



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR**

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

---

**Volume 1**

**Number 51**

**4th. Session**

**34th. General Assembly**

---

# **VERBATIM REPORT**

**THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 1970**

**SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE**

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair: (Mr. Noel)

HON. J.R. SMALLWOOD (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland Government Employees Association have made a public request that the Government postpone the coming into force of the new classification pay scale in the Civil Service and in hospital and other services paid for by the Government. The N.G.E.A. have publicly announced their approval of the classification system, but wish the Government to delay its introduction. The Government were strongly convinced of the need to have such a system when we engaged an experienced firm to undertake this work. We are more convinced than ever of the soundness of this plan, and its very great value to the civil servants themselves. We are being made aware that not all civil servants fully understand the plan as yet, and this may be the cause of their wish for delay in bringing it into force. We have considerable sympathy with this point of view of the civil servants, and we are prepared to discuss a postponement with the N.G.E.A., who have asked for it.

If the introduction of the new classification plan is to be postponed, the Government will be faced by a problem. We have agreed to find a total amount of \$6,000,000 to pay out in salary and wage increases this year, and this is absolutely the largest amount of money we can spend this year on this purpose without imposing heavier tax burdens on the people or cutting back still more on essential public services, such as education, health, welfare, road maintenance, municipal grants and so on. If the classification system is deferred for, say, a year, then some other basis or system of sharing the \$6,000,000 among the employees concerned will have to be found. In the search for a fair and equitable distribution of this amount of \$6,000,000 the Government would be glad to have the advice and assistance of the N.G.E.A. and of representatives of other bodies, such as the police and hospital workers. We would be glad to sit down with those representatives for this purpose. A committee of Cabinet, together with representatives of the Treasury Board and of the official side of the Civil Service have been appointed for this purpose and are prepared to meet immediately with representatives of the employees within and without the Civil Service.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

I must once again emphasize the fact that we cannot find the additional millions, over and above the \$6,000,000, that would be needed to meet in full the requests that we have received from all these employees without increasing the burden of taxes on the people, or cutting back still more on public services.

The sum of \$6,000,000 that we are finding for salary increases this year will be the largest increase ever to be paid out by the Newfoundland Government in a single year to the groups concerned.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and pleasure that I extend on behalf, not only of this House but of the people of this Province, a most cordial and respectful welcome today to one of the most distinguished visitors ever to appear in this Chamber. I refer to His Excellency the Ambassador of the United States to Canada, the hon. Adolph W. Schmidth. His Excellency lived most of his life, I believe, in the great state of Pennsylvania where for most of his career, before he entered the diplomatic service of his nation, he was a banker connected primarily with the Mellon Bank and Financial Interests. His last post before becoming Ambassador was that of trustee in the Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust. He is a distinguished American. Canada is fortunate to have so fine a man serve as Ambassador of his country to this country.

I am happy to welcome today a personal friend of a personal friend of mine because the Ambassador is a personal friend of the great president of the United States, President Nixon, with whom I have had the honour of a personal acquaintance.

His Excellency is accompanied today in this Chamber by a very warm friend of Newfoundland in the person of the consul general, Consul General Straus. I am sure the House joins with me unanimously in extending a very cordial welcome indeed to these two distinguished Americans.

I wish also to extend a word of very warm and cordial greeting to some forty young Newfoundlanders grade seven, forty of them from grade seven blue. I do not like that blue part of it, I would rather it were another colour but however -

MR. MURPHY: It is very significant coming from a Tory District.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am going to break the heart of the Leader of the Opposition, I am going to break his heart by telling him that this magnificent group of students from Mary Queen of Peace, these forty students, that this magnificent group is showing that although the name of their class maybe blue their hearts are in the right place. If the hon. the Leader of the Opposition could only see what the sign, the Joey sign, that is showing so prominently up there, if he could only see that he would never be the same man again. Wrong district how are you.

They are here with their teacher, one of their teachers, Mrs. Slaney, and we are so happy to welcome them here, young Newfoundlanders, handsome at least the boys are handsome, the girls are very pretty. I think the girls are better looking even than the boys and that is saying a lot, intelligent, good looking and their hearts are in the right place. They must have been very proud last night if they were up that late, they must have been so proud as young Newfoundlanders and young Canadians, so proud of the glorious victory last night in Quebec for liberalism and unity in Canada. They must have been very happy.

Ah, Mr. Speaker, it is hard to keep down liberalism in a great liberal nation and much harder to keep it down in a great liberal Province. Now I invite the Leader of the Opposition to get up with me here in this Chamber today and join with me, if he never did it before and never does it again, to join with me today in agreement with me that these are handsome and intelligent Newfoundlanders and that we are proud and happy to have them here with us today.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to join with the hon. Premier in welcoming His Excellency the Ambassador. I was very happy last night to share his hospitality with some other people in a lovely evening and unfortunately due to my habits I did not partake perhaps as much of his hospitality as I might have otherwise but I am very happy to see him here today and also this morning in a beautiful ceremony when the beautiful ring was presented to, the rededication rather of the class ring to Canada and I think it is going to be in our Province until May 22 or June 22 and I would urge anybody who has not seen it to visit the Arts and Culture Centre because it is a beautiful, beautiful thing indeed. It is beautiful, really beautiful and I think particularly all our school

MR. MURPHY:

children, perhaps it could be arranged by the Minister of Provincial Affairs to have our school children perhaps visit in groups to see this if they have not seen it already and I do not think too many have had the opportunity, I think it was at Expo I saw it there.

We are very happy indeed Mr. Ambassador to welcome you in this peoples House today and accompanied by a friend of yours there who is no stranger to this House. I think he is a more regular visitor than some of the members.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like, when I read this I thought it was Mary Queen of Peace on Torbay Road but after the Premier's talk I thought he must think they must come from some other part of the province if they are displaying a Joey sign, I do not know what it is but I presume that its from Torbay Road, the great Tory district of - Yes, I presume it is the great Tory district of St. John's East. There might be one or two that remembers the Premier every now and then, and also Mrs. Slaney who is in charge. When the Premier mentioned about it being so difficult to keep liberalism down I did pass a remark, I do not know if it was heard, and I said yes, people with weak stomachs must find it very difficult indeed.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would join with the hon. Premier in welcoming our distinguished guest, His Excellency, and also the pupils from Mary Queen of Peace and trust that what they see here will do them a little good. To His Excellency I will say, do not have it too long between visits. We would like to see you back again in the summer when you can see our beautiful Province at its best.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, we too would like to welcome His Excellency the Ambassador to the House here and we hope that he has an entertaining and educational few minutes while he is here with us and that he enjoys his visit and his trip to this Province.

I would also like to welcome the students from Mary Queen of Peace School and their teacher, Mrs. Slaney. The only thing that we were wondering on this side of the House. Mr. Speaker, since we cannot see these pupils, whether perhaps the sign read "Joey Who" as some signs have read that I have seen. That is one of those words that is not plainly distinguishable. We hope also, Mr. Speaker,

MR. CROSHIE:

that the students from St. John's East Extern will enjoy their visit to the House.

Before sitting down, Mr. Speaker, I have a question or two I would like to ask in connection with this ministerial statement of the Premier. One question is this: the Premier confirmed that the Government is now ready to negotiate or to meet representatives of the Newfoundland Constabulary before tomorrow at 2:00 P.M. and also ready to meet with representatives of the non-government hospital employees who of course have no association with the NCEA, can we take it that the Government is ready to meet with representatives of both those groups to discuss the matters the Premier mentioned in his statement?

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add to the statement I have just made, I think it is abundantly clear.

MR. CROSBIE: Well It does not appear abundantly or otherwise to us

MR. SMALLWOOD: I can only say Mr. Speaker, in the words of a famous philosopher, that I can explain a thing to a man but only God can give him the brains to understand it when I do explain it

MR. CROSBIE: You will obscure it more than anyone else in the House.

MR. HICKEY: Well Mr. Speaker, it looks like a warm afternoon. We are off to a good start. I would like to rise Sir, to add a word of welcome to these forty students from Mary Queen of Peace with their teacher Mr. Glynn. I did not know that I represented that great Liberal District. Something told me it was a Tory District and that was why I was here. The Premier says no, it is a great Liberal District. I can only remind the hon. the Premier Mr. Speaker, that if those students are showing a "Joey sign" then thank God they do not have a vote, and I will have to put my faith in their parents. I am sure that all the flattering he is doing this afternoon with those very fine students, and they are not going to bring it back to their parents and convince them because their parents have stood by us, this party for twenty-one years and I am sure they will continue.

I would hope Sir, that the students have an enjoyable afternoon. I am sure they have learned something already. I believe this is their first visit and I would take this opportunity Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet in welcoming those students of asking the Minister of highways if he would kindly look into a very serious traffic problem which exists right by this school on Torbay Road. I think what we would need would be some kind of flashing lights or a better crosswalk than the one that is there. At the recent opening of the K - Mart the traffic in this area increased tremendously and I fear for the safety of the children going to this school, having to cross such a very heavily travelled highway. I would ask him if he would be good enough to look into this matter and do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that those students have an enjoyable afternoon and I hope that they return some other day.

HON. W.N. ROWE (Minister of Community and Social Development): Mr. Speaker, before you get around to asking for petitions to be presented I wish to make a statement.

The purpose of this statement Mr. Speaker, is to give a more detailed outline of the preliminary or interim DREE program for this year, the year 1970 - 71. It must be understood Sir, that this interim or starter program is not the total five year program. It includes only those projects which will be started in 1970 and completed where possible during this financial year. Some of the projects cannot be completed this year and therefore will be continued and finished next year. Before this financial is ended as I have mentioned before the total five year program will be signed and is expected to be the first of three such five year programs.

Mr. Speaker, two tables are included in this statement. Table one gives a general summary of the projects in this year's agreement. Thus there is a total commitment, present commitment for municipal and industrial infrastructure so called including schools of \$26,520,000. of which nearly \$17 million will be spent during this financial year. Similarly Sir, there is a total commitment at present of \$44,470,000. over almost \$44 and one half million for road construction including forest access roads of which \$24,280,000. will be spent this year. These totals together with a fifteen per cent margin or leeway which I mentioned earlier amount to a present total commitment of nearly \$82 million of which \$47,390,000. can be spent during this present financial year.

In addition Sir, table 1A of this statement shows associated and related Federal Government commitments which are made possible by the DREE program. These associated programs bring the present total commitment resulting from the DREE program, to \$98,600,000. of which \$54,360,000. well over \$54 million will be spent during this current financial year.

Table two on the following pages of this statement give a more detailed breakdown of the projects, and I will go over those briefly Mr. Speaker, for the sake of the record

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.



MR. ROWE (W.N.): This is capital expenditure coming from the Federal Government. The hon. gentleman should know that Mr. Speaker.

Municipal infra-structure programs Mr. Speaker, water and sewage, some internal roads,

MR. MURPHY: Infra-structure, it is a word we are hearing so much now, and I am sure that not ten per cent of the people of Newfoundland know what it is all about. Break that word down.

MR. ROWE: Well it is a word that is used by planners, and especially Federal civil servants to cover things which we refer to perhaps as public services, capital public services, physical buildings, structures, water and sewage, school buildings, some internal roads, industrial infra-structure would be the physical plant for example which might be put into an area. It is the capital expenditures comprehensively referred to as infra-structure for the sake of brevity if not comprehension and simplicity.

So in the Mount Pearl, new town industrial park area Mr. Speaker, the agreement covers internal servicing, including water supply, sewer and access roads, for a total commitment of \$1,793,000. of which \$282,000. will be spent this year. There is also a trunk sewer and an advance factory which is the industrial infra-structure part of it for a total of \$440,000. of which half, \$220,000. will be spent this year.

For external servicing of that new town complex, there is a water supply, trunk sewer system, a sewage treatment plant, and a sewer outfall plant, which, together with land acquisition in the new town area, and together with the internal services I mentioned bring the total present commitment to \$4,123,000. of which nearly \$2 million will be spent in that area during this present financial year, \$1,887,000.

In Corner Brook Mr. Speaker, under the industrial park in that area, internal servicing and land acquisition will amount to almost one half million dollars as a total present commitment, and that total will be spent during this present financial year, \$492,000. That of course is not all for the Corner Brook area, that is only the industrial park aspect of it.

Then coming down to the residential sites program, the housing which, and the servicing for housing which will have to go into some of these municipal projects, we have a total of \$406,000, a total commitment of \$406,000.

all of which will be spent during this present financial year. That will include trunk sewer improvements in Corner Brook. Water and sewer trunk main extensions and Elizabeth Street upgrading in Corner Brook. Residential land acquisition in Hawkes Bay and Port au Choix, and Happy Valley, and servicing of that land, as well as the acquisition of it for a total of nearly one half million dollars to be spent during this financial year.

Municipal water and sewage systems under the DREE program Mr. Speaker, come to a total of \$4, 918,000. nearly \$5 million of which practically all will be spent this year, \$4,336,000. will be spent this year and it includes a water supply system for Holyrood at a cost of \$724,000., a sewage system for Holyrood at a cost of \$618,000., a water supply system for St. Lawrence at a cost of \$376,000., a water supply system in Arnold's Cove at a cost of \$400,000., a water supply system in Bishop's Falls which will cost \$1,826,000. nearly \$2. million for a water supply system in Bishop's Falls. Extensions to water and sewage systems in Corner Brook \$90,000., a water system in Hawkes Bay at a cost of \$364,000., and an outfall sewer in Hawkes Bay at a cost of \$34,000., and water supply system in Port au Choix at a cost of \$486,000. for a total as I have mentioned of nearly \$5 million to be spent on those projects.

There is an industrial water supplies program included as well Sir, at a cost of \$2,300,000. in Stephenville of which nearly \$2 million will be spent this year, \$1,800,000. on that industrial water supply program for the town of Stephenville.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): And for the paper mill

MR. ROWE: I beg your pardon?

MR. SMALLWOOD: And for the paper mill

MR. ROWE: And for the paper mill, that is right Mr. Speaker.

Next we come to teaching facilities, schools of all kinds, elementary schools, high schools, and vocational training schools. This is the DREE portion of it, it has nothing to do with the Provincial Government grant which may be made this year as represented in the estimates. The DREE program for teaching facilities this year include, an elementary school in St. John's East for a cost of \$1,292,000. of which over \$1 million will be spent in this present financial year. A junior high school in St. John's East at a cost of

nearly \$2 million, of which \$985,000, nearly \$1 million will be spent during this year. A high school to be constructed in St. John's West at a cost of \$2,640,000. of which \$1,420,000. just about half will be spent this year. And there is a vocational school extension in Seal Cove at a cost of, or as far as the DREE portion is concerned, at a cost of \$578,000. of which \$376,000. will be spent this year. There is provision for an elementary school in Creston at a cost of nearly \$1 million of which nearly \$800,000. will be spent this year. There is an elementary school to be built starting this year in Grand Bank at a cost of \$880,000., of which almost half will be spent this year, \$340,000., for a school in Grand Bank (elementary).

There is a high school to be built in Marystown starting this year at a cost of \$1,100,000. and it is hoped that that project will be completed this year. There is a provision for the total amount to be expended during this year. The hon. member is not in his seat, but he will be very happy to know that.

There is a vocational school extension in Burin at a cost to DREE of \$550,000. of which half will be spent this year and the rest in the next year. The extension will be completed.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Is this coming from the Tory Government in Ottawa?

MR. ROWE: No Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Premier probably knows, the Tory Government in Ottawa was defeated because they did not implement such a program before.

MR. COLLINS: Inaudible

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I will if I am permitted by the hon. member who I will be happy for his sake to state that, if I have not already, that there is a vocational school extension in Gander at a cost of \$550,000. to DREE, of which one half or almost one half will be spent this year. I am sure the hon. member will express his gratitude to me for the next two years.

MR. CALLAHAN: He does not want it

MR. NOLAN: Sure he will

MR. ROWE: The high school, there is a high school

MR. ROWE, W.N. There is to be a high school to be built in Stephenville, Mr. Speaker, at a cost of \$1,200,000 of which \$320,000 will be spent this year, and the remainder next year. A present commitment however of \$1,200,000. There is provision, Sir, for an Elementary School in Happy Valley at a cost of \$1,100,000, of which one-half will be spent this year and the remainder next year, at which time the school will be completed. And there is a provision for a Vocational Training School in Happy Valley at a cost to DREE, at a cost of \$1,423,000, of which nearly one-half will be spent this year, and the rest next year, when it is completed.

I might say, Sir, before going on that as far as the Vocational Training Schools are concerned, the amounts which I have mentioned is coming from DREE can be doubled because Manpower, the Department of Manpower will put in approximately an equivalent amount towards construction of those schools. This is part of what I was talking about when I said that there are other ancillary or associated expenditures to be made in this Province directly as a result of the implementation of the DREE program.

So, Sir, the sub-total for Vocational School Expenditure under this present first-year agreement is \$3,101,000 from DREE, you can double that, to about \$6 million, of which \$1,466,000 as far as the DREE portion is concerned to be spent this year. The other schools, the elementary and high school there is a total present commitment of \$11,182,000, of which \$6.5 million will be spent during this present financial year.

Next, Mr. Speaker, the road program under DREE, and first we will deal with the internal roads program as compared with the trunk road program. The internal road program generally connects towns close together, or are involved in construction within a town or a municipality or a city. The first one that we mention is the St. John's Harbour Arterial, of which people have heard about, which will cost in the vicinity of \$12,100,000, of which for the design and construction and land acquisition for that road over \$12 million, of which \$2,300,000 will be spent this year, and the remainder next year. Of course, there is some design work to be done

MR. ROWE: W.N. on that road, which will cut fairly deeply into this year, thus rendering it necessary to spend most of the money next financial year. But over \$2 million will be spent on that particular road during this present financial year. And there was a total commitment for the road from DREE under the present program of over \$12 million.

Then there is a provision for a road from Carbonear to the Trans-Canada Highway, the design and grading of approximately three miles between Carbonear and Harbour Grace, and a land acquisition comes to nearly \$ 1/2 a million all of which is to be spent this year.

Next, Sir, we have a road from Marystown to Grand Bank, and it is called an internal road, because it happens to be in that special area down on that peninsula. It is all contained within the special area. The total cost of that road, the design and construction of that road from Marystown to Grand Bank is over \$3 of which over \$2 million will be spent this year and the remainder next year. But there is a present commitment of \$3 million for that road.

Next, Sir, we have the road from Marystown to St. Lawrence, which will cost \$2,272,000 of which \$1.5 million will be spent this year and the remainder next year. And there is also a small provision for land acquisition for those roads.

Next, your Honour, there is a road to be designed and constructed from Bishop's Falls to Botwood, at a cost of \$615,000, all of which is to be spent, and that road completed during this present financial year.

Next, Sir, still dealing with the special areas, Stephenville-Roads and Bridges, which my hon. friend and colleague will be very happy to hear about, the reconstruction and paving of Highway 47 from White's Road Junction one and a-half miles west towards Stephenville, at a cost of \$80,000 all of which will be spent this year. The hon. Minister of Labour is also involved in some of these here I understand, Mr. Speaker, and he will be probably very happy to hear them. There is a reconstruction and paving of the access road from Route 47 to the Trade School and Harmon Industrial Area, this undoubtedly means something to those people who are involved in it. Route 47 elude me at the moment. But in any event, \$120,000 to be spent on that

MR. ROWE, W.N. particular road, all of which will be spent this year and construction completed. The building bridge over Main Gut at a cost of \$800,000, \$100,000 of which will be spent this year, the remainder next year, but a total commitment for that project of \$800,000. Then there is the Barachois Brook Bridge at a cost of \$320,000 of which just about half will be spent this year, and the job completed next year, Mr. Speaker.

Next there is the Corner Brook Harbour Arterial Road, the design and construction and land acquisition for that road comes to a total of about \$4,300,000, of which just over \$1,300,000 will be spent this year, Mr. Speaker, and the remainder next year. So we have a total commitment for these internal roads, as they are called

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that from the Independent Liberal Government somewhere?

MR. ROWE: No, Mr. Speaker,

MR. GALLAGHAN: Separatist, separatist,

MR. WELLS: It is from a real Liberal Government.

MR. ROWE: Yes, the same Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker, which the hon. member from St. John's West has attacked vehemently a week or day a two ago for being gutless.

MR. SPEAKER (NOEL): Order, Order, please.

MR. ROWE: And he wanted the separatist in Quebec to get in, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He certainly improved since Saturday Night.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, may I continue

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The minister is either giving a ministerial statement or he wants a debate, and if the minister wants a debate on anything I have said, I am ready to debate it right now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Bully boy, bully boy, bully, boy

MR. CROSBIE: Fuehrer, fuehrer, fuehrer,

MR. SMALLWOOD: Fuehrer, poorer, bully boy.

MR. ROWE: May I continue, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: A ministerial statement, on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, a ministerial statement there is nothing in the rules to permit the ministerial statement. It is permitted by the members of this House, and we do not have to sit here, Mr. Speaker, and listen to political tripe while the minister

MR. CROSBIE: is allegedly giving a ministerial statement.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Go out, go out, you cannot take it.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. gentleman is not going to walk out of this House, he will have to be carried out, before he goes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He cannot take it.

MR. SPEAKER: (NOEL) If he was giving out marks he would have to give fifty percent to either side. Would the minister please continue with his ministerial statement.

MR. ROWE: W.N. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The total as I was saying before I was provoked, Mr. Speaker, a total of \$24 million to be spent on these internal roads and bridges of which nearly \$9 million will be spent this year, and the remainder committed now, but to be spent next year.

Next, Sir, we come trunk road program, some of which will be included in some of the special areas we have heard about, but the greater proportion of which will be, these roads, a greater number of these roads and the amount of mileage of these roads will be done outside the special areas.

The trunk road program includes the road from Hoobies to Marystown at a total cost of \$11,667,000, of which over \$8 million will be spent during this present financial year and the remainder next year.

Next, Sir, we have a road to be built from Port aux Basques to Burnt Islands at a cost of \$890,000 all of which will be spent during this present financial. And nearly a \$1 million to be spent on that road, Mr. Speaker.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I am very personally happy to be able to report to the House that there is a road to be built, constructed and paved from Baie Verte to the Trans-Canada Highway at a cost of \$2,500,000, all of which will be spent during this present financial year.

Next, Mr. Speaker, there is a road to be design and construction of two portions of road, one road, but two portions of road from Lethbridge

MR. SMALLWOOD: Thank God, it is going to the Liberal Party.

MR. CALLAHAN: Alleluia.

3139

MR. ROWE: I must say, Mr. Speaker, nothing gives me more pleasure to mention this next item, because I know what a great deal of pleasure it will give my hon. friend the member for Bonavista South.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. BARBOUR: Mr. Speaker, are we going to continue.....

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order, please. Before the minister continues, I would like to remind visitors in the Galleries that the House is not suppose to be aware of their presence by laughing or clapping or movement of that nature. It maybe difficult at time to restrain yourself. Would the minister please carry on.

