



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

---

Volume 1

Number 71

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

---

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, MAY 19, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 11:00 <sup>A.M.</sup> ~~P.M.~~

MR. SPEAKER in the Chair:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the resignation of Mr. Gerry Ottenheimer as member of this House for the district of St. John's East left his party without a leader in the Province. This lack has now been remedied by the election of Mr. Frank Moores to be leader of that party for this Province. The Government feel that the Opposition party would wish strongly to have its leader occupy a seat in this House. As the district of St. John's East has been open for over six months a proclamation is issued today providing for the holding of a bye-election in St. John's East to be held on Thursday the 11th. of June.

When Mr. Stanfield was elected National Leader of the same party the Prime Minister of Canada Mr. Trudeau announced that the Liberal Party would not contest the bye-election in Nova Scotia in which Mr. Stanfield was his parties candidate. I wish to make the same announcement today in connection with the bye-election in St. John's East. The Liberal Party will not contest the bye-election, and so far as we are concerned Mr. Moores will receive the same courtesy in this Province that Mr. Stanfield received in Nova Scotia.

MR. HICKMAN: In the absence of the hon. Leader of the Opposition would the hon. the Premier indicate to the House if a bye-election will be called in Ferryland district as well.

MR. ROWE (W,N): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there seems to be a lack of understanding and even some misunderstanding about the water and sewer projects that are going ahead this year under the DREE program, I think it necessary for me to outline the program as it actually is for the present year. In the first place Sir, I cannot emphasise enough the simple fact that the DREE program itself, the main DREE program itself, is not yet ready, not yet signed, and not yet ready to go into operation. All of this will happen later in the present year, and all that we have up to this moment is a temporary DREE program for merely part of the Province.

In the second place Mr. Speaker, the water and sewer program even for the part of the Province covered by the temporary DREE program is anything but complete. It is our hope and our expectation that there will be other water and sewer projects in the present DREE section. The actual number of projects that are firm and final for the present season are eight in number. These eight are as follows; first at Port au Choix on the north west coast, a water system. At Hawks Bay, also on the north west coast, there is a water and sewer system. At Holyrood there is a water and sewer system. At Bishop's Falls there is a water system. On the south shore of Conception Bay there is a first step in a water and sewer system, and about this Mr. Speaker, I shall say more in a moment or two.

At St. Lawrence there is a water system. At Arnold's Cove there is a water system, and at Corner Brook, there is an extension to the water and sewer system. All of these projects go ahead this year and we have every hope that we can get nearly all of them completed and put into use well before the end of next year.

I must say Mr. Speaker, a special word about the Dree plan for the south shore of Conception Bay. This is a large area stretching from the western boundaries of St. John's to the eastern boundary of Holyrood. It stretches for a distance of some twenty or so miles, and has a good many thousand families living in it. The intention of the DREE plan is that an intensive study be made of that whole shore with a view to discovering what public services or infrastructure to use the word more popular in Ottawa will be necessary in that area in the coming years, including prominently a water and sewer system. It was specifically agreed in the DREE agreement this year, that the study, surveying and design of infrastructure or public service needs, including water and sewer facilities in the communities on the south shore of Conception Bay is a matter of high priority. In saying this I am virtually quoting the actual DREE agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to lay great stress upon the fact that these eight projects in the present temporary DREE program are anything but complete and final. It must be obvious to everyone that there are within the present temporary DREE areas a number of other water and sewer projects that are badly

needed. I have been making representations to DREE on behalf of the Government of this Province for inclusion of such needed projects in the main DREE agreement to be announced later this year. Some of these necessary water and sewer projects are as follows, and first I would like to mention the St. John's special area.

Water and sewer systems in Bay Roberts, Brigus, Kilbride, Spaniard's Bay and in Upper Island Cove. Also there is need of an extension to water and sewer systems in Carbonear, Harbour Grace and the St. John's metropolitan area. As I mentioned this is the St. John's special area. In the Come by Chance special area, there is needed water and sewer systems in Come by Chance and Southern Harbour. In the Burin Peninsula special area extensions to water and sewer systems are needed for example, in Grand Bank and Marystown.

In the central Newfoundland special area, there is need of an extension to the water and sewer system in Botwood, and a pumping station reservoir and water supply line in Gander for example. In the Corner Brook special area there is needed a water system at Steady Brook, a water and sewer system for the Pasadena - Midland area and an extension to the water and sewer system of Corner Brook to supply existing and new properties. In the Stephenville special area, a water and sewer system is needed at St. George's, and an extension is needed to the water and sewer system at Stephenville Crossing.

In the Happy Valley special area, there is needed a water and sewer system at Northwest River.

This list of special needs in the eight special areas announced so far by Ottawa, is by no means an exhaustive one. I have given it in order to indicate the volume of some of the requests and needs for municipal water and sewer systems merely within the present special areas designated by DREE. As mentioned, this Government is working towards having these and other projects included in the main agreement.

