suspect from the lists of names that I have, and the people involved, that a great many of them were legitimate excuses because I know that many forms, somehow or other in this new legislation, were sent to people who did not actually have to comply. Therefore this whole list - I have asked the Auditor General actually this afternoon to give me a complete story on it as it stands at this moment and I shall report to the House later. But as I know at the present time, I believe all of these people have complied that we are compelled to comply. I will be able to answer that correctly tomorrow. I hope that I shall also be able to say whether or not the reasons given the Auditor General

were satisfactory or not.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. House Leader.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion for adjournment by consent, we would just like to make a change in the rules while they are out at the printers in connection with this proceedings this afternoon. I have discussed this with the Leader of the Opposition, the change in Standing Order 31(g) so that it would say that "When a member is not satisfied with a response to a question he has to say that and give a notice." The rule now is that the notice must be given in writing to the Speaker not later than 4:30 of the clock the same day. Now on Thursday that creates a difficulty, so we suggest a change to say, it must be given in writing to the Speaker not later than 5:00 of the clock P.M. the same day or 4:30 of the clock on Thursday. The rule is that they have up until 5:00 o'clock every day to give you a notice but on Thursday we will change that to 4:30. And that Order 31(k) be amended to say that "Not later than 5:00 o'clock P.M. on any Thursday the Speaker indicates the matters to be raised at the time of adjournment that day." So they would have to give you the notice in writing by 4:30 and you have until 4:00 to say what is on the agenda.

So I would move it, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: So it is 4:30 on every day.

AN HON. MEMBER: 5:00.

MR. CROSBIE: 5:00 every day.

MR. ROBERTS: Except on Thursday when it is 4:30.

AN HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, we have been consulted and we consent to this change in the rules, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: All those in favour of the motion, "Aye". Those against the motion "Nay". The motion is carried.

It now being 6:00 P.M. I do leave the Chair until tomorrow, Friday, February 28, 1975, at 3:00 P.M.