MR. ROWE: W.N. Mr. Speaker, the road is from Lethbridge to Bonavista, and as I said it is broken up into two portions, the Lethbridge to Trinity road, which is to be designed and constructed at a cost of \$2,370,000 of which \$1,260,000 will be spent during this present year. And the other portion of the road from Trinity to Bonavista at a cost of \$1,700,000 of which \$1,395,000 will be spent during this present financial year. Over \$2.5 million of road work and construction to complete that road, will not to complete it, over \$2.5 million Sir, to be spent this year and the remainder next year, and that road will be completed, paved, and the hon. member will probably spent either more time in his district, he probably spends more time than any other member now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: He will do that, Mr. Speaker, as well, I am sure he will be there. There is a road from

MR. BARBOUR: He can even visit the Barbour Room.

MR. MURPHY: Right.

MR. ROWE: There is a road to be built from Harbour Breton, to Bay D'Espoir at a cost of nearly \$1 million,

MR. HICKMAN: How does that grab you, ah!

MR. ROWE: I am glad to see the hon. member is happy, Mr. Speaker. a total



MR. ROWE: of \$1 million on that road, all of which will be spent during this financial year.

Next, Sir,

MR. SMALLWOOD: If my hon. colleague will permit me, that is not all in that direction this year.

MR. SPEAKER:(NOEL:) Carry on.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Next, Mr. Speaker, there

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are not announcing the election today.

MR. ROWE:W.N.: Not today, no. There is a forest access road program, Mr. Speaker. There is a forest access road to be built in the Roddickton Area, a \$108,000; and Sop's Arm Area \$52,000; Parson's Pond Area \$18,000; Central Newfoundland \$60,000; and Eastern Newfoundland \$30,000 on forest access roads this year.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: There must have been some mistake somewhere, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing at all in this program for St. John's Centre. I will have the matter checked out as soon as I finish the statement.

MR. ROWE: F.W. The areterial road will not hurt, will it?

MR. ROWE, W.N. Now, Mr. Speaker, if I might be permitted to

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: W.N. Mr. Speaker, I am full of sympathy for the hon. members on the other side.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Look at the long faces.

MR. ROWE: W.N. The squirm in their seats, as these projects are given out. I could like to continue my statement, if you can protect me from them. The Hickman Highway. The Hon. member for Burin, Mr. Speaker, played a great role in his project. I saw his nose in my office probably, no, I did not see his nose in my office no. I do not think I got a word from him on it. Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. CALLAHAN: You better watch out, they will be after you.

MR. ROWE: W.N. There are a number of other associated expenditures which I will not go into in any detail.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE:W.N. This is hurting the hon. gentleman so much, Mr. Speaker, he cannot stand to hear any more.

MR. CALLAHAN: Maybe we should drag it out for two or three days.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Added to these, Mr. Speaker, there are certain DREE studies, which will be paid for by DREE. The Industrial Park study will continue in the Mount Pearl, new town area. There is a major water supply study in the works for the new town area. There are forestry studies, and minerals studies not of which have been designated any money at this point, but which will as the year goes on receive substantial injections of money from DREE for the purposes of conducting these studies. And Manpower needs, there is a study on that as well. Added to that will be the resettlement agreements which is now \$2.5 million every year from DREE. And a Rural Development Agreement which is not yet signed, but presently being negotiated which will probably amount to over a \$1.5 million under this present year's agreement, it may go above that, that can only be an estimate at this time.

And in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, there will be certain continuing ADB Projects, which DREE will be assuming, which hon. members can read from the table which I have attached to this statement. These tables, Sir, do not include any industrial incentive which can be made available by DREE in the form of cash grants to industries and firms looking to set up or expand operations in this Province. Nor Sir, do they include expenditures by other federal governments departments, like the Department of Public Works on such matters as the \$16 million to \$18 million commitment for the Come-by-Chance wharves. Of the totals provided directly by DREE, seventy-five percent will come to the Province as outright cash grants and twenty-five percent in the form of loans. All of the money whether by grants or by loans is to be provided by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. minister satisfy me on this, this program that he is now announcing -

MR. CROSBIE: To a point of Order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Premier refused to answer our question, on the ministerial statement, and I object to his asking

MR. CROSBIE: he has obviously planted question, when one of his minsiter's is making a statement.

MR. WELLS: It was ruled out yesterday.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am not planting, I am asking a question that no one has planted. Would the hon. gentleman explain his statement by telling me whether this program of \$95 million is the same program to which somebody objected, and said he hoped, he wish that it was not coming to Newfoundland? Is this the same program?

MR. ROWE: W.N.: Yes, I think this is the program, Mr. Speaker, which a certain gentleman objected to, unless there is another program somewhere which he has worked, that same gentleman is working a \$100 million, that might be the case.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It maybe, in any event Mr. Speaker, some of the project such as the construction of roads will be paid for by 100 percent grants from DREE. Other projects such as the construction of schools

the construction of schools will be paid for by a seventy-five per cent cash grant together with a twenty-five per cent loan and still others such as; water and sewer systems are on a fifty per cent grant and fifty per cent loan basis. The loan feature...

MR. WELLS: Would the hon. minister permit a question?

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Sure, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WELLS: Would he advise the House what is the involvement of the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion? I realize it is not contained directly in this, but what is the involvement of that department in the wharf at Come-by-Chance? When it was announced that department's name was announced along with it. It was done on behalf of both ministers. Would he tell the House that involvement?

MR. ROWE (W.N.): It is not part of this program, Mr. Speaker, but I do not mind giving a general statement on that, a general explanation. The DREE program, as I have announced it here includes those portions of Federal expenditure which ordinarily provincial governments, under the constitution, are required to pay for it and in certain provinces of Canada, the revenues of the provincial government are not sufficient to meet some of these basic capital needs; so DREE was set up, as far as this type of program is concerned, DREE was set up in order to lift off the provincial governments part of the burden of providing these provincial capital requirements. Things like a wharf in Come-by-Chance is something which would ordinarily in any event come under Federal jurisdiction. The same would apply to parks. That does not mean that DREE - actually what it means is this: that DREE will be the co-ordinating department of the Government of Canada for certain expenditures in various provinces.

AN HON. MEMBER: All wharves.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Not necessarily, Mr. Speaker, but DREE will be involved very closely in all capital expenditures by the Federal Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Economic.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Economic expansion and all these things. Obviously DREE has to be involved in them, because DREE is the department set up.

MR. SPEAKER (NOEL): Order please. I think the Speaker has been a little neglectful in his duty in allowing the hon. minister to be interrupted while he is making a ministerial statement. Now we have had one from both sides, and I think the minister should continue his statement without interruption.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): The loan feature of DREE as I have said or as I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, is applied, the loan feature is applied where possible to the types of projects which can be expected to repay the loan through sales or user charges or stumpage or assessments; thus, although the loan is made to the province, the provincial government is required under the agreement, the provincial government will transfer the loan to the municipality, the educational authorities, the housing corporation or other agency which will then be responsible for the repayment of the loan. Thus, Sir, I am told by our financial advisers of this Government that these loans which will be made at Federal Government interest rates of terms of up to twenty years can be presented to the financial world as being distinct from direct debts of the provincial government but rather as in the nature of contingent liabilities since they are not a direct charge on the government's revenues.

MR. SPEAKER (NOEL) Order please.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Speaker, it is to be noted that this first year, DREE program. But, Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with the hon. member?

MR. SPEAKER (NOEL): The Speaker just ruled that the minister should continue without interruption until his statement is finished and then a few questions may be asked by the leaders.

MR. ROWE: It is to be noted, Sir, that this first year DREE program does not cover all sectors of the total development program. For example the Fisheries Development Program must fit into the emerging, Federal Fisheries

Program and, therefore, cannot be completely set out until Federal policies are fully determined in this regard. Similarly, forestry, mining and agriculture programs have not yet been finally determined owing to the complexities of these particular sectors of our economy. DREE is providing some money for certain aspects of these sectors and will be helping us financially to make further studies. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we are working towards the time in the near future when DREE can provide us with very substantial financial help for the full development of these resources.

Before closing, Sir, a word should be said about the special areas' concept which DREE has developed. As far as municipal infrastructure is concerned which I have already described, development is being concentrated in eight special areas already announced for the first year. However, it is important, Mr. Speaker, that this policy be looked at in the light of the following additional considerations. Other special areas will be designated later. As a result of negotiations by this Government, DREE has already indicated that they are willing to add at least three more special areas to the present list and we can expect money to be spent on the infrastructure by DREE in at least these three areas, four areas after the signing of the main agreement later this year. Secondly, Sir, public service needs in other areas of the Province are being considered as formerly under the total Provincial program. In this regard, of course the Province's job in this respect is made somewhat easier as a result of DREE money being spent in the special areas; since the financial burden is lifted off the Provincial Government to that extent. Thirdly, Sir, the special area idea applies only to the type of infrastructure program which I have already mentioned. The other DREE programs will largely take place in other areas of the Province and therefore, DREE money will be spent on such projects; the trunk road program; a forestry development program; access roads in the first roads; mineral development; and the resettlement program, both inside and outside of the special

areas. It should be clear, Mr. Speaker that DREE spending in this Province will have its effect felt in all areas of the Province, not only because money is to be spent by that department outside to special areas, but also because the Provincial Government will be financially freed to the extent of DREE 's own expenditure and will, therefore, be enabled to pay special attention to the needs out the areas designated by DREE.

Finally, Sir, it should be noted, as stated on many occasions that the DREE program represents a very specific and precise selection of projects designed to promote and facilitate economic expansion. That is a Federal policy over which provincial governments have very little, if any control. Nevertheless, Sir, this Government has made certain that within the limits of that policy and within the limits of the very restricted total amount of money available to DREE for the 1970-71 agreements, Newfoundland's share is as large as human ingenuity, perseverance, industry, argumentation and planning nan possibly make it.

I have copies of this, Mr. Speaker for members of the House and for the press.

MR. CROSBIE: I would like to ask the minister a question following this ministerial statement. Would the minister tell us or confirm for us that the proportion of this program which is being advanced by way of loan from the Federal Government - do these loans have to be repaid? That is my first question. No matter how the Government is going to treat it in their accounting system, do they have to be repaid at some time and would the minister tell us whether or not it is a fact that <sup>if</sup> this \$18 million was not now being made available in DREE for this wharf at Come-by-Chance, there would have been a further \$18 million available for other DREE projects in Newfoundland?

MR. ROWE (W.N.) Well less than a quarter. One-quarter of the direct amount coming from DREE is by loan. Yes these loans have to be repaid. The loans have to be repaid, Mr. Speaker, over a period of what twenty years at Federal Government interest rate. Perhaps a point above what the Federal Government itself can borrow its money for.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, I have been closely involved in negotiations for this DREE program ever since the inception of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. There has never been any indication or intimation of any kind that the amount to be made available for the wharf came out of the amount which would have been in the DREE program, that it lessened the amount, that the two projects, the two types of projects are related in anyway. They are entirely separate, Mr. Speaker. Each stands on its own merits as far as I am able to determine, and I have no knowledge that the case is otherwise.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to the House that this huge sum of money that has been made available to us this year from the government of Canada, relieves the Newfoundland Government of finding that much money and we are, therefore, this year able to spend money in other parts of the Province other than those that are in this ministerial statement. In other parts of the Province not covered by the amounts mentioned by my hon. friend and, therefore, tomorrow..

MR. CROSBIE: On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. What the hon. Premier is saying now is not a ministerial statement. The minister has delivered a ministerial statement. Now if we are going to be permitted to debate this, well and good, we do not mind at all debating it, but what the hon. the Premier is doing now is not a ministerial statement. He can speak on this in the Budget Speech. He can speak on this in the Estimates. There is a dozen occasions. Now he is trying to enter into debate on the statement made by the hon. minister.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am making a ministerial statement and I am not debating, and I am making this declaration to the House that on tomorrow..

MR. SPEAKER (Noel): Just a moment please. I would like to check my ruling on that. When a minister rises in his place to address the House, it is always very difficult for the Speaker to determine whether or not this is a ministerial



statement or not. Now ministerial statements are supposed to be limited to the giving of information to the House and since the person making the statement is a minister of the Crown, if the minister puts it as a ministerial statement, the Chair has very little alternative but to accept it as a ministerial statement provided the minister is giving the House information and, therefore, there is really no point of order there.

MR. CROSBIE: Point of Order. If what your Honour says was to be literally adhered to, we could spend day after day here with ministers popping up, stating or giving the House information on ministerial statements. What the hon. the Premier is saying now is covered in the Budget Speech. It has been said in the Budget Speech that the money made available by Ottawa from DREE would relieve the Newfoundland Government so that it can spend more of its own money on other procedures. There is nothing that the Premier is now saying that was not already said in the Budget Speech, and he is abusing. He is abusing the use of a ministerial statement.

MR. SPEAKER (NOEL): Order please. Carry on.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the ministerial statement that I am endeavoring to make is this: that the areas of our Province not covered in the ministerial statement that we have just heard, the other parts of the Province for which DREE is not spending any money this year, are to be covered in a statement by the Minister of Highways who will give the Government's program of road work this year in the parts of the Province not already mentioned in the previous ministerial statement and on Monday by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to cover certain other aspects of this year's development program; so that on tomorrow and on Monday, the House will get ministerial statements to supplement and augment the ministerial statement we have just heard, but with application to the parts of the Province not covered in the ministerial statement just heard.

MR. CAULAHAN: Mr. Speaker, I have two announcements to make to the House which I think will be of interest to farmers and those engaged in any sector of the

agricultural industry in this Province. The first statement, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the proclamation this day of the Natural Products Marketing Act, 1966-67 which provides for the creation of the Newfoundland Marketing Board and other marketing agencies, and I have pleasure, Sir, in announcing to the House the names of the members of the board appointed under that Act.

To be chairman, the present Director of Agriculture in the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, one of the most senior civil servants in the Province and one of the most knowledgeable persons in the Province in Agricultural matters, Mr. A. C. Badcock. The members

MR. CALLAHAN: members of the Board, Mr. Badcock Mr. Speaker, will be the full time chairman. The members of the Board are to be Mrs. Lind of Grand Falls and Godden Tilley of Robins, and the intention I think, Mr. Speaker, is obvious, namely to provide the Board in the first instance with geographical representation in Central and Western Newfoundland, and in the second instance in the appointment of Mrs. Lind to provide for some consumer interest, or consumer representation on the Board. The main function of the Board, Mr. Speaker, will be to insure the orderly marketing of certain natural products being agriculture products, in response primarily to the needs and desires of the agriculture industry. The agriculture industry in this Province today in terms of our size our population is a very important industry which employs some 3,500 people, and which products valued at approximately \$16 million a year. Now, Mr. Speaker, the implementation of legislation to establish the Board, and this is what I am announcing today, brings us up to date with marketing activities which have been going on in other provinces of Canada for many years.

There are today some 120 farm products marketing agencies of various kinds, currently operating in the other nine provinces. And as of this moment there is no such agency in operation in Newfoundland. We have deferred to the disappointment and frustration perhaps of some producers, deferred until now the proclamation of the Act, and the appointment of the Newfoundland Marketing Board for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that for approximately two years there have been going on Federal-Provincial negotiations with respect to the establishment of an over-all national marketing council, and this council, this national marketing structure to ensure orderly supply management across the country now is being established under so I will be certain Sir - Bill C197, which is an Act To Establish the National Farm Products Marketing Council and to Authorize the Establishment of National Marketing Agencies for Farm Products. That Act C197, Mr. Speaker, is presently before the House of Commons, having been given first reading

on the 17th. March. Our feeling was that we should not introduce marketing structures in this Province until we could see what the national structure would be, and how we would infact fit into it and mesh with it. Mr. Speaker, it is necessary in the Government's opinion so that Newfoundland might benefit from the operations of the National Farm Products Marketing Council, that this Province be represented by a Provincial Marketing Board under the authority of appropriate provincial legislation. The legislation has been on our books now for some three years, but we have held off, as I said in order to be sure that we would be able to mesh with the Federal legislation, and our most recent comparison of our legislation to the new Federal Act indicates that there will be difficulty. One other word that I should say about this, Mr. Speaker, is that in the operation of marketing legislation, in the legislation we have, provision is made to establish schemes for the promotion control, regulation or prohibition of the marketing of any agriculture product, and indeed to constitute local Boards to administer such schemes. It is not our intention in any way, shape or form that the Government as such or through the marketing Board, will actually operate the marketing schemes for particular products, and I think it is important, Sir, that this be understood. Any scheme that is undertaken for the orderly marketing for the supply management in respect of any agriculture product, will be undertaken by the producers, by the farmers themselves. Any Boards set up to deal with particular products will be producer Boards. The function of the Newfoundland Marketing Board, Mr. Speaker, roughly will parallel the functions of the Public Utilities Board of this Province. The Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities, in that a group of producers who wish to establish some kind of orderly marketing scheme, or scheme for orderly marketing, will have to make application in the proper way to the Newfoundland Marketing Board appear before the Board, possibly in public hearings, and indeed there will be. I think I can safely say public hearings and the Board will make its decision on the basis both of the validity of the application

and the supporting evidence, and taken together with that, the entire public interest. And this is why as I have indicated, we have a lady on this Board because we think the public interest in the consumer interest will thereby be represented. And in addition to that of course, the lady in question is a very excellent choice, both she and Mr. Tilley of Robinsons are outstanding citizens of the sections of the Province they represent.

Mr. Speaker, within the framework of the policy as I have generally enunciated it, it is our view that the implementation of this marketing legislation and the establishment of the Newfoundland Marketing Board will greatly improve the marketing of the products of the agriculture industry in this Province, and also the welfare of those engaged within, that industry while at the same time insuring the consumer because if the agriculture industry is not aware of consumer needs and demands, it cannot be successful, the second objective therefore, is to insure the consumer will get a fair return on his dollar. The second thing I wish to announce, Mr. Speaker, is that as a result of representation made by this Government to the Government of Canada, at the request of and behalf of dairy farmers, the hog industry, the poultry and broiler industry - and other segments of the agriculture industry in the Province. We have been advised as to today, I have a letter which came to me just before I came to the House Mr. Speaker, from the Federal Minister, the Hon. H.A. OLSON, the Federal Minister of Agriculture, which advises that the expected or proposed reduction in the subsidy on feed grains, the freight subsidy will not take place this year. Mr. Speaker, it had been proposed and indeed a national task force very strongly suggested about a year ago, that the subsidies paid by the Government of Canada to lower the freight rates on feed grains for agricultural purposes be eliminated altogether.

Last Fall when it became known that the Budget of the Canadian Livestock Feed Board for this year, or at least of its Estimates, would be reduced by some \$5 million. There was very much concern on the part of people in this Province, farmers in this Province, and I might say on the part of

this Government. And we immediately made representation to the Federal Minister, Mr. Olson and our Newfoundland minister in the Canadian Cabinet the Minister of Transport, Mr. Jamieson. I am very pleased Sir, to announce today that while it is not possible to accurately determine the total feed grain demand twelve months ahead, or to say precisely where this matter will go in the long term, that the rates of assistance, the rate of subsidy which lowers very materially the freight rates on being imported into this Province, will not be changed this year. The import of it Mr. Speaker is that without the subsidy, many of our farmers would not exist. We cannot in this Province grow <sup>and</sup> grains . . . winter feeds, and therefore, we are totally dependent or almost totally dependent on imports from other parts of Canada in order to procure a feed for the various phases of agriculture I have mentioned. And so I am very pleased Sir, to tell the House and I am sure the farmers of this Province will be very pleased to learn that in this year at least, as a result of the representations we have made, there will not be a decrease in the rates of assistance on feed grain subsidies.

MR. MURPHY: Will the hon. Minister permit me one question? With reference to geographical representation on this marketing Board, who is the Eastern representative?

MR. CALLAHAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Mr. Badcock, who is the chairman, and who is equally a member of the Board with the other two, will be the full time chairman, and indeed resides in St. John's. He will be moving out of the department to be full time chairman of the Board. I think the Eastern sector of the Province which is a fairly compact region in any event, will be fairly represented.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, and I do not want to get into a debate, but it seems rather strange to me when Mr. Badcock has been with the department for years and a Civil Servant, and the other two people apparently are just independent people familiar with farming. It is rather significant why one of our farmers on the East Coast have not been invited to go on this Board.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, and I am glad the hon. gentleman asked the question because it is an important point. Neither of the other persons, the other members of the Board, Mr. Speaker, is engaged in farming or in agriculture in any way, and it was our intention that we not have farmers on this Board. This Board, Mr. Speaker, has to be completely above the possibility of reproach as to have complete integrity, and to have agricultural producers of persons involved in agriculture production on the Board, would prejudice very seriously the Board and their own position when an application from a group of producers came before the Board. So what we have done is find two very excellent citizens who with the most experienced man the Government has, whom we are willing to devote to this because this is a very important matter. These two persons with the most experienced man we can find in the Province, I think, will give every producer who comes before the Board, and indeed every member of the public, who may come to represent a consumer view, a very good and close and respectful hearing, but to have producers and farmers on the Board, Mr. Speaker, would frustrate the intention of the Board, which is that it not only provide a means by which farmers can come together and legally and with the law of their side control agricultural production in marketing, but also that the total consumer interests be protected with no possibility, with no shadow or shade of suspicion attaching to the Board, or to anybody else.

just to get the record straight.

MR.SPEAKER: Order please! The hon. member cannot ask a question on a ministerial statement.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

HON. J.R.SMALLWOOD(Premier): Mr. Speaker, Question 488 on today's Order Paper in the name of the hon. member for Burin. The answer is as follows: The Economics Branch of the Bank of Montreal; in Montreal; The Department of Finance of the Government of Canada; The Department of Regional Economic Expansion of the Government of Canada; The Department of Energy of the Government of Canada and the American Firm of Stone & Webster Engineers of New York City.

Question No. 489:

MR.CROSBIE: A supplementary question Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. the Premier inform the House whether the studies will be made available to the members of the House?

MR.SMALLWOOD: They will not be made available, Mr. Speaker.

MR.WELLS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In the light of this answer would the Hon. the Premier also tell the House if it was the same people who provided the figures that are reported on page 23 of the Budget Speech that the costs for this current year would be \$3,982,000 when indeed the estimates showed to be \$6,752,000, who did the figures?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR.WELLS: They did not. I did not think so.

MR.SMALLWOOD: Question No. 488 on today's Order Paper (2) spread over a period of a good many months, no particular date, many many dates.

Question No. 489, on today's Order Paper in the name of the hon. member for Burin the answer is that this is privileged and confidential information.

Question No. 495, on today's Order Paper in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West, the answer to the first part is no, (2) If we do we will let the hon. gentleman know in due course.

HON.L.R.CURTIS(Min. of Justice): Mr. Speaker, in reply to Question No. 497, I have received no resignation or request for pension. (2) does not apply.

HON.W.J.KEOUGH(min. Of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer



to Question No. 487, on today's Order Paper in the name of the hon. member for Burin.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I missed it, on the answer just given by the Minister of Justice on 497 if he will permit it. In the light of the answer given by the hon. the Premier to 495, is that the resignation of Chief Pittman was not requested and the answer just given by the Minister of Justice that he has not tendered it how was it able to be announced? It was announced earlier, he has not given it and has not been requested how could it be announced?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour did he answer, did the minister of Labour answer a question if so which one was it?

MR. KEOUGH: No. 487 on today's Order Paper.

MR. CROSBIE: Which Order Paper?