In addition to the eight special areas that have already been



established by DREE, this Government has negotiated with that Federal department in an effort to have other portions of the Province become special areas in the future. As a result of these negotiations, DREE has already indicated a willingness to add at least three more special area to the list including the area from Port aux Basques to Rose Blanche, portions of the Bale Verte Peninsula, and portions of the Bonavista Peninsula. Moreover Mr. Speaker, during the course of this summer, we shall be presenting strong cases for the inclusion of further areas of the Province as special areas.

As communities are brought into special areas, then of course DREE will be assisting them and bearing the cost of water and sewer services. If some of these additional areas should not be designated as special areas by DREE, the cost of such services will fall upon the Government of the Province. In either case Mr. Speaker, these services are so badly needed that, as will be seen by a statement to be made by my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs tomorrow, the Government has adopted the policy of insuring that these services are provided.

I have given this statement Mr. Speaker, in the hope of clarifying further the nature of DREE assistance contained in the first year's agreement, insofar as water and sewer projects are concerned, and to indicate what we in the Provincial Government are attempting to get the Federal Government to include in the main DREE agreement presently being negotiated. I have copies of this statement Mr. Speaker, for members of the House and for the press.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES:

NOTICE OF MOTION:

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow beg leave to introduce a Bill, " An Act To Incorporate The Moravian Church In Newfoundland And Labrador."

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, entitled a Bill, " An Act Further To Amend The Technical And Vocational Training Act, 1963."

I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, entitled a Bill, " An Act To Validate And Provide For The Enforcement Of A Certain Agreement Between The Heads Of Certain Religious Denominations Respecting The Apportionment And Payment Of Certain Monies Allocated By The Province For Certain Educational Purposes In Respect To The Fiscal Year 1962-63, And To Hold Her Majesty Bound By Such Agreement."

HON. G.A.FRECKER (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, entitled a Bill, " An Act To Amend The Automobile Insurance Act, 1968." I also give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, entitled a Bill, " An Act Further To Amend The Direct Sellers Act, 1966."

HON. E.DAWE (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, entitled " An Act To Amend The City Of St. John's Loan Act, 1969."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Mr. Speaker, question 108 in the name of the hon. the member for St. Barbe South, on the Order Paper of February 27th. It is a long answer, I think too long to give orally so I table it.

HON. H.STARKES (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to question 351, the answer to part one, have any or all road building contracts which were being carried out under the Atlantic Development Board grant, or any other special grants from Ottawa which were not completed by March 1970 been cancelled? The answer is no. Question no two does not arise. Question number three, would all of these contracts <sup>be</sup> completed under the first year of the DREE program, if not which one will be completed? The following contracts will be completed under the DREE program, Grand Bank towards Frenchman's Cove 12.18 miles. And now Mr. Speaker, in connection with the other two some people who have become mentally disturbed because of a previous announcement regarding the upgrading of a road at Hughes Brook, and I was accused of announcing that a river would be paved, I want it clearly understood that this is not the paving of the river. From Piper's Hole River, Sandy Harbour River mile 18 to mile 23, Piper's Hole River to Sandy Harbour River miles 23 to mile 27. Pipers

Hole River to Sandy Harbour River miles 27 to mile 32, 2.7 miles north of Clam Brook. Number six, reconstruction and paving Lethbridge towards Southern Bay 4.87 miles.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

HON. E. WINSOR (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, question 486, appearing on the Order Paper of April 27th., and asked by the hon. the member for Humber East. As the answers are fairly lengthy Mr. Speaker, I will table them at this time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

A Bill, " An Act Further To Amend The Highway Traffic Act, 1962."

On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a Bill, " An Act To Provide For The Appointment of a Parliamentary Commissioner To Investigate Administrative Decisions And Acts Of Officials Of The Government Of The Province And Its Agencies And To Define The Parliamentary Commissioner's Powers, Duties And Functions." (No.8)., read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a Bill, " An Act Further To Amend The Alcoholic Liquors Act." read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a Bill, " An Act Further To Amend The Local Government Act, 1966." read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a Bill, " An Act To Consolidate And Amend The Law Relating To The Raising Of Local Taxes For Schools." read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a Bill, " An Act Further To Amend The Trustee Act." read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a Bill, " An Act Further To Amend The Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act, 1961." read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, " An Act To Amend The Youth Administration Act, 1968." read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Newfoundland Teachers' Association Act, 1957," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Community Councils Act, 1962," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate last evening or yesterday afternoon, I was making a few remarks about tourism in the Province, and it might be worthwhile to make reference to the most recent report of the Tourist Development Division, wherein we find that in 1969 the total revenue accruing to the Province as a result of that particular business, tourist business, amounts to \$62,151,000 which is nine point two percent I suppose it is. Nine point two increase over 1968. This Mr. Speaker, certainly bears out what we have been saying over the years that there is room for much growth in the tourist business in Newfoundland. And we are of the opinion that certainly operators in this particular endeavour deserve all of the assistance both financial and otherwise, which this Government can afford to give them. I am not convinced that the Government have done enough for the tourist industry. Neither am I convinced Sir, that our own people and their own initiative have done enough, because I believe that we have to give it a lot of initiative, a lot of native ingenuity if you want to because our particular item which we have to sell is possibly a little different, greatly different possibly from P.E.I. or Nova Scotia, or some of the American states might have to sell. And while we can always learn from some of the things those people have done, I think that the onus is on us to come up with some original ideas, and certainly as I said people who do get involved in a tourist business deserve the full support both financial and otherwise of this Government.