MR. KEOUGH: Today's.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. CROSBIE: I would like to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance. And the urgent matter, or the matter of urgent public importance is, the matter of a salary increases proposed in the budget speech and in the ministerial statement the Premier delivered in the House of Assembly on April 29th, for civil servants and hospital workers and members of the Newfoundland Constabulary, firemen and prison warders, and the response of <sup>those</sup> /groups with reference to the proposed salary increases to the effect that unless their requests are met for across the board increases and unless the system of classification for civil servants is postponed the said civil servants, policemen, firemen, prison warders and non-government hospital workers may withdraw their services as at May 8, 1970 with respect to hospitals at Grand Falls and Corner Brook. As of May 1, with respect of policemen, firemen, and prison warders. And an undetermined date with respect for the remainder of the civil service. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of urgency that should be discussed here today, it is urgent to debate it today, With reference to the constabulary, a deadline has been given of 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, they are waiting to hear from the

Government or waiting to hear what the Government's position is. No one can understand the ministerial statement that has been made to date as to what just that involves, for the men involved, what the Government's offer now is, the same applies with respect to firemen, and to prison warders. But the part altogether from the matter of the constabulary, Mr. Speaker, it was announced today in Corner Brook that the Christopher Fisher division of the Western Memorial Hospital is being closed now, not May 8th, they are starting to close their facilities now because they have been notified that a strike will take place on May 8th, if the legitimate grievances of these employees are not dealt with, and it is therefore, Mr. Speaker, a matter of urgency now. Now Mr. Speaker, as far as the Order Paper is concerned the rules are concerned page 15 of our Standing Orders, says the right to move the adjournment of the House for these purposes is subject to certain restrictions: (1) Not more than one such motion can be made at the same sitting; this is the only motion made at this sitting. (2) Not more than one matter can be discussed on the same motion; this is all of one matter. (3) The motion must not revive discussion on a matter which has been discussed in the same session; this matter has not been discussed in this session. (4) the motion must not anticipate a matter which has previously been appointed for consideration by the House, Mr. Speaker, the matters dealt with in this motion have not been appointed for consideration by this House. When the matter was raised several days ago reference was made through a motion having to do with second reading of a Bill on the Constabulary Force of Newfoundland and a Pension Plan for the Constabulary Force. Neither of those Bills have been presented to this House or given to the members of the House, so obviously they cannot, those Bills cannot be debated today or tomorrow or for several days. The debate on the budget has not started nor has the debate on the estimates started and when those debates may start we do not know, Mr. Speaker, but the Premier of the Province was heard to say ~~in~~ publicly yesterday that as far as he was concerned he did not think that these debates would be brought on this week.

Mr. Speaker, in any other Province or Parliament such a grave and

serious emergency as now faces the Province would justify if the House of Assembly was not in session the calling together of the House of Assembly and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is an urgent matter. The members of this House should be permitted to discuss today just what exactly is the Government offering these employees. Just what the statements made to date mean. The confusion needs to be cleared up. An amount of \$12 million is mentioned by the Hon. the Premier as being the amount involved that 20,000 persons got an increase. But it is not 20,000 people he is including in that teachers of the Province. There are conciliation boards appointed who gave reports many months ago, recommending wage increases for the hospital workers at Corner Brook and Grand Falls. Their recommendations have not been carried into effect. They recommended wage increases

MR. SMALLWOOD: Point of order. The hon. gentleman is now going on with the debate as though it had been decided to stop all other business of the House and go on with the debate. He ~~is~~<sup>has</sup> now started his debate. And I hold, Mr. Speaker, that he is out of order. We have to settle the question whether the House will now defer all other business to go on to this matter without going into the matter we have to decide whether we will go into it.

MR. SPEAKER (Noel): As I understand the rules, I do not think we need to hear too much about it, it has been discussed so often, as I understand the rules 23 (a) says that the member desiring to make the motion rises and states the motion, and 23 (c) states that he passes the written statement of the matter that he proposed to be discussed which I have. And then the question with which the Speaker has to consider is whether there is urgency of debate and then also the restrictions on it even though there is an urgency of debate. Now as I read the statement given me by the hon. member for St. John's West.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, before you make your ruling I was referring to the Standing Orders I will leave the other matter. Mr. Speaker, section 23 (c) states that a written statement on the matter proposed to be discussed is handed to Mr. Speaker, who if he thinks it in order and of urgent public importance reads it out and asks whether the member has the leave of the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that I see no way really in which Your Honour

could find this now to be of urgent public importance and I submit to Your Honour that you should find the motion to be in order and of urgent public importance so that we can then see whether twelve members will arise accordingly.

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's West is correct but unfortunately I have to also consider the provisions of twenty three (f) and the written statement which I have here is to, really deals with the budget so I move the adjournment of the House to debate a matter of urgent public importance namely: the matter of salary increases proposed in the budget speech and in the ministerial statement of the Premier delivered in the House of Assembly on April 29th, for civil servants, hospital workers, members of the Newfoundland Constabulary, firemen and prison warders. And the response of those groups with reference to the proposed salary increases to the effect that unless their requests are met for across the board increases, and unless the system of classification for civil servants is postponed, the said civil servants, policemen, firemen, prison warders and non-government hospital workers may withdraw their services as at May 8th, 1970. With respect of hospitals at Grand Falls and Corner Brook as at May 1st, with respect to policemen, firemen prison warders and an undetermined date with respect to the remainder of the civil service. Now as I see that, that is simply an attempt to have a discussion now from the reaction of certain groups to matters contained in the budget speech. And the budget speech is appointed on the Order Paper. And I do not see how, the Speaker can deviate from the ruling that was given yesterday by Mr. Speaker to the effect that although this matter is of public urgency the Speaker cannot put the question to the House because it is appointed on the Orders of the Day. And since it is appointed on the Orders of the Day the Leader of the House has to accept responsibility for the way in which the Orders of the Day are called. Now hon. members have drawn the matter to the attention of the House, it is appointed on Orders of the Day and the Leader of the House takes full responsibility for the manner in which the order in which Orders of the Day are called, and therefore I have to find that although the matter is of some urgency the Speaker cannot put the

motion to adjourn the House is out of order.

MR.CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, can I address further argument; to Your Honour. With respect and I would like to appeal your Speaker's ruling.

MR.SPEAKER: The motion is that the ruling of the Chair be upheld, these in favour please say "aye" contraminded "nay." I declare the motion carried.

On Division:

MR. SPEAKER: Will those in favour of the motion, that the Speaker's ruling stand, please rise.

The hon. the Premier, the hon. the President of the Council, the hon. the Minister of Labour, the hon. Mr. Lewis, the hon. the Minister of Highways, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Smallwood, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Strickland, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, the hon. the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, the hon. the Minister of Community and Social Development, the hon. the Minister of Public Welfare, Mr. Barbour, the hon. Mr. Hill, the hon. the Minister of Supply, Dr. McGrath, Mr. Saunders, Mr. Mahoney, Mr. Wornell.

MR. SPEAKER: Would hon. members opposed, please stand.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hickey, Mr. Collins, Mr. Earle, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Wells, Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Murden.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. Twenty-four - nine against.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. CROSBIE: On orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice a question. Has the Minister of Justice received any indication from representatives of the Newfoundland Constabulary that they wish to meet with the Government to discuss the present situation?

MR. CURTIS: I received a letter, Mr. Premier, just before I came into the House and I have not had a chance to look into it knowing that the Premier is going to make the statement that he has made this afternoon.

MR. CROSBIE: Was the hon. the minister willing to arrange a meeting with them before tomorrow at 2:00 o'clock?

MR. CURTIS: I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, that I can in view of the statement that the Premier has passed the ball to the members of these various committees to send delegations to the Government.

MR. CROSBIE: But the hon. member realizes that the constabulary are not members of the NGEA, does he not?

MR. CURTIS: They are included in the statement.

MR. CROSBIE: Pardon!

MR. CURTIS: They are all mentioned in the statement.

MR. CROSBIE: The constabulary are not members of the NCEA.

MR. CURTIS: The statement says the Government would be glad to have the advice and assistance of the NCEA and of representatives and of representatives of other bodies such as the police and hospital workers.

MR. CROSBIE: Well the hon. minister has heard then from the constabulary that they are willing to meet. Is he going to arrange to meet with them before tomorrow at 2:00 P.M.?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, there is a committee appointed by the Government to meet with them and with the other members and the committee is told that they have so much money, they got \$6,000,000 to distribute. Now they are all invited to get together and divide up the spoils.

MR. CROSBIE: Who do they contact?

MR. CURTIS: They can contact, apply to the council, Mr. Channing.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, on orders of the day, would the Minister of Justice advise the House if it is correct that units of the Black Watch Regiment are being made available in case the police do go out on strike? I am sure people are concerned to know what other provision is being made.

MR. CURTIS: I would rather have notice of that.

MR. WELLS: Take notice of it and the strike going off tomorrow?

MR. CURTIS: There will be no strike tomorrow. Stop your nonsense.

MR. WELLS: Very good. That is real concerned of you.

MR. CURTIS: No, everybody is not foolish.

MR. WELLS: On orders of the day, the Minister of Health is not in his seat so I can only refer the matter to the hon. the Premier, what steps are being taken to correct the situation that now exists in Corner Brook in the light of the statement this morning that they are presently closing out the Christopher Fisher Division of the hospital. They cannot wait until the 8th of May because then they will not have staff. They are now in the process of closing out the Christopher Fisher Division of the hospital and moving to the Western Memorial on an emergency basis only, what steps are the Government taking to correct this situation?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have nothing to add to the statement I made in this House today.

MR. WELLS: That is real concern.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Motion, Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Dog Act".

MR. CROSBIE: Ah, the Dog Act, the Dog Act.

MR. NEARY: Big sook.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, if hon. gentlemen -

MR. NEARY: Big sook is at it again.

MR. CALLAHAN: If hon. gentlemen will contain themselves, Mr. Speaker, and I know they find that increasingly difficult to do.

AN. HON. MEMBER: The big sook, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BURGESS: A couple of days ago it was quack, quack, quack. The hon. gentleman has been reincarnated. Finally flipped.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman may think this is very funny and very hilarious but I assure him that he is quite wrong.

MR. SPEAKER (NOEL): Will the hon. minister please continue with his motion.

MR. CALLAHAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is pretty obvious that I am suffering the same welcome that other Ministers of Agriculture no doubt have suffered through the years when this question of putting, if I may say so, Sir, teeth in the Dog Act has arisen. Of course, what we are trying to do is remove the teeth from the dogs, at least remove the dogs and thereby the teeth.

But very seriously, Mr. Speaker, there are very serious problems and which over the years it has just been impossible to overcome in terms of the damage and destruction caused by stray dogs particularly where farmers are concerned. There is a man in Portugal Cove who came to see me last fall and brought some coloured pictures of some of his animals which had been set upon by dogs, Mr. Speaker, and the evidence of that damage to him, to his interest and to his investment was not a very pretty thing to see. The same kind of thing has happened very recently in a major way in Bay of Islands in the Irishtown area, and the same thing exactly has happened very recently further west in the Highlands area where individuals have suffered very serious loses, very tragic loses.



MR. CALLAHAN:

Mr. Speaker, there was a time when the sheep population in this Province, and let me say that if we have a chance of real success in terms of livestock, the best chance, by far the best chance we have is in sheep raising, and I know of at least a dozen farmers, citizens of this Province, with the money and with the know-how as what it would take to raise good sheep flocks, who had been deterred either by damage which they themselves have suffered and incurred or by virtue of the potential treat which they recognize in the damage that others have indeed suffered and of which of course they are aware.

We have one in particular and perhaps a couple of others, very useful very large scale sheep raising developments under way. One of them, the one I referred to particularly is in Branch where a company, a Newfoundland company, is undertaking a quite large development and if it comes to fruition over the next couple of years it will be, I think, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the biggest and hopefully the most successful of its kind ever undertaken in this Province and it will find its markets not only in Newfoundland but very largely on the mainland of Canada because there is a tremendous market for Newfoundland lamb, Mr. Speaker, and a tremendous price available.

These developments, developments of this kind, offer employment, they offer a good product to our local market and in each case they retain in this Province money which otherwise would have gone elsewhere. Part of our economic progress, Mr. Speaker, I think and a significant part of it will be found in agriculture and within agriculture itself, a significant part of it in sheep raising providing the proper condition, the proper climate of operation is provided.

Up until this time, Mr. Speaker, the Dog Act has been administered in terms of enforcement, in terms of what happens when a case goes to court has been administered under the Summary Jurisdiction Act which means to say that Magistrates have had complete discretion as to the penalties to be provided. In the case of the man that I mentioned from Portugal Cove in terms of his loss, I am not sure at this point whether the responsible parties could be found because obviously the stray dogs not being licensed or tagged could not be traced to their real owners and nobody was about obviously to claim owner-

MR. CALLAHAN:

ship. But if a case can be brought to court, Mr. Speaker, very often because there is an emotional factor in this thing, very often the penalties imposed had been extremely light and it has not been unusual to find that a fine say of a dollar has been imposed or that sentence has been suspended or whatever it happens to be. Of course there is bound to be public outcry if animals are destroyed particularly if at that point somebody does come along and claim ownership.

Mr. Speaker, I think what we have to aim to do, I think we have to be tough if we are going to protect the investment of farmers, I think we have to be reasonable but I think we cannot proceed entirely on a motion in this thing. I think that sheep raising and the keeping of dogs as pets need not be incompatible. It can be quite compatible providing the owners of dogs are prepared to keep them confined or chained or under control. The difficulty is that so many mongrel dogs are roaming around under no control, under no confinement, no ownership and this is of course where the problem is. And, Mr. Speaker, we want to get tough in terms of owners who can be traced because we do not think it is fair or just that owners of dogs that are allowed to roam at large and cause serious losses to farmers should be permitted to do that with freedom and with immunity.

So, Mr. Speaker, one of the

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, one of the changes that this amendment seeks to bring about will be to provide within the Act itself a penalty, and there is a provision that Summary Jurisdiction Act, rather than to give the magistrate full discretion heretofore, in future the Summary Jurisdiction Act will not be applied without the written consent of the Minister of Justice. So that in future cases, in virtually every case, except where there are extenuating circumstances and the Minister of Justice gives a written instruction, the action will be taken under this Act, where the fines are set out. And I must say, Mr. Speaker, they are rather heavy. For the first offense the fine is not less than ten dollars, not exceeding \$100 and default of payment, imprisonment for a period not exceeding one month. And for each subsequent offense, the fine not less than fifty dollars, and not exceeding \$200 and in default, imprisonment for a period not exceeding three months.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is one thing I think that has to be done. I think another approach to it is a somewhat different licencing procedure, which we are about to embark upon. I think we have to insure, and this is what the fines hopefully will do, that the fine is not so light that it simply becomes a licence, Mr. Speaker. So we have to take a different approach to licencing and to inspection and at the same time provide penalties that will in fact have some deterrent affect. This has not been the case up until this time.

The principle change, Mr. Speaker, is the Act the amendment would make, is to provide that residents of Labrador for the first time, make legally without special permission keep dogs as pets. It may not be generally known, Sir, that up until now, this has not been possible, that any resident of Labrador has not been permitted by the law, to keep a dog as a pet without special permission. My hon. friend here said, well he made a reference that is both right and wrong, Mr. Speaker. The situation is that because the Eskimo dogs of Labrador have until very recent years, been a very principle means of transportation for so many people, the ban on other dogs - the provision whereby inbreeding that would break down the strain as the Labrador Eskimo dog has been protected - protection

has been there in terms of the disallowance of other types of dogs to be kept without as I have said, some special permission. But because, Mr. Speaker, in recent years, the dog has pretty well had his day, they say every dog must. And the Labrador Husky has in terms of transportation, because most people now of course, use motorized toboggans for transportation, and we no longer see the necessity from that point of view, Mr. Speaker, to protect the pure breed of eskimo dog. At the same time it would be too bad if the breed were to be allowed to die out altogether.

And, Mr. Speaker, by the same token, whereby other types of dogs are not allowed to be kept in Labrador, so Eskimo dogs, or Labrador Eskimo dogs have not been permitted to be kept or to be brought into the Island, and so we have a sort of double-barrel situation there. We do not propose to change, Mr. Speaker, the latter <sup>provision</sup> at this time. Labrador Eskimo dogs may be brought into the Province, or into the Island from Labrador with permission, by permit. But I think because of the nature of the dog, because the animal is somewhat wild, and it is believed derived from some kind of cross way back between Alsatian and perhaps some wolf species, and is to some extent at least a wild animal that particular breed may not in fact be compatible with being kept in close communities. But, Mr. Speaker, from time to time, if one gentleman a couple of years ago came and sought and indeed was told that he could obtain, he could get permission to breed Labrador Eskimo dogs in the Island, and then for some reason, I really do not know what reason, because he never did follow through, decided not to do so. Now it may be possible that others will be interested, and we would be quite prepared to entertain applications, which would be granted and which we would comply under certain conditions. Perhaps after a time, these dogs would become acclimatized and accustomed to living in close populated communities. But for the moment, Mr. Speaker, the Act would remove the general prohibition against keeping in Labrador types, breeds of dogs other than the Labrador eskimo dogs.

Now we think this provision as it stands now works a hardship on residents of Labrador, particularly the new and large and built-up communities, and that it is time it be removed. There is one other matter I should like

to touch on, Mr. Speaker, because from time to time, it comes to our attention, and that is the control of dogs within municipalities. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are areas of jurisdiction which I think essentially must be observed, and we are not anxious to become responsible for the control of dogs, roaming dogs in the municipality. We think there should be a municipal responsibility, but at the same time, there are municipalities which do complain to us, and I can only say that we would like to limit any participation on the Government's part to advice and/or consultation with these communities as to what they might do. We think we have some people with experience who could indeed give them some very good advice. We are not interested, Mr. Speaker, nor do we have the finances or the facilities or the people to in any way become responsible for the control of dogs within municipalities. One other thing, perhaps I should say too, is that we are considering in areas where there is sizeable sheep production, where there are sizeable sheep flocks, considering clearing those areas if necessary so to do as special sheep breeding areas, where we would be very tough and perhaps even ban if the need became that apparent - the keeping of dogs, Mr. Speaker, within a certain radius or a certain distance of enclosed sheep flocks, because of course, the sheep flocks as other cattle today, are more and more being confined whether they are on our community pastures or elsewhere, because of course the communities are no more anxious to have roaming cattle on their streets, than there are roaming dogs. Mr. Speaker, that is aside from the Bill, the Bill, the amendment will provide some additional protection for sheep farmers, and perhaps remove the barrier that now exists to the growth of the sheep breeding industry, and at the same time I think, remove what is perhaps, an inequity and certainly a hardship on residents of Labrador who unlike other residents of the Province, have to have some kind of a special permission to keep a dog around the house as a pet. I move second reading Mr. Speaker.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe my ears. Listening to that hon.

minister, I can hardly believe my ears. We are standing here talking about dogs going in and out of Labrador, and the right to have dogs as household pets, and the hospital in Corner Brook is being closed out, the police are contemplating going on strike, and we are wasting our time talking about dogs.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. CALLAHAN: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, that has nothing to do with the speech.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Humber East knows better than that.

MR. WELLS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I know better. That is precisely why I will sit down and not say a word. I would be ashamed of myself to waste the time. I would be ashamed of it. Disgusting!

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the said Bill be now read a second time? Those in favour please say "aye" contrary "nay" carried.

On Motion a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Dog Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.  
Bill No. (14)

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, we have some serious problems in this Province in respect of our Wildlife Resources, and the House will learn I think a little later, about some measures that we intend to take in addition to the Bill now before the House. The Bill before the House today, Sir, attempts to provide some control and some procedures such as do not now exist in respect of the seizure of items of various kinds that maybe seized by our Wildlife officials in respect of contraventions of the Wildlife Act. The real problems, Mr. Speaker, the major ones today have to do really with aircraft, with expensive boats and engines, with snow toboggans which may cost anywhere upwards, some of them of a thousand dollars and more and also with other kinds of motor vehicles. The problem that arises, Mr. Speaker if a Wildlife Officer apprehends somebody some citizen, who has been using an aircraft or a high priced snow toboggan, or a truck or a car or a boat, the difficulty in seizure of course, then becomes

apparent. If the vehicle is seized the first problem that arises, I suppose, is the problem of transportation for the person involved to get back to wherever he came from and then there is the attendant problem - if he happens to be somebody who is using perhaps his vehicle in his work, he has lost his transportation. There is a difficulty with aircraft. If one seizes an aircraft, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the violation of the Wildlife Act, obviously to take the least I suppose an eighteen or twenty thousand dollar very small aircraft even, is quite an item to be seized and held and how do you hold it and how do you protect it, and how do you insure that if the charge against the individual is not sustained. How do you insure that the machine is taken care of and indeed returned to the owner in good condition. Because of course the owner should not be penalized simply because he has been charged. So, Mr. Speaker, these are some of the problems that arise. We are again in the position of either applying penalties or because the penalty would be too severe and there is no discretion applying no penalty at all. So, Mr. Speaker, what we propose to do is - rather than necessarily detain these vehicles or these very expensively priced items, is to require that perhaps a cash deposit of some kind be imposed - if it were an aircraft for example the deposit might be an amount of five hundred thousand dollars. I am not sure if the amounts, I do not think the amounts are set out in the Act. I think this would go in the Regulations. But this would enable us, Mr. Speaker, to have some control. Many of the aircraft involved in Wildlife violation for example again in Labrador are from outside the Province, and obviously it is going to be very difficult to detain the person involved if he can jump in his own little private plane and take off, and you may never see him again. If you can detain the aircraft fine - but as I indicated, that is difficult to do. So the sensible answer seems to be to require a fairly heavy cash deposit and then at least there is some reason for the person involved to come back and perhaps face the music knowing that if he can be successful and win his case that

he will have his deposit returned. That is the principal provision in the Amendment, Mr. Speaker.

We wish to have authority to make regulations prescribing as I have said, the amounts of the deposits and also the amounts of the deposits that may be required to secure in certain instances the re-delivery of certain things seized. Provision is also made to protect the interest of persons who might have an interest in the things seized, for example, it has occurred that someone was apprehended contravening the Wildlife Act, and it is subsequently found that the vehicle or whatever it happened to be whether a snow-mobile or a truck or a car actually belonged to someone else. Or you have the difficulty that there is a lien on it or there is a mortgage owing on it and we propose in the Act means of meeting that situation.

We, also, Mr. Speaker, and hon. gentlemen opposite will be pleased to know, are providing for a right of appeal, for many forfeiture orders made. Mr. Speaker, these are some of the things necessary to be done to bring the Wildlife Act, up to date to provide some additional flexibility to rule out the possibility of certain injustices and indeed to enable the Act, more effectively to be carried out in terms of imposing penalties and in terms of actually making the penalty I think, really fit the crime.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of the Bill.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against the Amendment, with all the force I can summon. It is atrocious what this amendment asks this House to pass.



MR. CROSBIE:

Now just look, Mr. Speaker, we should look at this amendment to the Wildlife Act, the new Section (10). Now the section that the Bill proposes to replace is this: "Any Wildlife Officer who has reasonable cause to suspect that any material, implement or appliance has been used or wildlife taken or killed or possessed, in violation of this Act or of the regulations may, on view, seize the same and upon conviction of any person in respect thereof the same may and in the case of firearms, shells be declared by the convicting magistrate or justices confiscated to the Crown and shall be disposed off as the minister may direct."

What does this Bill do? "Any Wildlife Officer, who has reasonable cause to suspect that any material, implement, appliance or thing has been used or any wildlife taken, killed or possessed in violation of the Act or the regulations may, on view, seize the same and it goes on further down to say: without limiting the generality of the foregoing, any gun or firearms, silencer, trap, decoy, snare, light, team wagon, automobile, motor truck or vehicle of any description boat, skiff, canoe or vessel of any description, airplane, refrigerator or storage locker or container of any description.

Under this amendment, Mr. Speaker, any Wildlife Officer, who has reasonable cause to suspect that for example, an airplane has been used, in violation of this Act, can seize the airplane or can seize the motor truck or vehicle. And then under other provisions of the amendment, it can be held in any event for three months. It can be held by the Crown for three months and then if the Crown has not proceeded with the prosecution, you can get the item back, if they have not proceeded with a prosecution.

Under Subsectinn (6), the new Section (10), notwithstanding Subsection (5): "Where the ownership of any wildlife paper, document, record, material, implement, appliance or things seized pursuant to Subsection (1), cannot at the time of the seizure be ascertained by the Wildlife Officer by whom the seizure was made (that is if the ownership cannot be ascertained) the wildlife paper,

document, record, record, material, implement, appliance or thing is: upon the seizure thereof - upon the moment that he takes it in his possession forfeited to Her Majesty in right of the Province.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, we do not require a draconian law like that in the Province of Newfoundland for this purpose. That if a Wildlife Officer comes upon an airplane, or truck or valuable gun or some other - a refrigerator or storage locker or container and at the time he comes upon it, he does not know who owns it, but he suspects it is being used improperly for hunting, that at the time he seizes it, it becomes forfeited to the Crown. I consider that to be an extraordinary, a completely extraordinary provision.

Yes, in Subsection (8): if no prosecution is taken within three months, then you can get your property back - three months. You may lose your property for three months and you may be innocent. Lose your property, Mr. Speaker, for three months, your gun, fishing lines, car, truck, plane, refrigerator, storage container. It can be taken under this Act by the Wildlife Officer. You may be completely innocent. He may never lay a charge against you, but you can lose the possession of it for three months. What next? Are we to have no rights left in this Province? Surely, this House is not going to permit that to go by?

Now under Section (10): if you know about what has happened, you can, within thirty days, apply by notice in writing to a judge for an order. So if you find out that you have left something in the country, Mr. Speaker, and the Wildlife Officer does not know who owns it and takes it, well that is forfeited right then, good bye. The title is now vested in the Crown. However, if they know who you are and you find out about it, within thirty days, you can apply to the judge of the Supreme Court - thirty days after the forfeiture to try to get it back. Let us compare it to the Criminal Code, Mr. Speaker, there is no judicial control over this. The Wildlife Officer does not have to go to a magistrate or a judge and get a warrant, not at all.. What happens under the Criminal Code: property can be seized only with a warrant issued by a justice.

To get a search warrant, the policeman has to satisfy the magistrate, as to its necessity. Then when he seizes the property, it has to be brought before the judge who exercises his discretion as to how it should be dealt with. The code has a provision that: the property seized must be released after three months, if no proceedings are commenced.

Now, Mr. Speaker, surely the Crown can come up with these amendments with some better safeguards that what is in this amendment to the Wildlife Act now. Any Wildlife Officer who has reasonable cause to suspect - well that just means to start with, that he has to suspect you. He suspects that you killed a caribou when you only had a moose licence or that you have taken more fish than you should have taken. Some along, take your guns, take your fishing rods, take the car you are in, take the airplane if you are out by a plane, and they can keep that for three months, whether or not you are ever proceeded against. That, Mr. Speaker, is not reasonable. This is just not reasonable. He does not even have to come up on you in the act. He just has to suspect.

Now in the amendment that this is replacing: it is cause to suspect that any material, implement, or appliance has been used; that is far more restrictive. That would not cover, in my opinion, a motor vehicle or a truck or an airplane. It is material, implement or appliance that would be the gun or the fishing rod or some implement or appliance or shells. But this, Act, clearly states without the limit, the generality of the foregoing, guns, firearms, silencer, trap, decoy, snares, light, team, wagon, automobile, motor truck or vehicle of any description that would be a skidoo, boats, skiff, canoe, or vessel of any description; airplane, refrigerator, or storage locker or container of any description.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the law is going to provide that all of these kinds of things can be taken from a person who is suspected of violating the Wildlife regulations, let us have some better safeguards put in. Let us have the magistracy brought in to it. Let us have the Wildlife Officer have to

apply to a magistrate within three days or within a week to have the magistrate decide what should be done with the property or whether it should be returned or what. This is too draconian, Mr. Speaker, to stand as it is here. It is savage. I do not know if it follows what is done in other provinces or not. But, really, I think that this is too much power to put in the hands, valuable property to be put in the hands of any servant of the Government without some judicial restraint put on it.

MR. SMALLWOOD (W.R.): Mr. Speaker, it is not too often that I agree with the member who just sat down, but in this particular case I do. This amendment is going just a little too far. I realize that the Wildlife Officers may have their problems, but, Sir, this is going just a little bit too far altogether. According to this proposed law, a person could have any piece of anything which could be used or could be confiscated, could be up in a person's cabin, stolen by somebody, used and the person caught in the act. The person who robbed the piece of equipment whether it was an airplane, whether it was a car, boat, engine, snow machine, would not necessarily know who the owner was. It would automatically then be forfeited or if the person was not caught in the act, if he saw the Wildlife Officer coming, he could make his escape, therefore, the Wildlife Officer would come upon the machine or upon the piece of equipment and not know who the owner was, it would automatically be forfeited, even though it had been stolen in the first place.

Now there is a method, of course, whereby the person, when he finds out his piece of equipment whatever it was was stolen, can get it back. He can go to the court, the Supreme Court. Now, of course, that is a very cheap place to go to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland to get, say, a gun worth \$100 back; may be it will cost you \$200 to get your gun back, but of course, you have the right. There is an appeal there. You can go within thirty days after the piece of equipment has been forfeited to the Crown. You have the right within

thirty days after the piece of equipment has been forfeited to the Crown, and you have the right within thirty days to appeal; that is providing, of course, you found out what happened to the piece of equipment which was stolen. You do, then, have the right to go to the Supreme Court. That is not a cheap process to do.

Now, personally, I go off every winter, every weekend, I go off in the woods on snow machines, and I can just imagine, if I lent my machine to someone and he went off and shot some animal in the winter when he should not have shot it, or some bird and the Wildlife Officer takes that machine, and I am deprived of that machine for three months. They decide not to go ahead for three months, for the full winter, I am deprived of the use of that machine, through no fault of mine, through no negligence of mine. I do not have the right to go in and automatically get it back. They can keep it for three months and not proceed against anyone and still I cannot necessarily get that machine back.

Now, I did suggest earlier when I read this proposed amendment, at least one month or a month and a half ago, at that time, I said that I thought and I still do think that the minister himself - you should have the right to go to the minister himself or at least somebody in that department without necessarily having to go to the Supreme Court. You should be able to satisfy the minister or some deputy minister or somebody in the department without having the trouble and the expense of going to the Supreme Court to get your equipment back, if you yourself had not used that equipment or whatever it was <sup>which</sup> was taken by the Wildlife Officer.

Now the Wildlife Officer only has to have a reasonable cause. Now what is reasonable to the Wildlife Officer is not necessarily reasonable to everyone else and not necessarily reasonable to me. Somebody can tell him that I have been off in the woods and I have shot some animal or shot some bird or done something which I have not done or anyone and then two weeks later, the Wildlife Officer can come up to my premises and take my machine and go off on just somebody's say so.

3177

Now that would be a reasonable - he would have reasonable cause to believe it, if he were told by somebody that I had done something or that somebody had done something. That would be a reasonable cause, and I could lose the use of my piece of equipment, whatever it was for three months if necessary. They do not have to take it to court, and if they do not take it to court, then after three months, I think I would get it back. But in the meanwhile, I would be deprived of my piece of property for three months. This is just going too far. I realize that there is a problem which the Wildlife Department has in people using airplanes, boats, automobiles and in the winter time, snow machines to get off up into the wilderness areas and may be possibly to commit breaches of the Wildlife Act. They have their problems there, but this is going too far to rectify it.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I must rise to agree with the hon. member who just spoke and for that matter, the hon. member for St. John's West and some of the objections they raised to this Bill. I would hope that we could make some necessary changes in committee that would give the Wildlife Officer certainly the type of legislation that is needed, because his job is not easy and we are now faced

MR. J. NOLAN: are now faced with a situation particularly in this day and age with new roads and so on opening where we have snowmobiles, planes, and I am afraid often times, I feel, that ~~we~~ in areas as I have already mentioned in this House, both for St. John's and other centres, people are deprived of hunting and fishing and so on, and often times the best of this type of sport is being made more and more available only to those who can afford it to go in by plane and so on, and this is something I believe we are going to see more and more of. But, I would not like to see a piece of legislation going through here, where all ~~the~~ documented in this Bill indicate that this can be confiscated for the period involved. Now my hon. friend indicated that perhaps it might be possible to appeal to the minister, or the deputy minister, well it depends of course, on the limitation period and where the person involved is located at the time. They may not find it convenient to get to St. John's to the minister or the deputy minister as quickly as maybe required. I believe we have got to have sufficient police to make the legislation worthwhile, but at the same time let us not go whole hog, and just make the wildlife officer out there who is trying to do the job absolutely useless, and making a laughing stock as he has been in some instances in the past. Which I think is ~~a~~shame, and not fair to the men concerned. But I certainly would like to see, and in very many instances, I mean it is a joke. I know of people who come in, you know saying what they have been getting away with from the wildlife officers and this that and the other thing. And to me it is ~~a~~shame, I must say I would like to see greater consideration given to this Bill, and by all means an attempt to make the necessary improvements, but let us not destroy it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would like to say a word in Your Honour's behalf, on this Bill. Your Honour, of course, Your Honour is in the Chair dare not express any opinion, you have only to sit and listen to the opinions expressed. But your Honour must be brusting, over the fears that have been raised by the hon. member for Green Bay. Because, like him, Your Honour is a skidoo specialist; "buff" is that the word? A skidoo buff, I was never called a buff, myself. A skidoo fiend, and the thought of losing a skidoo, having

MR. SMALLWOOD: It taken for a whole winter, and especially these recent winters, when you do not get enough snow long enough, and you get men leaving all the way from St. John's by truck with their skidoo stowed in the back and going out as far as Gambo, parking their trucks on the side of the road and getting the skidoo out and off for fifty or a hundred miles out in the centre of the Island, and coming back, with business neglected with everything neglected back here, so they can just enjoy themselves out in the snow, this is the right of a free born British subject. And this is the sort of thing that Your Honour I know whats. Unfortunatèly for my desire to speak for Your Honour I happen to be a member of the Government, which means that this is my Bill, it is the Bill of every member for the Government who are stuck with it, if that is the right word. But, however we have this consolation, we know that in Committee of the Whole, the hon. and generous and fair minded minister will be happy to receive suggestions, as will every hon. minister. Suggestions for improving and liberalizing, especially liberalizing the legislation which what the House might reasonably expect from a Liberal Government. I support the Bill, I will give it my vote, when the vote is taken on second reading, and I will do it all the more readily and happily knowing that I will be able to suggest an amendment, everybody in the House expect the minister, he is not permitted under the rules to amend his own Bill. But he can get one of his colleagues or one of his opponents or he can get anyone, any member of the House to suggest an amend, and I fancy there will be some sensible amendments made to it. But in the meantime, I do support the second reading of this Bill.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, whether this is ~~a~~ liberalized Bill, or Liberal Legislation, or whatever it is, I find myself in complete accord with the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Green Bay, and because of the sentiments he has expressed obviously I have to vote against it, and he has to vote against it. This Bill; Mr. Speaker, cannot, I submit cannot be cured by an amendment in committee. Because the whole guts of this Bill, the whole purpose and intention of this Bill is to grant unto the wildlife officer the



MR. HICKMAN: right where he has reasonable cost to suspect to seize automobiles, motor trucks, canones, boats, refrigerators, storage lockers, aeroplanes, and snowmobilies, and almost anything that could be remotely connected, even a refrigerator that could be remotely connected with hunting wild game and wildlife in Newfoundland. That is what this Bill is all about. That is the whole guts of this Bill, now if you amend that section, that in effect in a new Bill. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that there is just no way to amend that Bill to make it into a piece of legislation that would be acceptable by decent Newfoundlanders, who like the outdoor life. And I can tell by the expression on Mr. Speaker's face, that he hopes that the assistant deputy speaker will be in the Chair to enable Mr. Speaker to vote against this piece of legislation, this intimate piece of legislation, if it should ever come to a vote.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are two other items in this Bill that have been referred to very ably by the hon. the member for Green Bay and the hon. the minister for St. John's South, and the hon. the member for St. John's West. The other is, "where the ownership cannot be ascertained, then it is forfeited to Her Majesty the Crown," that again is a pretty restricted piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Then we come to the last tortuous procedure where some poor fellow who through no fault of his own finds that his refrigerator out in his country house has been used to put a couple of pounds of moose in, that he knows nothing about. He then has to take, it is a wonder the house is not in it, that is about the only thing that is left out, although container of any discription might be broad, even to cover summer cottage, if it was used to store moose meat. And having found that, and having been the innocent victim, then he can if he has the money, or alternatively if he wants to apply for legal aid, he can then take the tortuous route of going to the Supreme Court, in all his innocence, now remember he is innocent from the very beginning, to have this restored to him. Mr. Speaker this will be a very good test for hon. members freedom on both sides of this House. It is obvious, that this cannot be, this Bill cannot be amended to make it a decent piece of legislation, a piece of legislation exceptable to Newfoundlanders. But take it, it might be all right

MR. HICKMAN: for a fellow, I do not want to be unkind to St. John's Centre, but a fellow living in St. John's Centre who does not have the same opportunity as we have in the truly outport district of getting out and roaming around the country, be it in Burin or Green Bay or some of our other truly outport districts, it does not catch on the way it does in Burin, . . . I could keep this House all night, if he wants me to list all the places in Burin that I went from on bicycle from day to day

MR. CALLAHAN: . . . . . Bare foot boy.

MR. HICKMAN: I know I cannot, I do not want to spare you, You would not understand it. The hon. the minister does not even know where he is going to put a community to pasture in Dantzic Point. Until I told him, he thought it was the corridor between East and West Germany, which shows that he has a tremendous knowledge of outport Newfoundland. Well, I happen to be fortunate enough to have spent about eighteen years, you know, before I ever saw the bright lights, ever saw St John's or Corner Brook.

MR. WELLS: Be careful of the manner in which you talk about Corner Brook.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, this Bill cannot be amended to make it acceptable to Newfoundlanders. It cannot be amended. The principle of the Bill, if you amend the offensive paragraph, the offensive section which is section 10 of the Bill, that takes the Bill, you might as well tear it up.

MR. CROSBIE: What one?

MR. HICKMAN: Ten, ten,

MR. CROSBIE: The whole of ten.

MR. HICKMAN: The whole of ten, and again the whole of five. These two, or actually it is not the whole of ten, it is section four, to amend this Bill to make it acceptable to Newfoundlanders, you have to amend four and four is the guts of the Bill, it is the whole principle of the Bill, and this is the time for all good men to come to the aid of those who go out in the country and enjoy wildlife. Take the hon. Minister of Education where he has out in Grand Falls a Rod and Gun Club, who would hit the roof, if they ever find out about this piece of legislation. He has got a very agonizing decision to make. He has to put the right and the belief and the wishes of

MR. HICKMAN: his rod and gun people, and all the people in Central Newfoundland up against party discipline. And with an election any day he has got a very, very agonizing decision. And this will point up once and for all to the people of Grand Falls, as to where their member stands. I know where he is going to stand, he is going to join with the hon. the member for Green Bay. He is left? If he was here and vote against this Bill. And the hon. member for St. John's North

MR. ROWE, F.W. I ask this question, Mr. Speaker, sincerely because I was

MR. HICKMAN: You were not here, ~~Mr. Speaker~~

MR. ROWE:F.W. I regretfully was not here.

MR. HICKMAN: You will have to go to your seat before he can ask the question.

MR. ROWE: I am in my own seat, no? I am not. I will have to go to my own seat?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. ROWE: F.W. Mr. Speaker, the question I want to ask is this, I understand there are some objections, and I understand somebody else objected as well. Are these objections of a kind, or are they complaintive a kind of they cannot be remedied in committee?

MR. HICKMAN: They cannot. The whole objection, if the hon. minister will look at section 4, that is this piece of legislation. The rest of it is administrative practice following the implementation of section four. And there is only one way you can amend section four, and that is to delete it. If you delete it, you have deleted the Bill, Mr. Speaker. And for that reason I cannot support it, and I would be awfully surprised if anyone on the Government side, other than the hon. the minister votes for it.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that regardless of where one might sit in this House, he will be able to express his own views in terms of this particular Bill. I have a lot of sympathy for the minister in this particular regard, because I believe that he has tremendous problems in trying to do an effective policing job where wildlife is concerned. And I would also suspect Mr. Speaker, that possibly the people he has in mind here are people from the

MR. COLLINS: Canadian mainland, and the United States, who fly into Labrador, who fly into very remote areas of Newfoundland by airplane, people who come in and set up in cabins, and use snow-toboggans and so on and so forth, I am not including you Sir, in this particular category. But I suspect these are the people who the minister is trying to get even with, and I admire him for that. Not get even with them, but to fine them, and take their airplanes, and take their houses back in Connecticut, if you got to take their houses in Connecticut. And take their cars in New Brunswick, if you have to take their cars in New Brunswick. I am all in favour with that. But I would not like to see, the provisions of this Bill applied to the ordinary Tom, Dick and Harry along the Gander Bay, and Carmanville and Lumsden and all the bays in Newfoundland, and because of the high price of meats which we are experiencing in Newfoundland, sometimes he might find himself having to stretch the law just a little wee bit, and take a chance and possibly get another rabbit or an extra partridge or something along this line. I would hope that you have not got that man in mind. I would hope that you would possibly have your wildlife officer almost turned around and look the other way with this type. But certainly if it is meant to put peace in the law, to prohibit those so-called millionaires who come into Newfoundland and rape our wildlife, I know they are doing it, and I think the minister is aware that it is probably being done. If that is the effect of the law, then it is worthwhile. But, I believe Sir, that certainly as it is now, that the law will be applicable not only to the millionaire from Connecticut, but also to the poor fishermen in Notre Dame Bay. And with this in mind, I would hope that the minister would see fit to certainly amend the Bill when it gets into committee stage. Now if it cannot be amendable then, we certainly cannot support it.

Insofar as wildlife officials are concerned, I have met a few of them, I never had any trouble with them. And a member of the Rod and Gun Club

MR. H. COLLINS: Rod and gun club and I would suspect is the only man in this House who is a member of a rod and gun club, and a very, very good rod and gun club. I am sure the rod and gun clubs in Newfoundland would support this if it meant protecting our wildlife against the American and Canadian millionaires who come in here and rape it.

However, if the provisions are to be applicable also to the Speaker and myself, then I think we certainly should have to amend it.

MR. SPEAKER (Noel): Order please, the gentle from Humber East

MR. WELLS: Thank you Sir. Most of the matters that I had marked for discussion in this Bill have already been covered and so I will not go over much of them again. It seems to me Sir, that the Government is going about tackling this problem the wrong way, and I admit readily with the Minister that it is a problem and a serious one. Efforts at conservation of our wildlife, our fish and game must be made. I like to fish a great deal and hunt a little, and anybody who has fished on any of the rivers in western Newfoundland can often see the remnants of a net or something lying across the river, and to me this is disgusting to see this. Efforts must be made, but this, the efforts that are being made here are the wrong way to go about it, and I think the efforts, what has gone on in the House this afternoon has clearly indicated that.

The way you go about it is extremely severe penalties, and I mean it. I mean jail sentences for lengthy terms if necessary to deter anybody who,

MR. CALLAHAN: Including the hon. gentleman who .....

MR. WELLS: Anybody who offends the fish and game laws. They are two valuable to this Province, not only from a point of view of the pleasure I get out of fishing or hunting, or any other hon. member, but from a point of view of the economy of this country. Our fish and game is too valuable that they not be protected. What is done in this Bill gives to the Minister through his agent the wildlife officer, an unbelievable power which they should not have.

I can readily see seizing a firearm or anything involved in the killing of the animal until guilt is determined, but these powers are too broad. I do not want to go into the detail except to mention one under the proposed new sub-paragraph (3). Anything can be sold immediately, that is not limited to

meat, although it is talking about perishing, rotting or spoiling. A ski-doo car or anything can perish or rot or spoil before guilt is determined. The wildlife officers of the department, the wildlife division of the department have the authority to and sell these items. This is wrong, in principle it is wrong. I disagree with the hon. member for Burin, I think it can be corrected

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible

MR. WELLS: Sub-section 3, of (10).

MR. HICKMAN: What were you saying again?

MR. WELLS: Well, any item can perish. It does not have to be meat to perish, so that when you say anything that may perish, that brings in an automobile, or a ski-doo.

AN HON. MEMBER: How is an automobile going to perish?

MR. WELLS: It can rust, this is perishing. That is broad enough to bring in anything.

MR. NEARY: Perishable goods. What is perishable goods?

MR. WELLS: Look, perhaps the hon. member does not know it and I will excuse him, but I have been in court often enough arguing over words to realize the meanings that courts will often give to words. It is necessary to make it quite clear

MR. NOLAN: Would the hon. member permit a question? I think it is essential because, we might get bogged down and I believe the hon. member wants to mention something and we were sidetracked, and that is that the hon. member felt Mr. Speaker, that it could be corrected in committee. I was wondering if we could go with that Sir?

MR. WELLS: Well, I think it can be corrected in committee, it is a most peculiar situation. It can be corrected in committee by having somebody move that the whole of section 4, be deleted, and the whole of section 5, be deleted and be replaced by provisions in increase in penalties and so on in order to protect our game and wildlife. Now that is a means by which it may be corrected in committee, but I mean, you have abolished the whole Bill. The essence of the Bill is contained in those sections.

3186

Now if we want to be nice, and pleasant and cooperative and easy to

get along with, which after the performance of the last few days, I do not recommend we do. This can be done, but the principle of this Bill is basically wrong. Instead of voting on it, perhaps the Minister would agree ~~to~~ withdraw it and present it in a revised form. Because, it needs to be done, some steps such as this must be taken in order to protect our game and wildlife, but the efforts that are now being made here is wrong. The principle of protection is right, but the principle that is involved in this Bill is the unwarranted seizure, the extent of the unwarranted seizure that is involved and the rights of sale, and the right of assuming guilt before guilt is determined to do these several things.

This is very wrong. For this reason I cannot support it in its present form. If that is the essence of the Bill, if the Minister is prepared to say that this is not the principle of the Bill, then I can support the principle of protecting our wildlife. But as long as these two items are there if he is prepared to state now for the House that these two things are going to be withdrawn and substituted by other means then I will go along with the principle.

Perhaps the simplest way is to withdraw it and redraft it and present it in another form.

Now Mr. Speaker, before I sit down I would like to move Sir, that the House at its rising adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 3:00 p.m. This is seconded by the hon. member for St. John's West.

MR. WORNELL: That was not seconded Mr. Speaker

MR. WELLS: It was seconded by the hon. member for St. John's West

MR. WORNELL: I was on my feet before that was seconded Mr. Speaker

MR. CROSBIE: A motion for adjournment does not need to be seconded

MR. SPEAKER (Noel): The motion is that the House on its rising at 6:00 p.m. adjourn until tomorrow Friday at 3:00 p.m.

Those in favour "aye," Contrary "nay," the motion is lost.

The hon. member for Hermitage.

MR. WORNELL: Mr. Speaker, I could not let this opportunity pass without saying a few words about this amendment. I certainly am in favour of any amendments

to the wildlife Act or to any Act for that matter, because, I cannot see in this fast changing world how we can have an Act on the Statute Books which does not need amendment at certain times.

However, Sir, I have a feeling that this amendment was hastily concocted. I do not say that Mr. Speaker to make political hay out of it because, I think I know something about wildlife. I have pursued wildlife sometimes to my sorrow Mr. Speaker, because I have taken too great a toll of trout and small game at times, but within the law. I do not want to commit mayhem.

But anyway, to get back to this amendment I will say this. I was a charter member of the St. John's Rod and Gun Club when it was started here about ten years ago. We had very many valuable sessions with the various wildlife officials of various Governments. It was of course the Liberal Administration. Some of these officials I recall one of which was Capt. Harry Walters of late, lamented memory. Another was Mr. Stu Peters, and there was Dr. Jones I think it was, but anyway everytime we met with these wildlife officials these questions came up. The policing of the wildlife resources in Newfoundland. How could we do it? I remember one time the Rod and Gun Club members were all engaged, were all a press gang so to speak, into becoming deputy game wardens and we were issued cards. We carried them, and we had the power to apprehend a person who was carrying illegal game.

Now, you might say that that was not British Justice. As a matter of fact, I do not think this amendment here strictly adheres to the principle of British Justice. Because, it is definitely against, because no man can be guilty in the courts, in British courts until he is proven guilty. He is innocent. And I must say, even though I agree with the principle of this Bill, I cannot see how I can vote for it in its present form.

There was one other point that I would like to bring up, and that is how a person sometimes say, stalking moose and wounding an animal near the precincts of a national park. How a person can.....



how a person can let that wounded moose go inside of the boundaries of, say, a National Park, or a restricted area. To me that is against all concepts of conservation, all concepts of, what shall I say, good hunting practices. my hon. friend here, that is a fact. So that is probably beside the point. But there are several things that we should consider when we are bringing in an amendment to the Wildlife Act, and I believe that this should be referred to a committee of knowledgeable experts. I do not consider myself a knowledgeable expert. I know something about wildlife and hunting and fishing. And I really cannot see how I could vote for this Act, this amendment in its present form.

MR. MYRDEN: Mr. Speaker, I am going to have a few words. It is almost six o'clock but I have gone through a particular case such as this Act that is trying to be brought into here, but I understand as the hon. minister is going to withdraw the Bill like he has been trying to get me to withdraw the Bark motion. I would like to tell the House about a particular case only last year, when six of my constituents were seized with moose meat at the time by Wildlife Officers and RCMP Officers. The meat was taken from them, their clothing was taken, and everything else that they possessed at this particular time. They were in the woods, in what might be the National area but it is still hopeful anyway, in Rocky Harbour, so that these men who had been given a piece of moose meat and had been found that it had been found in their camp, they were in sawing, other people had been given moose meat were fined the atrocious sum of between \$250 and \$500. Now these men or many of them were on welfare, and other men were just ordinary fishermen.

We appealed the case. I appealed it on their behalf and of course the Judge threw it out. Now under this section here, it is going back to the same thing again, so that I feel that in the interest of Justice I think the whole Bill should be torn up and burned and probably a new one brought in.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, just a few words briefly on this Act. While I am entirely in favour of preserving our game, Newfoundland is becoming an extremely

small island. One has only to look down in the winter and see the criss-crossing of snowmobile tracks and so on. And the ease with which people who ~~xxx~~ now are able to get into the interior is frightening. So that every precaution I agree with the minister must be taken to protect our fish and game. But this Act does seem to go much too far. I recall on one occasion in my district where a group of people went twelve miles up a river to fish and forgot their licenses, and left them at home. And down in that area as you know there are no roads, no roads at all. I was very happy to see that while members were talking the minister of Highways and the Premier and the member for Hermitage were looking at the maps so I gather that that condition will be corrected this year. There will be plenty of roads so that people will be able to get back and forth to these places without any trouble, especially in Fortune Bay. I know that is going to be the case this year, I am quite sure of it. Therefore in this particular case which I mentioned they had to go by small boat, and while they were gone all their equipment was seized. Now these were welfare cases and it took them months and months to get back their equipment. It was a real hardship to them. It seems to me that the tone of this Act provides for just such a happening again. I do not think these people could find the necessary money to bail themselves out and I do not think the Act will give them any freedom whatsoever it is a restrictive Act of a nature that is far too severe and the great danger of it is that when you put the authority in the hands of perhaps small time officials and sometimes their breakfast disagrees with them or they are feeling a little bit upset about something they can take it out on a person regardless of the circumstances and I do not think that any person in that position should be given such extensive powers therefore, I am against this Act.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it is, what I have to say would take I think perhaps Your Honour would agree I would like to move the adjournment of the debate. There is not much point in starting it. It is nearly six o'clock. I wish to move adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 6:00 p.m. I do now leave the Chair until 8:00 p.m.



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR**

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

---

**Volume 1**

**Number 52**

**4th. Session**

**34th. General Assembly**

---

# **VERBATIM REPORT**

**THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 1970**

**SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE**

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Motion, Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Administration Of Certain Special Services By The Department Of Social Services And Rehabilitation To The Residents Of Northern Labrador". (Adjourned debate)

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this proposed legislation is aimed at providing official recognition by this House of a whole area of activity within the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation that has grown up over a number of years. The department, Sir, has in the past provided a constantly widening range of services to the native population of Northern Labrador. May I mention some of these services, Mr. Speaker?

Perhaps hon. members are not aware that the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation maintains general stores in a number of communities where supplies of food, clothing, hardware, fishing equipment and so on are available. Generally speaking, Sir, these are located where it would not be feasible for private enterprise to furnish this kind of retailing service. As well, Mr. Speaker, my department is charged with assisting the fisheries at seal, cod, and trout. This includes supplying fishermen with boats, engines, nets, traps and all the other variety of items of fishing equipment. The department is also responsible, Sir, for the erection of fishing stages, living quarters, warehouses and wharfs used by these fishing industries.

All communities in Northern Labrador, Mr. Speaker, are also supplied through departmental power plants with round the clock electricity. As well, Sir, we provide refrigeration units for the preservation of the produce of the sea until it can be shipped out to markets that are available elsewhere thus making possible an export trade in among other things artic char, currently enjoying such a vogue on the tables of restaurants and hotels catering to gourmet tastes.

Your Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation, Mr. Speaker, is also responsible for radio, telephone communication systems, for housing projects and resettlement and for the provision of saw mills and logging camp facilities. In addition to these specific services there is also community planning and development, the planning, designing and erection of buildings used by the division in its operation, staff quarters, retail trade stores and warehouses

MR. MARY:

as well as the planning and installation of water and sewage systems and various other projects, Mr. Speaker, that are undertaken from time to time in the interests of our citizens in Northern Labrador.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is to vest in the Minister of the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation, through the departments division of Northern Labrador, services with certain specific powers, functions, and duties in regard to discharging our social and humanitarian obligations to the Indians, Eskimos and other persons resident in Northern Labrador as defined in this Bill. May I here remind hon. gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, that under the renewal of our agreement with the Federal Government, for another five year period, commencing with the beginning of this present fiscal year, our working among the native populations is recognized by a contribution from Ottawa of ninety-per-cent of current and capital expenditures on Indian services and sixty-six and two thirds per-cent of current and capital expenditures on Eskimo services.

And here, Mr. Speaker, in these introductory remarks may I interject a brief parenthesis indicating a matter of pride for every member of this House as well as for every citizen of this Province. Whereas, Sir, across Canada, in all our sister provinces and in the territories, Indians and Eskimo leaders are fighting for recognition as citizens and are pushing red power into headlines of our news media to correspond with the black power campaigns waged so bitterly in the United States. Whereas in Canada, Mr. Speaker, our native populations are fighting for release from the legal, social and economic bondage that goes with traditional tutelage status in Northern Labrador, Sir, we have no second class citizens. Although for bookkeeping purposes and our dealings with the Federal Government we must record ethnic origins of residents of Northern Labrador, the distinction stops there.

Even if Federal accountants insist on our classifying families as Indian, Eskimo and white for federal grant purposes, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation knows no such distinction, no such discrimination, Mr. Speaker. Every resident of Northern Labrador has the same entitlement to the franchise and provincial and community

MR. NEARY:

services as has the residents of the capital city of St. John's or of Gander, or of Corner Brook, or of Port aux Basques.

Now let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, the people of Northern Labrador not only has the right to vote but they use it with some communities, Sir, registering as high as one hundred-per-cent participation in the last federal election. Mr. Speaker, you and every member of our hon. House has the right to be proud of the unique status of democratic rights accorded to the residents of Northern Labrador.

To give legislative recognition to the fine work of the branch of the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation, Sir, may I ask for unanimous support of the Bill which now comes before the House.

I move the Second Reading.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection whatever to the Bill but there is one thing puzzles me in this Bill and all the powers given it. We have a Department of Labrador Affairs which we thought was a department which was going to be set up to handle pretty well everything pertaining to Northern Labrador and all areas of Labrador and I am just wondering why this Bill now and what relation to the Department of Labrador Affairs has this Bill and what duties then would the Department of Labrador Affairs have? They have a properly set up department, they have a Deputy Minister and so on and so forth. Now we have the Department of Welfare, now will we have the Department of Health come in with something like this and the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Department of Community and Social Affairs? I am just wondering, it seems to be a duplication which we spoke about at the time that the Bill was introduced to create the Department of Labrador Affairs. We thought that Labrador was entitled to all the services that the island part of the Province was concerned to, Health, Welfare, so on and so forth and we questioned the reason for setting up the Department of Labrador Affairs and now we have this Bill coming in here that sets out the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation. Now I am just wondering when the minister closes the debate just will he explain then where will the Department of Labrador Affairs fit in and is it necessary at this time to operate such a department?

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I suppose, as every ex-minister of Welfare feels, this is one division of the Department of Welfare of which he can be justly proud and very, very proud of their activities. Just a few comments. I cannot quite see the purpose of this legislation because it is only actually formalizing something that has been going on for years. The necessity for the Act escapes me because all of the details which are outlined here have actually been carried on for a long, long time and I suppose it is only for the purpose of making a formal division of the department. Now what that will accomplish I do not know. The fact is that I always felt in the Department of Welfare that there was between departments of Government a great duplication of effort. I

I mentioned when I was talking in my address in reply to the speech from the Throne that I thought many department could be reduced and a lot of saving undertaken by so doing. There was great disagreement from the Government side on that because they felt that everybody was fully occupied and doing everything they should be doing. But here we have, as my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition mentioned, the Department of Labrador Affairs, we also have a Department of Community and Social Development and we have a Department of Welfare which is doing in this particular operation a job which is closely akin to the same sort of functions that each of these other departments could well be doing.

I remember when the Department of Community and Social Development was being set up, they were in great need of experienced people and several of the top members of the Department of Welfare got jobs with this new department at greatly increased salaries over what they were getting in the Department of Welfare. This was a bone of contention because this new Department had literally stole from the Department of Welfare at the time some of their top men and they only did so by paying them higher salaries and attracting them. This was within Government, one department competing with another and in my thought at the time I thought it was a great waste of funds because if the Department of Social and Community Development was truly what its name implied this is a very logical function of such a department. This is in effect Community and Social Development related to Indian and Eskimos,

MR. EARLE:

of course.

MR. NEARY: I understand you know why, why it has been done.

MR. EARLE: Yes, I also know why because as the minister pointed out while the Provincial Government is very happy to take credit for this great effort ninety per-cent of the cost, in the case of Indians, is paid for by the Federal Government and sixty-six and two thirds -



two-thirds of the cost of Eskimos is paid by the Federal Government. Actually what this division is doing, literally, is administering Federal funds. I do not see any argument in that, why it should not rest with other departments and why a lot of this work could not be co-ordinated at a considerable saving.

I feel that there is another aspect to this. When the Department of Welfare was called the Department of Public Welfare this almost automatically put a stigma upon this effort, because it led to the assumption that these people were all welfare cases which was not the case. They are actually a very independent hard working group of people, and they should not have any stigma of welfare attached to them. This is another argument, I feel where they should really come under the Department of Labrador Affairs or the Department of Social and Community Development. Even within this sphere of operations there is a tremendous waste of money. I remember, when I visited that area down there, I could not understand, and I still cannot understand the need of the segregation of Indians and Eskimos to the extent that it is done. There is a duplication of expense in this operation which is terrific. I am told that Indians and Eskimos cannot be brought together. Now this is subject to argument, because when I was in that area on Labrador, there were a great many people that said this was so much hog-wash, that this could be done and could be done successfully, but there seemed to be a barrier down there which resulted in, just to give a practical instance of it, on the lower side of Northwest River, there is a fine elementary school built. It was built at a cost of something like \$750,000. It may have cost more since, I know that that was the original cost. Right across the river from it in the Grenfell settlement, there is a dormitory and school complex; the last figure I heard on that which was two years ago, was \$1,100,000. These two operations together cost something close to \$2 million or will cost, and I venture to bet that as the dormitory is not yet built that these figures are likely to be

be increased. I am not quarreling with the expenditure of this money as such, because it is some of the money best spent by Government, I think, but I feel their economies could be exercised there to a great saving. I do not go along with the fact that there could not be some combination of that effort which would save the Government a considerable amount of money. This area down there gets very special consideration from the Federal Government because of the fact that it is Indian and Eskimo which is as it should be.

There are sections of Newfoundland and I happen to represent one of them in this House where conditions are just as bad and just as desperate and just as needy as they are on the coast of Labrador. There is not nearly as much being done for these people by the Provincial Government simply because it is not being paid for by the Federal Government. The people of Labrador are very, very fortunate to have the Federal Government behind them and I think all thanks and praise should be given for that, but there are many sections of Newfoundland where our own people, our own Newfoundland people who have been on this Island for many centuries are, in my opinion, neglected far worst than some of these people on the Labrador coast. The services are not comparable nor has the money been spent, and I do not think that the Government can take any great credit if comparisons are made. I have to support this Bill, Mr. Speaker, I think because the purpose of it is excellent. The effort made there - there is no question about it. It is good. But the only comment I would like to make is that I cannot see that considerable saving could not be made by proper co-ordination of this within the effort of Government, and I am quite sure that there is no need of taking on many more people to do this. We already have the staff that are qualified and well trained to do this sort of a job. In fact, it would be much more efficiently and much cheaper done, and I would like to see, for the sake of the people that it looks after, that this be taken out of the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation, because actually that stigma should not be

attached to it any longer. It is not a welfare matter. It is a social and community development matter or pending that, Labrador Affairs.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Mr. Speaker, I wonder, if he would answer a question.

We do not like to mention names in the House but I do not think there would be anything objectionable to mentioning this name. Incidentally, I intend to speak on this. I am merely standing now, Mr. Speaker, to ask a question. Does he happen to remember - he mentioned that officials of Welfare had been enticed over into the Department of Labrador Affairs by paying a much higher salary. Does he happen to remember the name of any - it is a public matter anyway?

MR. EARLE: No, the Department of Community and Social Development, not to the Department of Labrador Affairs. They were attracted to the Department of Community and Social Development. The gentlemen, I cannot recall their names at the moment. There were two, I think, at the time. Two well-trained, highly qualified social service workers who went to the Department of Community and Social Development at that time. I know there are quite a lot of officials within the department.

MR. ROWE(F.W.): Mr. Speaker, I intend to speak on this matter, because a number of erroneous impressions have been thrown out and they should be correct,<sup>ed</sup> for the sake of the public record. They should be corrected. To start of with, the Department of Labrador Affairs, the functions. I was not the founding minister of that department, but I did hold a portfolio after Mr. Granger moved out of it. In other words, I went into that department within a few months of its being set-up. So I know something of the philosophy and the history of it. It was not set-up and this was - surely, my hon. friend must remember this that one of the things stressed at the time that it was created was that it would not attempt, as a Department of Labrador Affairs, we

were creating a precedent. We were for the first time, in our history, setting up a department for a geographical region of the Province. It is true that it is the largest section of the Province in area and it is true that it is separate from the Province, from the Island of Newfoundland. But it was a precedent in setting up that department, it was a precedent and the question arose, certainly the theoretical question arose: if you are going to have a Department of Labrador Affairs, what is there to prevent it eventually from being a department of Western Newfoundland and a department for Notre Dame Bay and a department for Central Newfoundland and so on? This was one of the least of theoretical questions, and it was stressed at that time, and it was stressed here in this House by the Premier and certainly it was stressed in other quarters that this was not to be a department which would automatically, because it was a department representing the interest of Labrador that, therefore, it would take on to itself all the functions for Labrador that other departments were constitutionally forced to carry out; for example, education, does it mean because we have set up a Department of Labrador Affairs that from thereon all matters pertaining to education in Labrador were to go to the Department of Labrador Affairs? Of course not. Does it mean that the school inspector or the school attendance officer or who ever or any other official down there from the Department of Education would there upon be responsible to Labrador Affairs. The answer is no. Of course not. The same thing applied to Welfare, and the same thing applied to Health.

The public health nurse in Labrador where there was one did not automatically become responsible to Labrador Affairs. She remained responsible to the Department of Health and so on all down through the roster. What then was the function of the department? There were several folds. One was to - I can tell my hon. friend what it was. One was to recognize the fact that Labrador was in itself a distinctive portion of the Province - not in the same sense as the Burin Peninsula or Notre Dame Bay or Central Newfoundland. It was a great geographical entity with very special problems and very special matters

affecting it.

The other one and the other one was to be a co-ordinating agency. It was to be a liaison agency and this was particularly important in view of the industrial development that was about to take place in that great area and the other was, of course, the other was psychological. I do not need to tell this House that the argument has been advanced over and over again by people. I might say and I know something about Labrador. I

standing up here someone who spent fifty odd years of his life right here in St. John's, I know something about Labrador I represented the entire District of Labrador. I was in every community in Labrador and at that time I was in every home in Labrador. And I know something about the place. And this idea that Labradorians ever wanted to be divorced from Newfoundland, that was for the birds. Certainly up until I severed my official connections with Labrador, which is not too long ago, it is about three years ago. That is all since I ceased being minister of Labrador Affairs. It is less than three years. And for a number of years I was a representative of the district, and I found no evidence there anywhere of people wanting to separate from Newfoundland or anything of that kind. But I did find evidence as you find here in Newfoundland generally in respect of the rest of Canada. I found evidence of an inferiority complex, we have it in respect, we have had it in respect of the rest of Canada, we have a sort of a, and there is some reason for it, I am not saying this in a derogatory way or a critical way. We react, I always react badly. I do not mind a Newfoundlander running down our weather or running down our roads, or running down our people or anything, I just take it in stride, we all do that, that is our privilege. But I see red if somebody comes down here from Toronto or somewhere else and starts shooting off his face about Newfoundland I see red and most Newfoundlanders do. I want to put him in his place and frequently do put them in their place.

But you had that, you had that, and speaking of this, you might say this psychosis, you have it in the rest of Newfoundland we all know that We know that you have communities outside of St. John's, who regard St. John's, well they regard it in a number of different ways, I grew up in a community which took a pretty dim view of St. John's. They figured that St. John's was getting, St. John's was always getting the cream. St. John's was always getting the attention. St. John's was living at the expense of the rest of Newfoundland. I grew up in a community which believed that, and I grew up, and the same thing is true in Corner Brook of course you get that view expressed by the member for Humber East .

regarding St. John's. Certainly there is the psychological basis for it. This was true down on the Labrador. This was true and is probably still is to some extent. But one of the reasons therefore that we set up a Department of Labrador Affairs was to try to impress and this House did it not the Government, this House did it on the recommendations of Government but it was to try to impress. I said the House did it, I did not say it was unanimous, the House - this House did it - that is, if I say that this House passed a law, passed the Highways Act. If I say this House passed the Highways Act which contains the clause about, should I at every time, specify the fact that it was not unanimous. About all the thousands of Bills that have been passed in this House, this is nonsense. One of the reasons for the setting up of the department of Labrador Affairs was to impress, to try to convince the people of Labrador that Labrador counted for something. That is, was going to get, and was getting special attention.

It was not and this is the key point I am trying to get at. It was never intended that the Department of Labrador Affairs would become in miniature a Department of Social Welfare and a Department of Highways, and a Department of Municipal Affairs, and a Department of Education all in one department. This would <sup>be</sup> stupid, it would be silly, it would be ridiculous and that is why to this moment people say over and over Department of Labrador Affairs, what does it do, what has it got to do, and they say there is only a small amount of money voted for it. The Department of Labrador Affairs was never meant to be a large department in the sense of Education and Health and the other departments were. And that is why to this moment I do not know how many there are, there are probably a dozen people altogether employed in that department, certainly not

MR. MURPHY: There is \$470,000.

MR. ROWE: Oh no, oh no, I beg, I take, my hon. friend, look he is an honest man he does not mean to give. I said there may be a dozen persons and my hon. friend says there is \$470,000 worth. Look I am spending a \$100,000,000 you know I am only one man. But you know this is too silly to talk about. The twelve men, there is \$470,000 this is silly. That money, look that department

one of the programmes in that department is an exchange programme of taking students and other groups from St. John's and other parts of Newfoundland into Labrador and bringing other groups back here in order to bring the two sections of the Province closer together. And that takes a sizable section of that money.

MR.MURPHY: No need to set up a department to do that I could do that from Corner Brook to St. John's.

MR.ROWE: Yes, and my hon. friend could do a lot of things anyway rightly or wrongly the department was set up and what I am trying to remove is this wrong impression that is created that the department of Labrador Affairs ought to be or was ever intended to be a miniature department of this, that and something else. It was never intended, it was supposed to be a co-ordinating and connecting department and that is what the function has tried to do. It has, and secondly, that is wrong that is not true, that is just not true. My hon. friends when they say that they are saying that from ignorance they just do not know, and I say this ignorance in the correct sense of the word they do not know what they are talking about. Anymore than if I were to try to explain the functioning of appollo 13, I would be doing it from ignorance. I do not know what I am talking about. I do not know the functions of appollo 13 the internal electronic functioning of that particular instrument and I do not profess it and if I were to talk about it it would be just stupid.

The fact of the matter is that the Department of Labrador Affairs has done a very valuable function, has performed a very valuable function. And one of the functions it has done is that is to look after the special matters pertaining to Labrador because Labrador is a geographical entity in itself. It is geographically separated from us by water, it is an island in that sense it is separated from us and it does have special problems we all know that. You, among other things you do have these ethnic groups down there just to mention two of them. You have separate ethnic groups down there certainly far different from any ethnic problem that we might have here in



Newfoundladd I will deal with that in a moment too. And the function of the department therefore was to be co-ordinating to be a liaison agent and to deal with any special matters pertaining and if that included Churchill Falls so be it. if that included assisting or trying to assist Newfoundlanders to get jobs in Churchill Falls that was one of the special functions and a very important one as well, when it was at it.

I want to say this Mr. Speaker, the department of Labrador Affairs is not a big department it does not have to be. Certainly, so long as its functions are limited to what they had been limited there is no need for it to be a big department of Government at all. No need whatever. But it can play, it has played a very important role in the past two or three years. Now, I want to say a word also about the ethnic aspects of Labrador. And here again I do not speak from ignorance Mr. Chairman. When I became the member for Labrador in the postponed election that was supposed to be held in the fall of 1951. One of the first things that I did was to visit the Grenfell missionaries, the Grenfell doctors who were, of course also to some extent medical missionaries, that is why I use the term missionaries. Dr. Thomas at St. Anthony; Dr. Curtis at St. Anthony, who was then superintendent a very great man, one of the great medical men of our time incidentally. And Dr. Paddon at North West River and others. I accompanied them, they accompanied me, which ever way you want it, down the coast of Labrador and at that time there were two Indian colonies for want of a better word in Labrador. And these were first of all nomadic. In theory, on paper they were supposed to be domiciled at North West River on the south bank of the river, what my hon. friend called the lower bank, and that at Davis Inlet about a 100 or 150 miles to the north, I suppose, Davis Inlet. Now far north is North West River, 200 miles. As the crow flies 100 miles. But by boat out around Cape Harrison and so on it would probably be 200 miles or more. If they were heredity they were supposed to be domiciled there. In practice they were nomads and not one family, of the, at that time 250 persons, Indians, Montagna Indians commonly referred to as mountaineer Indians and

Naskaupi Indians, two distinct groups not one family lived in a permanent dwelling. Not one. They lived in canvas tents. I saw those tents. And they moved from place to place, they had no settled place of domicile. No permanent home at all. Months of the year they spent in the country searching for caribou and trapping and carrying on activities of that kind.

They had numbered, and this is a significant fact, they had once numbered historically several thousand. When we went there they numbered two hundred and thirty odd. Dr. Paddon and his associates x-rayed every single one of the remaining of the two hundred and thirty odd and found that forty out of the two hundred and thirty odd had active, virulent tuberculosis. And he told me, and Dr. Thomas told me that at the rate they were going. Here there was not a single tent, visualize Mr. Speaker, a tent a canvas tent, with twelve or fourteen people living in that tent, eating together, sleeping together, living crowded in there and in the winter time of course compelled to stay in there, in this tent, breathing one another's air, breathing the exhaust from one another bodies, and not a single tent that did not have an active case of tuberculosis. And it was very simple, he told me something I knew, I was not a medical man, but I, this was commonsense, those of us who spent fifty years in Newfoundland knows the ravages of TB in Newfoundland we know what TB can do. No people on earth should know better.

He told me the rate that they are going, ten years there would not be a single Montagna or Naskaupi Indian left in Labrador. They would have become as extinct as the Beothucks. And while I am on that let me say now, again the Beothucks of Newfoundland were not slaughtered and exterminated by the bullets and gunpowder of the white settlers, they were exterminated by TB., tuberculosis. This is another, this is a lie that has been propagated all over the world and I am sorry to say by Newfoundlanders in part and with the help of Mr. Farley Mowat. Once they got tuberculosis once they got it their fate was inevitable under their living conditions. and this was true of the Indians of Northern Labrador. Now this problem was complicated Mr. Speaker, by another fact that historically these Indians and I know this my father was a Labrador skipper for over thirty years. Every

inch of Labrador from the Strait of Belle Isle to Saglek Bay he fished in and I suppose he knew almost every resident of Labrador by name.

Historically these Indians had no connection and refused to have any connection with either the White People or the Esquimaux. They were the bitter enemies of the Esquimaux, battles were fought. Battle Harbour itself got its name from a battle between the Indians and Esquimaux of Labrador. They had, there was no cohabiting, there was until that time, I do not know what has happened since, there was only one recorded case of an Indian woman ever having had relations, intimate relations with a white man and she was ostracized from the group. And no recorded/<sup>case</sup>of an Indian and an Esquimau ever having cohabited in the 400 years of recorded history down there.

Now that was a pretty, the implications of that Mr. Speaker, has to be considered because this explains why you could never get the Indians to integrate. So off with, religiously they were very devout Roman Catholics the Indians were. Every Esquimau to the last Esquimau was a devout Moravian and even here in Newfoundland

MR. ROWE: F.W. and even here in Newfoundland, we know in our early history why we had so much segregation here. Why do we have whole stretches of the Newfoundland coast? Whole stretches, for two hundred miles and not a single Roman Catholic family, and then another stretch of 200 miles and not a single Protestant family. That was not an accident. So you have this division, you have this segregation of the Indians down there, they refused, they refused to have anything to do with white people, they refused to have anything to do with the Eskimos. And here they were on the verge of extermination, on the verge of extinction. Well we stopped it rightly or wrongly, we stopped it. The Newfoundland Government and the Grenfell Mission, they were the two that stopped it, and I had to take issue with the insinuation that my hon. friend the member for Fortune Bay gave out a few minutes ago, when he said, we have to give the credit to the Federal Government. In that year the Federal Government was taking no interest at all in the Indians or Eskimos of Labrador. I am talking about 1951. And the reason for it was constitutional

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: F.W. They were not providing the cash, I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. They were not providing any cash, they were doing nothing. I happen to know, I know better than the hon. gentleman knows what happened. And if he will listen, I will tell him what happened. Under the terms of union, we had a choice between having our Indians and Eskimos declared wards of the Federal Government, in the same way as the Indians of other parts of Canada, on the reservations for wards. And therefore, they would be denied the right of citizens, they would not be Canadian citizens, in the sense that I became a Canadian citizen in 1949. We had that choice, Mr. Speaker, we could have said to Ottawa, you take them over, you can have them all. And you do whatever you want to do with them, they will have no right as citizens, they will be some segregated units, and we refuse to do it, and rightly so. We refuse to have that, we said these Indian and Eskimos are going to be citizens of Newfoundland, and citizens of Canada.

MR. EARLE: Would the hon. minister permit me to ask a question?

MR. ROWE: Yes, Sir.

MR. EARLE: Other years since 1966, to the best of my knowledge a good many years since

MR. ROWE, F.W.: Yes, I was going to tell him about it, because I happened to be the man who negotiated the agreement with the Government of Canada, I went to Ottawa and negotiated the first agreement which brought Ottawa into a partnership with the Government of Newfoundland to look after the Indians of Labrador, and Eskimos of Labrador. I remember very well the amount, the first initial amount that Ottawa agreed to come in on, to assist them in welfare and in education and several other things was half a million dollars. I was the one who negotiated it, and signed the agreement on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland, and until that time the Government of Canada had taken no interest in, and disclaimed any responsibility for the native people of Labrador.

My hon. friend says, \$250,000, I thought it was half a million. The half a million I think may arise from the fact that Ottawa was to provide a half a million, and we were to provide - no, Ottawa was to provide a quarter of a million, and we provide a quarter of a million.

MR. EARLE: When was that, what year?

MR. ROWE, F.W.: I do not know, well they came in before that, they did help before that. Well anyway, the actual year is unimportant, it was since Confederation. Now, Mr. Speaker, as a result of our program of rehabilitation of the Indians of Labrador they are today domiciled in permanent homes, in Northwest River and up in Davis Inlet, and these homes are not canvas tents, incidentally I should go back for a moment and say that what we did up to that time, the time that Dr. Paddon and I and Dr. Thomas visited them, and make a survey, up until that time it had been virtually impossible to an Indian to agree to go to the hospital in St. Anthony. And through the help, and co-operation of the Oblate Fathers, those priest so dedicated priests, Father Sear at Davis Inlet, a French Canadian, priests of the Oblate Order, and Father Pierson, a Beligan Oblate priest and other faiths through their help and cooperation we were able to induce those Indians who

MR. ROWE: F.W. had active tuberculosis to go down to St. Anthony Hospital and enter the tuberculosis wing on that hospital, and get treatment. And we eliminated T.B. from the Indians of Labrador, and we saved them from extinction and today they are at least medically—they are prospering. We have them domiciled in permanent homes, in these two settlements.

My hon. friend referred to the fact that we did not intergrade them, or we did not push them together, that was impossible, that was a great victory, it was a great achievement, when we got these Indians to agree to settle anywhere permanently, and they did. This does not mean they still go and hunt caribou, or they do not trap, but it means at least we have them in a permanent community where we could establish schools, and we have established schools. They would not in any case agree to go into Northwest River, the white settlement of Northwest River, or to go into Nain or to go into Makkovik or any of the other Eskimo settlements. They would not do it that is all, they just would not do it. Any more than I would agree at this moment to be domiciled permanently on the Funk Islands. They just would not do it. What do you do, when people do not do a thing? But they did agree and again I am using the pronoun "I", Mr. Speaker, I had to hear it in the interest of historical records. I negotiated with the Hudson's Bay Company and got them to give us free a grant of land on the southside of Northwest River to enable those Indians to establish a permanent community there. And so you have this lovely community there, and two years ago, we went down, the member for Labrador North and I and opened up that beautiful marvelous school, then which there is no better school in all Newfoundland or for that matter in Eastern Canada, a marvelous school, a school combining both academic and vocational interest with every facility that is possible in the school, and that school is ministering to the needs of the children of the Indian families there, all of whom prior to 1952, all of whom without exception were illiterate, completely illiterate, young and old.

MR. EARLE: Is it a Government school or a church school?

MR. ROWE: F.W. Actually it comes under the Roman Catholic Church, because the Roman Catholic, the Indians I said, were all Roman Catholics. It is a school which was built largely by money from the Federal Government, but the Federal Government cannot own schools, and does not own schools. I think

MR. ROWE: F.W. we passed it over or leased it over, anyway it is under control of the Roman Catholic Church. Which church is responsible for the education of Roman Catholic children whether they are Indian or white in Labrador. Just as it is here on the Island of Newfoundland. And so we have today Indians who have been educated, and who are gradually, and I am not in a position, I have not been down there this last couple of years, I know the member for Labrador North has it all at his finger tips. But we are gradually getting the Indians of Northern Labrador to integrate with the other ethnic groups, with the white people and so on. I believe, that in recent years some of them have been able to get employment at Goose Airport, and more and more they are integrating with the others, but this is taking time. It is something you cannot do by force, you cannot take an Indian up by the scruff of the neck, no more than you can take a white man up and say, you must live with that man, you must live side by side with him, you must be friends with him, you must work in cooperation with him, he does not want to do it, he will not do it.

There are one or two other things I wanted to say, but I realize Mr. Speaker, I am monopolizing perhaps the time on this thing, so I will simply say this, that the record, and with this I am closing these comments, our record in Northern Labrador is one that I am prepared to justify anywhere, at anytime, with anybody, we have nothing to be ashamed of, and our entire record, this does not apply merely to Indians, because the story of what we have done, and tried to do in cooperation with the Government of Canada for the Eskimos is equally impressive. And our record is one that is far from being ashamed of, it is one that we ought to be and can be very proud of.

MR. G. MYRDEN: Mr. Speaker, just for the sake of clarification there are a few things here I was very proud to hear the hon. member because not being from that part of the country I was really amazed to see some of the things in this Bill.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, under section 11, there is certain specific powers of the minister, for the purposes of this Act and without limiting the generality of section 10, the minister may in Northern Labrador carry on business of the merchant, trader, commission agent or any other capacity they import and export by, that is in(a). In (b) establish or acquire or carry on offices, to carry on business of buying, selling, shipping. and exporting furs, carry on at Northwest River sawmills, preparation of timber, down further the training of people in the operation of heavy equipment

MR. MYRDEN: capacity they import and export by, that is in(a). In (b) establish or acquire or carry on offices, to carry on business of buying, selling, shipping and exporting furs, carry on at Northwest River sawmills, preparation of timber, down further the training of people in the operation of heavy equipment of sawmill machinery, and logging. I just wondered, it goes right on into employment with commerical companies. Now from this Bill I gather that there was very few commerical companies in the whole area. So I wondered whether the minister will explain some of that, and what their duties are. Because it seems like a whole new empire is being created down there by the Department of Social Services. And again, if you will turn into the estimates, I notice on trading supplies, \$780,000. And then the sale of those supplies I gather is \$750,000, I wonder whether there would be any profit in this, or whether just the cost?

MR. B. J. ABBOTT: Mr. Speaker, speaking to this Bill one or two things I would like to mention, I note the jest of the Bill is to give the minister special powers, functions in regard to the Eskimo and the Indians. I am sure all hon. members are for that, personally I subscribe to what the hon. Minister of Education has said relative to our efforts to improve the conditions of the Indians and Eskimos. That cannot be said, of course, when we look at our brothers and sisters in Western Canada, the Indians in Western Canada. History has recorded some of the terrible things which has happened in relation to the Indians of Western Canada. But now thank goodness they are coming into their own and they see that they have been treated very badly and now they are standing up for their rights, and I think if we belong to a just society, then we all have to support them in their efforts.

Now, Sir, it strikes me as if the Northern Labrador services conducted by the Department of Welfare, which started as we all know in the days of Commission of Government, it has grown year after year, and we have nothing to be ashamed of, when it comes to the efforts which we have put into bettering their conditions, the condition of the Eskimo, and the condition of the Indians. We are proud what we have done, I will not say that we have done our best, but we have made an effort. Now it seems as if we have in houses alone, for we will at the end of this fiscal year have an equity of nearly



MR. ABBOTT: \$1 million in houses. Now I cannot see for the life of me, the Department of Social Services, I get mixed up, Mr. Speaker, calling it the Department of Welfare, getting into housing, I recall when I became Minister of Welfare in 1956,--we were then--we had the department inherited from the Commission of Government, the care and custody of the Ebsary Estate. And it was not long before I saw where that should go with the Department of Housing or Municipal Affairs and Housing, and it was placed under the administration of that department. Now we have today, a Department of Housing, or Municipal Affairs and Housing, they have a staff adequate to take care of housing. And I do think, this is where housing whether it is in the Department of Welfare or whatever department of Government it is, it should go to the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing. They have the staff, there is no need of employing any staff for Northern Labrador Affairs, because they have an adequate staff, they are looking after millions of dollars of houses in this country, and I see no reason for there not taking over the housing of Labrador.

Furthermore I see if we play the role of a merchant, we play the role of a trader, establishing offices, maintaining radio and telephone, and even gone so far as subject to the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission to generate, sell and distribute electrical services. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think, this is where we are going to get mixed up, letters will be going to one division, and that division will say, that belongs to such a department, which means work for officials and goodness only knows, if it will not necessitate extra staff being taken on. And by and by we build up an empire, an empire of officials, and this is where Government is getting today, getting to big business. And as I see it, Sir, I feel that the services which I have mentioned should be assigned to the divisions and the departments which we have already set up, without increasing the present pace loads which the department is carrying on today, the Northern Labrador Affairs they are doing a very good service. But it is

MR. ABBOTT: If you are going to increase their load, well then of course, you are going to have to increase staff and some of the services which they are doing should be directed to other departments. Now you take the supplies, the trading supplies that has gone on very well, but we notice year after year, even there, the trading supply. I think it was the year before last, three quarters of a million, or seven hundred thousand - and last year maybe even the same, it may not have been that amount, but this year I noticed in the Estimates, it is around seven hundred thousand again. Now that is not too much, but what I am saying is, that the greater the burden, the more staff it will necessitate. And I am most happy to support the Bill, but I do think even education, I noticed in this Bill that they are prepared to assist finance high schools. Now that is the Department of Education's business. They are prepared to finance students going to Memorial University. I say again the Minister of Education that is his business, and not the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation. However, Sir, as I have said before, I support the Bill, because I want to do all I can for the Indians and Eskimos, but I have just pointed out some of the things which I do not go along with, and I think it would be better placed in other departments.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of standing here and making a strong case for the Department of Labrador Affairs. I happen to be the minister of that department. The department was created three or four years ago. I did not create it. I am there now to do a job and I intend to do just that. Now, I do not want to labour this House Mr. Speaker, talking about the Indians and the Eskimos, because Sir, I can go on for hours talking about the Indians and Eskimos. I practically grew up with them.

MR. WINSOR: Grew up with them. I have known them and I have known the Labrador people for more than twenty-five years. I have had very close associations with them, and Sir, I am surprised at the little knowledge that the member for Fortune Bay disclosed here. He made one visit to Labrador and like a lot of other people who make a flying visit to Labrador, comes away with all the answers.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): He became an expert

MR. WINSOR: They are experts over night on an hours visit. Now Sir,

MR. MURPHY: How sensible some people can become though, and others can go forever and still be a little bit stupid.

MR. WINSOR: I would not say stupid, knowledgeable

MR. MURPHY: Knowledgeable

MR. WINSOR: Yes, one man can get a little more knowledge and retain it, whereas the other man you know, just cannot hold on to it.

MR. MURPHY: That is right

MR. EARLE: Three visits

MR. WINSOR: Three flying visits, like the flying nun.

MR. EARLE: The hon. Minister was my teacher

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, with reference to the hon. members - of bringing the eskimo and the indian together. This has been tried and Sir, I happen to be the one who helped carry out one of the experiments. I recall in 1949 I think it was, when the Department of Natural Resources then, transferred the whole tribe of indians from Davis Inlet to Nutak about 150 miles north, and Nutak of course is or was an eskimo settlement. The indians Sir, remained there until the freeze up. We took them in there in September and Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a heartbreaking sight to witness I witnessed that in Davis Inlet at seven o'clock in the morning of September in 1949.

I was the master of the ship or the boat, and I had instructions to go to Davis Inlet, transfer the whole tribe to Nutak. We arrived at Davis Inlet in the evening, it was a strong westerly wind and we had to go a little in the bay for shelter. Nevertheless the next morning at daybreak I was out blowing the horn for the indians to disband, and Sir, at seven o'clock we

started and at ten o'clock in the morning we sailed out of Davis Inlet with every individual, every living individual there with every possession they possessed on board that boat.

This will tell you how much the indians had. We convey them to Nutak

MR. HICKMAN: 120 tons you said?

MR. WINSOR: 120 tons, we had to stow them in the hold. But nevertheless we mastered

MR. MURPHY: About how many persons would be involved Mr. Minister?

MR. WINSOR: 180 people

MR. MURPHY: 180 people?

MR. WINSOR: 180 people, yes. We took them to Nutak Sir, and we disbanded, we disembarked the passengers and they were then within one half mile of the eskimo settlement of Nutak. But Sir, they were not there very long before they started to quarrel with each other because one was encroaching on the others hunting grounds. To make the long story short Sir, before Christmas that year every indian family, every indian with his family walked back to Davis Inlet and they must have travelled a distance of 200 miles or more over the worst terrain that you could find anywhere in Labrador and I am thinking of the Kiglapait Mountains. Now Sir, that is one example of trying to get them together. They are coming together now, they are beginning to be able to communicate because the language was the great barrier. Let us make no mistake about that. The indians and eskimo are of two different dialects and they have two different languages apart from the english people with whom they have to deal.

But Sir, that is breaking down thank God. Getting back again, when you have a settlement in Northwest River as the hon. member mentioned there you are not speaking of an eskimo community. Northwest River is a white community and I would say producing as smart a people, and as an intelligent people as you would find anywhere in Canada.

Now you go north. Where are you going from there? You have to go to the next indian community which is about 150 miles by water into Davis Inlet and that is strictly an indian community. There are two indian

communities in northern Labrador. One at Northwest River and the other at Davis Inlet. There are no Indians at Nain, Hopedale or Makkovik, or Postville. Sir, how are you going to get them altogether when you have that distance to travel?

The hon. Minister for Education covered a lot of the ground that I would have covered. Because, Sir, let us go back a little and find out and see what this is all about. The Moravian Mission in 1771, they were asked by Governor Pallister of the British Government to send the Moravian Mission into Northern Labrador to sort of christianize the eskimo. Prior to that, in 1752 they made their first attempt. Now Sir, if you can visualize yourself on a London Dock in 1752 in a small vessel. 1752 is when they started. They left London, four men headed for Northern Labrador to preach the gospel among the Moravian Missions. The little vessel Sir was named the Hope. They sailed to Labrador and their first port of call was Hopedale and thus the name of Hopedale became Hopedale because, it was sort of called after the ship. They had four Moravians who disembarked at Hopedale and there they started to build their mission. It took days and weeks for that little vessel discharge with only a very small boat to carry cargo to shore.

But Sir, after striving and working and building their houses there and preparing for the winter, the vessel finally set sail from Hopedale to return to England. On the return it was heading north to get out into the North Atlantic when it was boarded by a group of eskimos just north of Davis Inlet and the eskimos persuaded the captain to come on shore. They had a lot of furs to trade and if they were to bring ashore their goods they would enter into trading with them. The four men went on shore as the story goes, and it is true, but Sir, the four men never returned. That is four of the ship's crew never returned. The chief officer of the ship decided after waiting for hours and days, that he would have to go back to Hopedale in order to sail the ship back to London, he would have to go back to Hopedale to pick up the four intended missionaries to help sail the ship back, and that is what he did. The ship arrived back in Hopedale and the four intended Moravians were very disappointed that now they had to forego their mission among the eskimos and return to England. This they did and it was not before 1771 that the

Moravians started back in Northern Labrador to preach the Gospel and provide the Eskimos with what spiritual guidance they would perform.

But, Sir, the trading among the Eskimos and the Indians to some degree was carried out by the Moravian Mission. The Moravian Mission did the trading that we the Government are doing today.

MR. ABBOTT: The hon. Mr. Neary..

MR. WINSOR: No, well he is doing a very good job. This I must say, Mr. Speaker, since I have been in service to the people of Labrador, as their member, I have had the opportunity of escorting every Minister of Welfare to that particular part of the coast except the hon. member for Bonavista North. He got as far as Goose Bay, but I do not know what happened from there. He never did get down to the Northern part of the coast. I wish he had, I wish he had.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. WINSOR: Oh, yes, I had him down, I had him down as a matter of fact, I had him baptized in one of the synagogues up there..

MR. MURPHY: I believe that if he had to stay there, he would have done a tremendous amount of work.

MR. WINSOR: Well as a matter of fact, he left a very good impression, because since that trip he has got quite a few compliments. I have been asked to bring him back again.

MR. EARLE: Did he get any Christmas cards? I got a dozen.

MR. WINSOR: No. He did not get the Christmas cards, but he, too, like the member for Fortune, he collected quite a few of souvenirs. I never could collect any, but those two gentleman did and I am sure they have them in thier living room somewhere now.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the trading, the first Harmony which was the name of the vessel the Moravian Mission owned, it started trading in 1902. It used to bring the supplies over from England and go back or go to Labrador and collect what fish, furs they had and bring them back to England. That was the beginning of it. But in 1926, the Moravian Missions solded their Harmony

and Hudson Bay Company came in. This is the year the hon. Minister of Education was telling us about. The Minister of Social Development has a very important meeting outside, Sir, and I am afraid that I am going to have to cut this short, but nevertheless, in 1926 the Hudson Bay Company took over the trading in Northern Labrador. Then, Sir, when the price of fur went down and there was no fish to catch, because the Hudson Bay Company did not encourage the Eskimos to fish - then the Government was left. When the Hudson Bay Company gave an ultimatum to the Government and said " we cannot make ends meet up here, you people will have to take over." This the Government did and not by choice at that time, not by choice but by force, because there was no other alternative open, only a few suggestions offered by private enterprise and if they were to go in there, they would be paid their deficit or loss. Well now that would be a very good pay and proposition for any private enterprise.

Sir, that is briefly the background of the trading. Now we, the Government, are providing an excellent service in that area and what is being done in Northern Labrador, Sir, is almost unbelievable. I do not want to take any credit for it, but I am glad that I was in a position to play some little part in the improvements in Northern Labrador. The Minister of Education mentioned the fact that the Federal Government paid a subsidy for housing and schooling and what not. Now, if I recall in 1956, the Federal Government made available \$250,000 for this purpose. It continued until 1958, I think, it was when Mr. Diefenbaker came in power - the friends' party over there now and it was discontinued completely. And it was not picked up again before Mr. Pearson got into power and then they increased it with the help of the Minister of Education and the help of the hon. Jack Pickersgill, we got it up to ninety - ten which it is now. But, Sir, I could go on and on and on, but the Minister of Social Development there is anxious to attend some other meeting and I certainly agree with this Bill.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to delay the hon. Minister and I will not speak for any more than one hour and a half which is all I am permitted on this Bill. I certainly am not going to vote against the Bill, Mr. Speaker, because no one wants to vote against that hon. minister - who wants to vote against babyhood. I MEAN

to vote against a baby would be ultimate degradation and as the hon. minister likes it in baby talk, I will try to be simple.

Now, Mr. Speaker, under this Bill it is to cover all the Northern Labrador and all the residents of Northern Labrador which, of course, includes more people than Eskimos and Indians. It is for all the residents of Labrador and by way the hon. minister who just sat down, of course, is a very knowledgeable man in that area of the country being the member for the district since when?

AN HON. MEMBER: 1956

MR. CROSBIE: 1956 and he is certainly familiar with the coast. Now I have never been up any further than North West River, but, Mr. Speaker, I think the Government should consider seriously transferring this division, if there is a Department of Labrador Affairs, if that department is going to continue, I feel that it should have some function to carry out directly related to the people of Labrador. In this case, Northern Labrador.

My own experience leads me to believe that the Department of Labrador Affairs, as at present constituted, does nothing but get in the way of other line departments of the Government. It is not necessary, now this is nothing to do with the hon. minister. I certainly know that he is doing his best job that can be done in the Department of Northern Affairs. But by definition, the Department of Labrador Affairs can only get in the way of the line departments of Government. The Department of Municipal Affairs deals with Municipal Affairs in Labrador, the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources deals with mineral resources, the forests of Labrador. Welfare deals



MR. CROSBIE: the welfare of Labrador where that is needed, welfare allowances. Highways deal with the Highways of Labrador, and the Department of Labrador Affairs do nothing, and in my opinion Mr. Speaker, and according with my experience, does nothing for the people of Labrador except it is a Department of Labrador Affairs in the Government of Newfoundland and that is supposed to have some great psychological effect on Labrador, but it does not. Most of the Labrador people I have met resent the fact that we have a Department of Labrador Affairs in the Government of Newfoundland. They feel that it separates them, that it puts them in a category of some kind of second class citizenship, and they do not - the policy move that created Labrador Affairs has not worked in Labrador. It has not made the people of Labrador feel any closer - more closely related to the people of Newfoundland, and I am not talking politically now, just from what I have experienced from when I have been up there on trips. And I do not doubt that many members from the other side had the same experience.

There is another thing resented in Labrador. They changed the name of the Province to Newfoundland and Labrador - it has not had the psychological effect or whatever effect the Government of Newfoundland desired it to have. It has not worked, and the division of Labrador Affairs has no real function, it operates a subsidy policy on the air flights to and from Labrador, which is just a book-keeping minor clerical business. It has no live functions to perform, yet if you are dealing with Labrador you feel that you have to deal with the Department of Labrador Affairs and keep them advised. In other words Mr. Speaker, all they are doing is getting in the way. They are an unnecessary obstacle, and the hon. minister shakes his head. But if that department is to continue I would like to see it with the Division of Northern Labrador Affairs going with it? Why should the people of Northern Labrador be looked on as coming within the category of those that have to be assisted by the Department of Welfare or Social Services. It is the wrong department

for it to be with. It should not be with the Department of Welfare. Why should everyone in Northern Labrador, Northwest River North, have to feel that he is a ward of the Department of Welfare, soon to be called Social Services and Rehabilitation? If we are to have a Department of Labrador Affairs, that is one live function that that department could perform admirably. And the present minister of the department is the member for the district, the one in the Government most familiar, with all aspects of that operation in Labrador. He is also acting Minister of Fisheries now, which keeps him a little bit busier. However, a man in his capacity could manage Northern Labrador Affairs also I am sure. Quite seriously Mr. Speaker, if we are to continue the Department of Labrador Affairs, let us give the minister something to do besides getting in the way of all the other departments that operate in Labrador. And the Division of Labrador Affairs is one of the matters that he could certainly take over. Northwest River, now one of the most important aspects of this Bill, is the one having to do with education - two aspects, Section (11) L - Erect at Northwest River, a dormitory to provide accommodation for residents. I assume that that dormitory is a dormitory for students who are going to attend school in Northwest River, which is not yet built. But in my visit to Northwest River Mr. Speaker, Doctor Paddon and the others living there have stressed and the rest of them, that it is of the utmost importance for this dormitory to be constructed at Northwest River, so that - because they say that the only way you are ever going to really assist education in Northern Labrador is to have a centralized high school facility, and to have that you must have a dormitory with it, because you just cannot scatter these schools along the coast of Northern Labrador. Now last year

MR. WINSOR: Is he not aware that there is a dormitory at present in North West River? It is to replace the old one.

MR. CROSBIE: Right. The dormitory is present in Northwest River is not of the required size now, and is not a modern

MR. WINSOR: There is one there.

MR. CROSBIE: Right, there is one there now, but it cannot take the number of students that are now required. And if the students along the coast of Labrador are ever to have an opportunity to even get a Grade XI education, much less go to University, that dormitory is essential. Now last year, the Government called tenders to build the new school and dormitories in Northwest River. Because of lack of funds or some reason like that, it was decided later to build only the school and not the dormitory, and they are not in the Estimates this year Mr. Speaker, as far as I can see, the minister can correct me. Any funds allocated for the construction of this dormitory at Northwest River - now the construction of the school without the dormitory is almost in the category of being a waste of funds. Could the hon. minister tell us when the Government plans to construct the dormitory - are there any plans to construct it this year? There are other questions in connection with those tenders too Mr. Speaker, that I will not speak on tonight, I will speak on later. The tenders that were called for the school and the dormitory. So that is one important aspect. Can the minister tell us what the plans are in respect of the dormitories? As I understand it, it is essential for Labrador to have that dormitory if education is really to get a move ahead in Northern Labrador. In the same Clause Mr. Speaker, (11) M - Assist financially students from Northern Labrador to complete high school education, and if considered desirable, assist financially students in Northern Labrador to attend the Memorial University in Newfoundland. Would the minister tell us - this is something that is now in effect when he retires. Is there already a scheme in effect to do this? And could he tell us how many students are involved now, or whether this is a future policy, or how many are now being assisted to attend Memorial because I think that is another very important aspect of this Bill. Now Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more with the hon. member for Bonavista North tonight, when he said that housing should be with the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing. That department has a minister. The hon. minister opposite - one of

the two ministers who answers questions tabled in the House fully and completely to date at any rate. The Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation Mr. Speaker, operates in Happy Valley now. They are in charge I believe, of a housing development in Happy Valley. Yet twenty miles away or thirty whatever the distance is at Northwest River, is a housing estate for the Indians of Northwest River, operated by the Department of Labrador Affairs. Why should that be necessary? Why should this division operate this housing? We already have a housing agency for the Province.

The Department of Provincial Affairs - theirs is a department that should include what is now included in Labrador Affairs, and the Northern Labrador Division also. What do we have a Department of Provincial Affairs for Mr. Speaker? It is almost a joke. It is almost a joke, the Department of Provincial Affairs. If we have a Department of Provincial Affairs, why should not that cover Labrador Affairs? Are not Provincial Affairs, Labrador Affairs? I do not mean now the hon. minister who heads that department is a man I respect very much, but the Department of Provincial Affairs could supervise or carry out a lot more activities than it does now. I am sure the hon. the minister would agree with that. Why have this department of Labrador Affairs when we already have a Department of Provincial Affairs? However, that is another question.

The minister might also mention the cable car over Northwest River - what department does that come under? Now the cable car in Northwest River Mr. Speaker, comes under the Department of Highways, with everything else comes under the Department of Labrador Affairs. Why does not the hon. the minister want that cable car? He has refused to take jurisdiction over that cable car. There is probably a department for "ferries" in the Government too. I mean in our new modern society we are going to have a Department of "Ferry Affairs."

Now to be quite serious, a cable car I saw somewhere in the news recently was going to do something about the cable car. There had been an accident there a week or two ago, and I think it was probably the member

for Labrador North who said I think it was a bridge is required across the river. So I do not whether the minister has any news on that cable car. And I think I have about covered what I wanted to say on this Bill, with one exception Mr. Speaker. Section (15) Mr. Speaker, it is just as well to give this Government all power, because it is going to take it anyway. Just look at Section (15) B - Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Government-in-Council the minister may (b) enter into any Agreement for which no specific provision is made elsewhere in this Act, which he deems necessary or desirable for the purpose of exercising or discharging his powers, functions or duties. Carte Blanche - the minister may have an oil refinery up in Northern Labrador the next thing we know, under Section (b) The minister can enter into - I would say that hon. minister is going to have a baby-talk refinery up there. It might not be 100,000 barrels. This Bill Mr. Speaker, gives the hon. minister, and we all know if you give the hon. minister anything - is you give him an inch he will take a mile. This gives him a mile, I do not know what he is going to take. He can enter into any agreement which he deems necessary or desirable for the purpose of exercising or charging his powers, functions or duties.

Mr. Speaker, in this Province, we are so used to the Government being all-powerful, that the most atrocious legislation can go through this House without anybody even throwing up. And this is one of the Sections - we had another example this afternoon - the Wildlife Act. We noticed the hon. the Minister for Wildlife stayed out of the House until a few minutes ago, because he did not want to defend that atrocity. We hope it is down being redrafted. The hon. the minister wants to seize everybody's property that goes in hunting, and have it forfeited whenever a wildlife officer has had a rough night. The hon. minister has to go to a meeting - so I will just ask the hon. minister. I know it is casting my what-nots before swine is it? I am never good at all these old expressions Mr. Speaker - casting the pearls before the swine, is that it? Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister really look at that, and let us know whether he feels he

feels he should have the power just to enter into any old agreement he wants to enter into without referring to the people's House. For twenty-one years we have heard talk about the people's House, and if there is one thing the people do not control is this House. We do not control the House - the Government does not control the House. We are told the majority controls the House, and when we say that the Government controls the House because they are the majority, we were howled down and laughed at. And you hear ministers get up and say, "the Government does not control the rules, the Government does not control the rules, the members do." How many of the members? The majority of the members. Where are the majority of the members? On the Government side of the House, therefore the Government controls the House. I am getting a bit off the point.

DR. ROWE: Point of order. My hon. friend anticipated me when he said he is getting a bit off the point. I am enjoying immensely what he is saying here, but I cannot help feeling that he might be out of order there. I do not think what he is talking about here - the rules of this House have anything to do with this particular Bill.

MR. WELLS: People in glass houses should not throw stones.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I must now conclude because as the hon. the minister pointed out I was getting a little bit off the point. I must say that I did not feel that he was off the point when he went back 400 years and he started talking about intimate relations between the races and all the rest of it. I do not know of one line in this Bill about intimate relations between the races. However, if the hon. minister has experience in that line in Northern Labrador, I am prepared to accept his evidence. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKEY: I would like to speak Mr. Speaker, but two cannot stand at the one time. Am I allowed to go on now Sir? Or should I wait until the meeting is over? Well Mr. Speaker, I intend to do the hon. minister a favour in announcing that I will oppose this Bill, and if he does not appreciate it right now, he will soon after this Bill becomes law and passes through the House. My reason in saying that is I think he already has enough

responsibilities. In fact any hon. minister of Welfare or Social Services or Rehabilitation or whatever one would like to call it, always bites off more than he can chew. And this certainly is not as evident in any other Province as it is in this Province of ours with the tremendous problem that we have of unemployment and highrate of welfare benefits. I am somewhat astounded Sir to find that this Bill is introduced in the House. I had hoped to find

MR HICKEY:

I had hoped to find something really new to my knowledge most, if not all of the things that we are now asked to give authority to the minister to do - have been carried on for quite a number of years by this very department. I wonder why we are - is it that we are now going to legalize what has been going on for a number of years. Surely, Sir, I would vote that instead of this Bill coming before the House that the responsibilities for the various aspects of problems in Labrador would be dealt with by the appropriate minister, who has responsibility for example for housing, I can see no reason why the Minister of Housing cannot deal with a housing problem in Labrador, as he does on the Island. Why the Minister of Fisheries cannot deal with a fisheries' problem in Labrador the same as he does on the Island. We have just heard that the Minister of Highways is still charged with the responsibility for a highway problem in Labrador. What in the name of God has he done to deserve that? Because every other area of responsibility that I can see has been cast on to the hon. minister who introduced this Bill. I frankly, Mr. Speaker, do not think that this Bill is the idea of the hon. minister at all. I think it has been passed on to him by someone else.

There is already a gap, Mr. Speaker, between Labrador and the Island of Newfoundland, and I do not mean that literally. There is already the feeling that among some people and especially some residents of various parts of Labrador that Labrador is really not part of Newfoundland. It should be our job, Sir, and it should be our desire to cement Labrador to the Island in terms of the administration of public services, not widen that gap and in passing this Bill, I think, this is exactly what we are doing - it seems that we are improving the lot of the people of Labrador and rightly so. This afternoon a Bill was passed to this hon. House granting approval among other things for people to take their dogs to Labrador. Well that is a step in the right direction.

MR. Speaker, if this Bill should pass, the only conclusion that I could



draw from it is that we will now have two Premiers. We will have the Premier of the Island as such and the hon. minister could only be classed as premier of Labrador, for he has all the powers almost as all the other ministers put together. What are we doing now, Mr. Speaker? Dividing Labrador? It would seem then that we are adding insult to injury. Instead of making the Labrador and bending over backwards to make it, really, a part of this Province, we are setting it out as a separate section.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly am not, having worked in the Department of Welfare, against any special treatment or special benefits for the people in Labrador and especially the Eskimos and Indians and the residents of that northern area. I am all for it. I realize only too well that the need for special services and special treatment and an effort to make them self-reliant. But I feel in all sincerity and I would like the hon. minister to know this that I am just not being funny or anything of that nature. This is not amusing. I am quite sincere when I say that this to me places a very onerous responsibility on the hon. minister who, as I have said at the beginning already has a most difficult job to do and a very trying job to do and certainly one that he can spend every available hour that he has in improving the Welfare services throughout this Province.

The only thing I can add, Sir, is that I, in all conscience must vote against this Bill. I think it is repetition to a certain extent. I think that we already have a Department of Labrador Affairs. We already have quite a large number of Cabinet ministers almost responsible for every aspect of life, covering every type of service. Surely, we do not have to burden one minister with what we are putting on the plate of the hon. Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation.

One could only suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if this Bill goes through that we make Roache's Line into a duplex. To go along with it, I suggest, we have two Premiers.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few comments. I am overdue

by about two hours to a most urgent meeting that hon. gentlemen will be talking about all day, if it should go ahead. But I will say this, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman who just took his seat has no more idea in this world than my two year old twins of what he is talking about, as far as the Northern Labrador service division is concerned, because this Bill Mr. Speaker, all it does is recognize a whole area of activity that is being carried on by this department for the last twenty odd or for the almost twenty years and so all it does is give it official recognition. It does not create an empire, Mr. Speaker, as one hon. gentleman pointed out. The service - Mr. Speaker, let me indicate to the gentleman who suggested that the generating of power and that the housing and all the other things be turned over to various Government departments. I want to say, in all sincerity, to these hon. gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, that at this particular point in our history, this for legal, technical and accounting reasons, through an agreement that we have with the Government of Canada, at this moment, it is not possible.

If we did this, we would have to make a very great sacrifice, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that the hon. members will understand what I am getting at without spelling it out. The hon. member for Labrador North brought up a very interesting point about the Moravian missions and he reminded me that next year the Moravian mission will observe its 200th anniversary in Northern Labrador and I think that we would be very remiss in our duties in this Province, if we did not recognize this very historic milestone in the life of the Moravian mission in Northern Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as the question the hon. member for Labrador West asked about the new dormitory at Northwest River, he is quite right. The school and the dormitory go hand in glove - for St. John's West. He is quite correct, when he says that the dormitory and the school go hand in glove. At the moment we are building the school. I think it will take something like two years to complete and I hope that the construction of the dormitory will

be announced in due course. I could not give him any time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just to wind up, I want to say this: that we are very, very proud of the service that is being provided to the people of Northern Labrador. As a matter of fact, because of this unique five year agreement that we have with the Government of Canada, I think I could say in this House without fear of contradiction that the native population in Northern Labrador, in this Province, are being treated better than the native population in any province of Canada. And that is a pretty proud boast, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. minister takes his seat and for his information with reference to the 200th celebration of the Moravian Missions, I might say that there is a committee of Government set up for that same purpose to celebrate 200 years of the Moravian Missions. The hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and I happen to be members of that committee.

MR. NEARY: I am glad to hear that, Mr. Speaker. I move second reading and if I have not answered the other questions that were raised, perhaps I could answer them when the estimates - or in committee.

On motion a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Administration Of Certain Special Services By The Department Of Social Services And Rehabilitation To The Residents Of Northern Labrador, read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion, second reading of a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The School Attendance Act, 1962," (Bill no. 37)

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Mr. Speaker, this is another one of what I have called for the sake of distinguishing them from the three major Bills on the Order Paper, one of the minor Bills. It and again I stress that this does not mean that by so designating them, I am in any way denigrating their importance; a change or an amendment may be important, but nevertheless, it is a minor - relatively<sup>a</sup> minor change here. I should also point out this: that in respect of

this Bill and several other of the minor Bills, they are more imposed than they actually are. Sometimes a change may be only in one word and yet the entire section or subsection is quoted - is repeated, given the impression perhaps that something new or a very important amendment is being introduced here. In this particular case, the purpose is to make a number of relatively small amendments in order to conform with certain aspects of the reorganization of Education that has been going on for the last two years in this Province and in particular, of course, to conform with the major legislation that we passed in the last session of the House.

Specifically, I would draw, the only points that I think I need draw to the attention of hon. members too are in three clauses and I should say also, at this time, that there may be some small point in a clause which we could - which some hon. member may wish to take up and in which case, I suggest, perhaps, that it might best be done in committee, when we can chit chat back and forth about it.

In Clause (2), we are changing the name of "School Attendance Officers" to "District School Attendance Counsellors." This is quite a deliberate recommendation to the House. At one time, we use to refer, in Newfoundland and elsewhere to those men who performed those functions as Truant Officers and, of course, there was an aura of the police about them and their functions. We, in Newfoundland, have not in recent years used the term "Truant Officers." We have used the word "School Attendance Officers." But this is a better term, of course, than Truant Officer, but it still does not convey the full meaning of the functions and responsibilities of these men who incidentally, I am very happy to say, are doing a marvelous job of work in Newfoundland. It is no accident. I stress this. It is no accident that school attendance - the average daily attendance in all our schools has gone up almost astronomically from

MR. ROWE:

at one time within the lifetime of many of us here the average daily attendance in the schools of Newfoundland was under sixty-per-cent. Certainly in the experience of many of us here, of Your Honour in your rule as a school principle and mine in the role of a supervising inspector of schools and other hon. members of this House who had experienced it. We can well recall when the average daily attendance in Newfoundland was only seventy-per-cent and that was the reported attendance and that reported attendance was not, in my view, always accurate. I would suggest that it was inflated at that time.

Today the attendance is much more carefully recorded for a number of reasons. A very important one being that the family allowances, the Federal family allowances are based on school attendance and if a child is not in attendance at school regularly, he should be unless there is medical evidence that he cannot be in school or there is some other reason of one kind or another, the family allowances are withheld and, of course, today we also have other means of enforcing attendance at school. But nevertheless a large number of families needs something more than merely a check up, they need something more than somebody rapping on the door and saying, "Where is Johnny, he is not in school today? Why was he not in school? You know we are going to take you to court". That day is gone. When children are not in school today usually something more than a treat is needed and so in the records of our Department of Education you will find that the school attendance officers spend more time in the homes of children than they do in the schools, they spend more time, a goodly portion of the time meeting with clergymen, meeting with welfare officers, meeting perhaps with police officials, with the magistrate and others in an attempt to do something to help children have regular attendance at school.

One reason in Newfoundland for the drop out in grade nine, ten and grade eight, and that serious drop out is still serious, it is not as bad of course as it was but it is still pretty serious in Newfoundland, it is serious elsewhere too, we are not alone in that but one reason for it is that so many children with irregular attendance in the lower grades and eventually being pushed ahead, you cannot keep a student or a pupil in grade two forever, if he reaches eleven or twelve or reaches puberty and shoots up to six feet, you

MR. ROWE:

cannot keep them down in grade two or three so usually they are pushed ahead anyway, eventually they may have to repeat but one reason for the drop out, the very large drop out is that pupils with a record of irregular attendance and therefore, of course, of poor learning, most students they reach grade seven or grade eight or grade nine and they are entirely in over their desks, the work is simply beyond them, they lose interest and it does not mean anything to them and so they drop out of school as soon as they can, as soon as they reach the legal age.

Well, I stressed this because although this change is minor in a sense, it is also significant because it symbolizes the different role that our officers, our so called school attendance officers are playing in Newfoundland today. I am very happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that within this last couple of years we have been able to do something that was never done before, as the hon. member for Fortune will recall and others who served in the department, we have now been able to extend this service to cover the entire province including Labrador.

Clause 4, that replaces Section 9 in the Principal Act. In addition to amending the old section to conform with the new definitions given in Clause 2, it amends the Principal Act by deleting two sub-sections which authorize principals to suspend pupils for serious breaches of discipline. This was deleted because it is included in the Schools Act. In other words it is superfluous, it is a redundancy. There is no need of it, it is in the Schools Act and there is just simply no need of having this thing carried in other legislation as well. The Schools Act is the main education legislation that we have in this Province.

Clause 5 amends Section 10 of the Principal Act by giving school superintendents certain responsibilities which in the original Act were assigned to the chairman of the School Board. The reason for that must be obvious I am sure to all hon. members. Until this last couple of years there was quite literally no one who could carry those responsibilities except the chairman whereas this last couple of years, with the reorganization and consolidation of our School Boards, from some three hundred down to about thirty-seven for

MR. ROWE:

the entire Province, with that consolidation, Boards, as I pointed out I think it was yesterday, are now in a position financially and administratively to engage profession superintendents. So these duties which perforce had to be assumed by the chairman, usually a clergyman, can now be given to the proper person, the Boards agent, the superintendent who in every case has to be a profession man and, of course, far more competent to discharge these duties than would be any chairman no matter how dedicated he might be.

These are the three amendments here in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, and I have much pleasure in moving Second Reading.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I am quite aware of the explanation given by the hon. minister with reference to these changes. The Education Act at the present time is very difficult, of course, to follow on account of the many changes and when it is all compounded. But there is just one thing I am wondering and this is the term councillor. I think in all the high schools today we have councillors, as such, within the schools themselves

AN HON. MEMBER: Guidance Councillors.

MR. MURPHY: Guidance, yes, but I am just wondering now, a councillor means a district school attendance councillor in the department you see. Is there any repetition of the like or duplication of names in calling these people councillors? You are suppose to report to your councillor. Well a kid reports to his guidance councillor in school instead of this term here district school attendance councillor. I am just wondering, it seems to be to me that there is going to be a bit of a mix up there in many cases and I am just wondering if it is wise to, at this time where so many high schools are getting their guidance councillors who is referred to as the councillor in the school and perhaps dropping guidance, would there be any doubt there if the area in which a councillor, as such, whether it be a school attendance councillor or a guidance councillor would work? It is just a thought I had. Everything else, of course, is following on, other members may wish to. But that is one point that struck me this term councillor which is becoming very prevalent today particularly in our high schools.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on this Act. I hope that the hon. minister in his reply does not assume, as he appeared to do in my discussion on

MR. EARLE:

the last Act, that I was blasting the Government on this particular one. I did not do so in the previous discussion and I was only commenting adversely on some of the duplication and expense. But in this case here, this particular Act, there are one or two things that I would like to mention.

There is particular reference here to the approval of principal, may excuse from attendance any child. This, I think, is quite a good provision but it brings to mind one rather sad circumstance which I think the Department of Education has so far not been able to cope with. That is the type of children who are somewhat more than just slow learners but are not really in the fully retarded class. I have come across this in many sections of the country, where a child cannot seem to benefit fully from school but yet is not unintelligent. This is a field which I hope that the Department would be able to get into in a very, very big way.

There is a great need around the Province of Newfoundland to take care of children who are a little more than just what is termed a slow learner. I have in mind a case which I saw several months ago of a child who gave every outward appearance of being quite intelligent in the home but that child had reached eight years old and had not been in any school at all. It did not seem to be sufficiently retarded for the School for Retarded Children and yet it could not cope with the ordinary class work. There is a very difficult area here which I know the department has made some attempts in schools to do something about it but probably from lack of funds and more particularly from lack of trained personell. This is an extremely difficult field to cope with but this phrase in the Act just brought to my attention that particular problem and I should like to stress it for the minister and hope that within the reorganization of his department that that particular problem would be taken special note of because it is a very big problem.

The other question of school attendance is somewhat at sometimes related to transportation and the hon. minister answered a question of mine yesterday in the House. I planted the question deliberately to find out what had been done about upgrading or improving the bus transportation system. I knew and he knew that I knew that a report had been prepared in confidence for the



MR. EARLE:

Government and he mentioned this but he was not prepared to give it to this House. Now I did not know that any action had been taken on that report because I seem to feel, I seem to remember that some very serious implications in the report that meant that the bus system needed very, very complete revision, the whole school bus transport system.

It is a very expensive operation for Government. It is costing, I think, upwards of \$3. million a year now. There seem to be at times a great crossing of tracks and recrossing of bus routes and so on which needed to be ironed out. There are problems in areas actually that I have seen where buses are going over routes which essentially are not really safe for children. This is a problem to be decided between the Department of Highways, I believe, and the Department of Education. But all of these things coming within this bus survey, I was hoping that the minister would be able to elaborate somewhat more and tell us actually what the department was planning and what it was going to do to improve the bus transportation system.

This very often in small outports brings up a very serious problem for parents because distances involved where these buses travel are quite long, quite great, and while it does not matter too much in the case of high school children of teen-age or in their say twelve to sixteen year group, in the very young children who are now in some cases being transported to grades one and two and even, I believe, down to kindergarten, it does present a very, very great problem to the parents when these very small tots are away from home for the best part of the day. I know there has been in a number of places quite a lot of resentment about this and difficulty with the authorities, the school boards and so on in transporting these children back and forth.

It is not an easy problem to solve because without doubt the children are benefiting by going to better schools but at the same time there is a home problem there which has to be taken into account. I sometimes wonder in a small place where the children are at a very young age and have to be taken long distances if it would not be preferable for a year or two to keep them in that village with a well trained junior teacher there to look after these

MR. EARLE:

very young ones rather than taking them for many miles every day. I do not know, I do not claim to be an authority on education as I was on minister for three years but these are some of the vexing problems which a minister and his department faces. In this total reorganization of the department, I think some of the fundamental problems which affect the families and affect the parents and, of course incidently, affect the children themselves will have to be looked at very closely.

This particular Act just brought to mind these two particular problems. The problem of the more than slow learner child and the problem of the transportation of the very young children over long distances. I just mentioned these things in passing so that I hope that they will be taken note of.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I will support this Bill and the purpose of my rising is to ask the hon. minister a question. I raised it in this House before and that is in connection with certain section of the School Attendance Act. I am not sure what section it is but it deals with a certain area in which there is no bus service or where a child who is absent, will be, the parents of that child will not be penalized in terms of having their family allowance cut off.

On a couple of occasions this matter was brought to my attention and I raised it in the House and it seems that some parents are aware of it and have indeed taken advantage of it. Some parents, of course, who probably could well be charged with neglect of their children or who are not interested in their children to the extent that they should be from the point of view of proper education. I think a matter such as this possibly could be looked into and possibly an amendment to the Act might be in order. I wonder would he check it and -

MR. HICKEY: determine what the story is.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, if no other hon. member wishes to speak I will just make one or two comments relative to those made by the hon. gentleman on the other side. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition mentioned just one point which frankly had never occurred to me at all. I can see the possibility there of its happening, but I think in practice possibly not, because the guidance counsellor normally and hopefully is assigned - he is an employee of the Board, number one, whereas the people we are talking about here are employees of the Department of Education. Number two, a guidance counsellor would be restricted to one or may two or three schools under a Board system. For example the guidance counsellor for the integrated board of St. John's will probably confined if not to one of the colleges, certainly to one or two of them. And he will be an officer with an office in those schools. And normally he is another teacher, a specialist it is true, but another teacher on the staff the children would be reported to. Whereas these officers are men who have large districts. These officers are men who have large districts. There is one for example for Conception Bay, well there are a couple, a man and a woman for Conception Bay. And incidentally we have started Mr. Speaker, to do something that I think is an important innovation, we have started appointing women to these posts - capable, trained and dedicated women to these posts, not in any way denigrate the work done by the men. But I think it would be appreciative that women can do some work. However, I do not think in practice that this would be a serious matter. Now the hon. member for Fortune Bay made several I though, quite intelligent contributions to this debate here. And in particular he mentioned, he referred to a certain type, not exactly retarded children, but the type that we all are familiar with - the extremely slow learner, whatever the reason might be for it. This is something that we are attempting to cope with in a determined way. Already as a result of our program, Boards have been able to engage specialists of various kinds, and at this moment there are 280 specialists, this is not generally known - 280 specialists employed

by Boards of Education. We have now amended the regulations at the Cabinet level to make it possible for Boards of Education to engage another - between another forty and fifty specialists in the coming school year. And many of these specialists are reading specialists, and this is significant because Mr. Speaker, as I know you are quite aware of, one of the great causes of slow learning is inability to read, and this inability to read may persist right through students or a pupil's school life. And you will find, I have known them in University who found great difficulty in getting through their University courses, and the reason for it was they did not know how to read, it is as simple as that. It is a pretty serious problem in our school, and in other schools too, but especially in Newfoundland, where we have had so many in the past, so many small schools where teachers had too many classes and too many pupils, and consequently could not, could not devote the time to the training of children in reading, because reading is something, again something that is often not known. I do not want to preach a sermon on pedagogy, but this is not generally known. Certainly a great many people do not know it. Reading is an art which has to be taught to the pupils. You have to learn how to read. This has been discovered more recently, only in the last few years that it is quite possible to take an average reader and by intensive training and practice of the right kind, not of the wrong kind because you can have practice in misspelling a word, or practice in multiplying wrongly, and you can keep on misspelling that word from now until judgement day and you are still wrong. An adult may have bad habits of reading, and he may persist in those bad habits forever. A dangerous life, still carrying on bad habits of reading. It has been found of course - it is well known that by intensive training and practice an average reader may be taught to read and indeed in some cases may even teach himself to read as much as four or five times as fast as he has been reading. And some people have developed the art to a point where they can read a page in two or three seconds. I know one or two friends of mine who are quite

confident to do that. We had one member of this House who was probably - he may very well be the fastest reader in Newfoundland, I am referring to the hon. member for St. Mary's, who may be the fastest reader in Newfoundland. Certainly the fastest reader I know in Newfoundland. The late President Kennedy was also a person of that kind. He could read the average size book in perhaps half an hour or an hour. Whereas for most people it would take five or six or seven or eight hours. Speed-reading is one name given to it. Anyway I will not go into it any further. The point I am making Mr. Speaker, in answer to my hon. friend's remarks over there - is that the addition to the specialist to our school system, especially specialists in reading, more and more of our children are being taught to become good readers, and therefore are able to learn better. Because a child cannot learn history well if he is not a good reader, if he does not know how to read properly. It is impossible to learn history or anything else requiring reading. The other point I would make Mr. Speaker, is this. I announced a couple of months ago, to my mind, and I was surprised at the lack of publicity this got, not that it mattered too much perhaps, but I was surprised at it. I announced one of the most in my view, most momentous and progressive step in education in our entire educational history. And that was that starting in September of 1971, the Government was assuming complete responsibility for the education of all so-called retarded children in the Province. Indeed we are starting in September of this year, 1970 - we are assuming financial responsibility for the payment of the teacher, and starting the following year, we are taking over the entire operation ourselves. Now this can have great significance because once the Government gets into the field - take for example the education of the deaf.

I remember in 1949 when I was in the Department of Public Welfare. At that time one of the clubs here was sending, I think it was two children a year, the Kinsmen's Club was sending away two children a year to the school for the deaf up in Montreal I think it was, or Halifax. And they came to us and they said, now I am paraphrasing it - we can no longer afford

this, and in any case we are being embarrassed by the fact that other parents who have deaf children are coming to us and asking us to do this - to send their children away, and we do not have the means or the money - my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works who was I believe one of guiding spirits in that very worthy enterprise. Well we decided, I put this up to the Government, and the Government decided to take over responsibility, and what happened? Within two years we were sending to Halifax and Montreal, seventy-five children at our own expenses, that is at Government expense, we were paying their transportation, we were paying people to go along with them, nurses and attendants to go along - chaperones or some word we used - escorts with them, taking them to Halifax and Montreal, paying their cost up there, and within two or three years, the Government was then responsible for the education of every deaf child in Newfoundland, and is to this moment. Fortunately now we have our own school. So this point raised by the hon. minister -

MR. CROSBIE: To a point of order. The hon. minister was up there about an hour ago when I was off the point, and this is to deal with school attendance? I mean really! We want to progress with our work in this House as quickly as we can.

MR. ROWE: I thank the hon. member for drawing my attention to this Mr. Speaker. He probably was not here, if he was, he was not listening - after all it was not I who raised this matter at all. It was the hon. member for Fortune Bay - after all you would not expect me to ignore him would you? There is just one other point that was raised over there, again I do not think it directly concerns this Bill. My hon. friend, two of them, raised points regarding transportation. I said a day or two ago that when we come to the Estimates, I intend to give the House a fairly complete account of the transportation program. Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in moving second reading of this Bill.

On motion A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The School Attendance Act, 1962," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole

House on tomorrow.

Bill No. (44)

HON. E. N. DAWE (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this Bill - the amendments for this Bill is to confer upon municipalities to make regulations with respect to zoning within the various communities. Also provision is made to set up zoning appeal boards and further appeals of the zoning appeal Board to the Judge of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland. I can speak Mr. Speaker, from personal experience that I fail to see why this small amendment has not been made to the Act previous to this, because many small councils especially have been frustrated in the past by not being able to set up zoning within their municipalities, unless they had a plan adopted by the urban renewal planning Act of my division. And anyone familiar with this the urban Renewal Planning Act have knowledge to know how restricted it, and that to make any changes in the plan once it is adopted is quite extensive. And some of the communities I know, some of the council have been reluctant to adopt the Urban Renewal Planning Act just because of this reason. I would also like to point out for the benefit of the House, that due to the heavy demands and requests for Urban Renewal Planning, that many councils being frustrated in that they have had to wait many years before the plan could be envisaged for their community. I know speaking of my own council I was associated with in Bay Roberts, we have been waiting for close to ten years to have a plan adopted, and I am sure we would be most happy if these amendments were made to the Act, so we could have adopted our own zoning at that time. I do not see

I do not see any conflict with the councils in this regard and I am sure that it would be welcomed I know by all the smaller communities throughout the Province so that they can make regulations regarding the fruition of building and lands as I say within the community.

We also made provision that an appeal board will be set up by the Council, but the board itself will not consist of members of the council and that failing the provisions under the zoning appeal board, in the decision of this board is not acceptable by a person himself they can make further appeal to the judge of the Supreme Court. As I say, Mr. Speaker, I think this would be welcomed most heartily by many of the communities and councils throughout the Province and I would have much pleasure, I have much pleasure in moving second reading to this Bill.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to support this Bill and the question I would like to raise, may be the minister would be good enough to answer when he closes the debate. I am wondering if there is such a provision in the city of St. John's Act, wherein a person who does not agree with the decision of the, made by council, in regards to zoning property and having appealed it to council still does not agree. If there is a provision wherein they can take it to the Supreme Court, I certainly support this amendment because I feel that there are instances where properties are zoned to be residential and upon request by certain people to have such property re-zoned commercial, they are turned down, however in some cases not too long afterwards such properties were zoned commercially this raises the question as to whether or not it makes a difference as to who is requesting the re-zoning of that property. I think this measure is certainly a good one, certainly in the right direction and I am wondering if such a provision exists within the city of St. John's.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, just so there would be no doubt. I do not know whether the minister intended, and there is an error in the Bill, intended that there would be an appeal to the Supreme Court but there is no appeal to the Supreme Court from the basic decision. An appeal to the Supreme Court is limited to a question of law or jurisdiction so that the matter



raised by the hon. member for St. John's East Extern, if an applicant to the city council is dissatisfied and appeals to the board, and is still dissatisfied, he does not have a right to appeal to the Supreme Court, basically, unless the board that heard it made an error on a point of law, interpreting a point of law, but on the factual situation there is no right to appeal the appeal is limited to law or jurisdiction whether or not the board had jurisdiction here, it has nothing to do with the rights or wrongs or whether the appeal should<sup>or should</sup>/not be granted except on legal matters.

This Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support the principle of this Bill. It makes an appeal from a decision of the municipal council outside of St. John's much more readily available to people than it is presently. And the urban and rural planning board at the moment are handling the appeals from zoning decisions of municipal councils and they have done a good job I do not think anybody should try and take any credit away from them. They have, they have travelled all over the Province and heard appeals and they have made a good effort. But nevertheless there is delays and so on in appeals you cannot readily take them, I think that this is the step in the right direction.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support the principle of the Bill but that is not, either have the minister tell that he was wrong or the Bill is wrong and an appeal to the Supreme Court was intended, or let us correct this idea that there is a right of appeal to the Supreme Court it is limited to matters of law or jurisdiction, as it appears in the Order Paper now.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I hope we are seeing a preview of the new page boy uniform, for the House here, it is very very attractive, Now, Mr. Speaker, with reference to this Bill I am happy to see that the hon. minister is following the great tradition of the minister of Municipal Affairs in the past. Because on my right hand here, I have the past minister of Municipal Affairs, with the longest tenure in that department

my hon. friend from Bonavista North. I was in the department for I think thirteen months. And now of course the hon. minister is there and he has a vast experience in Municipal Affairs. He mentioned Bay Roberts by the way, and his old town council, he was mayor there for many years. When the minister is answering I wonder if he could bring us up to date on the status of the financial affairs of the town of Bay Roberts. As there was some intimation that they are not entirely satisfactory -

MR.SPEAKER: Order please.

MR.CROSBIE: Do not think that is relevant Mr. Speaker? Well, the hon. minister just mentioned Bay Roberts, just brought it to mind. Getting back to the Bill then Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the Bill but I wonder whether the minister will consider making some amendment in section 1 (8) page 5. Certain appeal lies with a judge of the Supreme Court and the person who proposes to appeal has to serve a copy of his appeal on each member of the zoning appeal board. Under an earlier section the number of people who may be on the zoning appeal board is not regulated but are likely to be three or five. And I wonder why it is necessary to have the appellant search out and serve each member of the zoning appeal board. I would suggest to the hon. minister that nobody should ~~be~~ have to be served on one member or perhaps on the chairman of the zoning appeal board. because, for example, if there is a five man board in the town of Bay Roberts or Corner Brook or wherever, it would not be Corner Brook, Grand Falls, and one of them goes off to a business trip to the mainland and after the zoning appeal board gives its decision, and cannot be found to be served with a written notice of the intention of appeal it could be an awkward situation so I think it should, in fact it probably would be better if it was served on the town clerk, or some official, because who is usually around. I think the hon. minister might consider that it could be awkward, and it might spoil a person's appeal because he could not serve each member. With that exception Mr. Chairman, I would support the principle of the Bill.

The only other question I had was, the only other thought I had was that it might be worth considering regional zoning appeal boards. Instead

of having an appeal board for Bay Roberts and then one for Brigus and one for all the communities put together Carbonear, Harbour Grace, the minister might consider setting up regional appeal boards. For example, from Holyrood right to Carbonear, there could easily be one zoning appeal board, with three or five knowledgeable people on it. Now that cannot perhaps be done this year but it will be worth keeping in mind. Otherwise I support the Bill.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank the hon. member for Humber East to give me the information in regard to appeal to the Supreme Court in the city of St. John's. I have taken all the questions raised here and I am sure the question raised by the hon. member for St. John's West is an excellent suggestion and probably could amend the Bill in committee. I could see now the difficulty to, as I say for the appellant to give notice to every member of the zoning appeal board. I think probably it is well taken and I may have some suggestions for amendment in committee. As I say I feel that this Bill itself will be welcomed by many of the communities throughout the Province and as I say I fail to see why this amendment was not ~~brought~~<sup>brought</sup> in before this, and I do thank the members for the question raised and I will take these suggestions for a consideration during the committee stage of the Bill.

On motion Bill read a second time ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend the Public Libraries Act,"  
Bill No. 17.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, this is another one of these so-called minor Bills it is not nearly so substantial as it looks actually. Again you have a case where sections and sub-sections are quoted in order to make relatively minor changes within them, just a few words. There are four changes that I would, amendments that I would draw to the attention of the hon. members. I think perhaps that the best time again for any detailed discussion would be in committee when we can talk back and forth about them.

Clause 2, simply clarifies the procedure for the constitution of the Public Libraries Board. It does not change the content, there is no substantial

change in the content of the principle Act. It simply clarifies. Those three makes certain changes in the period of appointment of members of regional library boards. Whereas the principle Act states that one-third of the members of regional library boards shall retire annually in order of seniority. This Bill provides that members shall be appointed for a three/<sup>year</sup>period and that any vacancy called by a member who fails to complete his term of office can be filled by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. I think it is the opinion of those concerned, I have no strong opinion on it at all but they advise me that this is a more effective procedure to follow than the one that we have where one-third drop off every now and again.

Clause 4, amends the principle Act by providing the holding of annual and general meetings of the library board. It also makes provision for the establishment of an executive committee and it defines the status and functions and duties of such a committee. Where you have a large board I have forgotten how many there are now altogether - perhaps some hon. member remembers I believe it was something of the order of eighteen or twenty. Where you have a board of that kind trying to attend to details is very difficult for all hon. members, for board members to meet regularly and frequently, certainly frequently, especially when you have several out of town members as well, as we do have on our Public Libraries Board. Some living as far away indeed as Labrador, St. Anthony and so on. And so provision is now made for an executive committee which of course is standard procedure and practise with most boards of that nature anyway.

MR. WELLS: What do you mean by out of town members?

MR. ROWE: Well there was a member on it from Corner Brook. There was and is one on from - out of town, out of this town - out of St. John's. My hon. member should remember what I said about that inferiority complex earlier tonight.

MR. WELLS: Not an inferiority complex.

MR. ROWE: Out of town, surely my hon. friend, knows that out of town is

used all over the world, as the same connotation wherever it is used, whether you are in New York or in San Francisco or in St. John's or in Lewisporte. Out of town means out of the town does it not; in which you are speaking.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Town, the Town, what is The Town? St. John's.

MR. ROWE: Clause 5 is designed to provide continuity of operation of regional library boards, by holding members appointed under the principle Act in office until a date to be fixed by order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the public libraries board. It sounds a bit involved, but what it simply means is that members can be held in office there so that you will not have a lapse, you will not have a hiatus for some reason or another, the term of a board expires and a new board is not set up or new members have not been appointed to it. These are the only amendments worth commenting on Mr. Chairman, and I would move second reading.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, no comment that I may make is against this particular Bill, I think it is just a routine affair and does not need comment in that respect. There is only one point which comes to mind when I had to do with this directly as minister of Education and the question is often raised it seems to me an awfully stupid one in the appointment of members of Libraries Board. What were their political affiliations? I was never a political animal I could never, I have been accused of being politically naive, more so recently than in the past, but what on earth a person's political affiliations had to do with an appointment to the Libraries Board is quite beyond me. I could never

never see any since in that. The qualifications of a person on the Library board, in my opinion, were that he was a good servant, a good worker and a person with some intelligence, but the question always seemed to come up: what was his for her political affiliation? I hope that perhaps, in a little more broad-minded age, at least, that part of it can be forgotten. Other than that, Mr. Speaker, I have no comment to make on the Bill.

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

MR. CURTIS: I move, Mr. Speaker, that..

MR. COLLINS: I wonder can the House indicate to us at this hour just what legislation is coming the next day so that we can have a chance to get prepared for it?

MR. CURTIS: Tomorrow we can practically clean up this Order Paper as far as the Bills are concerned. I guess they really are not very consequential Bills, and I do not think they need any particular study.

I move, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred and that the House at its rising to adjourn until tomorrow Friday at 3:00 p.m. and that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER (NOEL): Motion is for adjournment. Those in favour "aye." Contrary "nay." Carried.

• This House stands adjourned until tomorrow Friday at 3:00 p.m.