Sir, I do not know how much time I have left. I suspect it is possibly in the order of another hour. I want to draw reference this morning to something which possibly I have been accused of introducing something into this House which is of no direct importance, or not of

direct responsibility of this House, however Sir, since Newfoundlanders are involved I feel that I have a right to discuss it here and make recommendations. What I want to mention Mr. Speaker, is not to dwell on the recent tragedy in the Cabot Strait, whereby one of our trawlers went down and one of the C.N.R. Coastal boats while engaged in rescue mission also went down with considerable loss of life, I believe Sir, that the time has come for the Federal Government, for after all the Federal Government have responsibility in this particular area, I believe the time has come for the Federal Government to take a good hard look at our rescue facilities. And I would hope that since we have many men engaged in the Fishery and the coastal trade, many men employed in draggers and long liners, (some of the boats possibly not as seaworthy as we would like them to be, but nevertheless, I presume they have passed the required inspections of the Department of Transport and are at sea) but I would suggest Sir, that since we do have a lot of our people going "down to the sea in ships" as it were still that this Government impressed upon the Federal Government the importance of providing an adequate air-sea rescue service.

As all hon. members in this House know, the headquarters for the air-sea rescue now is in Halifax, Nova Scotia, and is run by I would imagine a pretty competent group of people. It is my opinion, Sir, that when we have so many people who are exposed to the hazards of the sea, and since we are a province jutting out into the Atlantic, an extension of the Canadian Mainland, certainly the place for an air search rescue center should be in Newfoundland.

I would go further Sir, and say that in the present setup in Halifax, while they have a pretty vast, and a pretty effective communication system, being able to receive S.O.S.'s from the various ships and aircraft and so on and so forth, while they have a pretty effective system in establishing when a disaster does occur, I am afraid that the resources insofar as being able to quickly go into action and take effective measures in terms of



saving lives and so on and so forth, I am afraid that there is a lot left to be desired. For instance, very often we find that the rescue headquarters have to depend on Eastern Provincial Airways or possibly Gander Aviation, or a Navy plane which might be down on the Caribbean on exercises. Failing that, they have to depend on a ferry which we saw a little while ago, the "Patrick Morris", a ship which certainly is not designed for rescue operations. I would not say it should not be sent, but there should not be any need for that type of ship to be sent on a rescue operation. And I would say Sir, that in this day and age when we see the marvellous equipment which can be employed on rescue missions from space ships and so on and so forth, all the equipment both in the air and on the sea, when we see so much of this equipment, and know of the great facilities which our American counterparts have in the United States, whereby they have all-weather boats and all-weather aircraft to go into action, and when they are called to go into action generally do a good job. And when we make a comparison there we must accept the fact that our equipment is rather outdated and certainly there is a need for great improvement there, and I would hope that our Provincial Government would bring all of its resources and influences to bear on the Federal Government so that those people who do have ultimate responsibility will properly locate and properly equip search and rescue centers so that they can do the job that is required.

Sir, I would like to make a few remarks concerning my own district, and I will start first of all with the town of Gander. I meant to make some reference to my district in the Throne Speech, but I elected to wait until the Budget Address, so, as all hon. members possibly know, the town of Gander is tied very closely, when I say the town of Gander, the economy of the town of Gander is tied very closely to the aircraft industry, to the aviation industry. While we do have many people employed in auxiliary operations and other types of service industry in the main they owe the economy of the town and reasons for its existence, is the fact that we do have an international airport, and at one time, a very

busy airport with many trans-Atlantic flights coming in, in addition to the domestic flights such as Air Canada and Eastern Provincial Airways.

And Sir, during the past several years there has been a substantial decline in the number of landings by trans-Atlantic carriers, and as a consequence of this of course, we find that there have been lay-offs, naturally the planes are not coming in - the services which were provided there, are not needed and the services are not needed and cannot be sold, well then it follows that some people must be laid off or transferred. Much work has been done Sir, by various groups in the Airport town to try and recover some of this lost business. I am not sure what luck they have had yet, but we still have some hope that they will be successful. But Sir, in addition to the losses sustained by the lack of activity in terms of trans-Atlantic flights, recently, this past year, we find that Air Canada have decided to drop one of their flights through Gander which fortunately did not result in too many people being laid<sup>off</sup> but there will be some lay-offs and some transfers as a result of it. However, some of the seriousness of that particular move, that impact has been absorbed by Eastern Provincial Airways, which are up and coming and a growing concern. For Provincial Airways in that vein have gained a parallel route with Air Canada into the Mainland and Montreal. As I said some of the impact hopefully, or the impact of the layoff there, will not be as bad on the people as we thought it might be.

But then Sir, with all of those setbacks - the setbacks in international flying - the setbacks by Air Canada reducing one of its flights. And now the rumour that Air Canada, not a rumour Mr. Speaker, it is a fact now that Air Canada have made application to the Air Transport Board to reschedule their international flight through St. John's rather than through Gander, and of course this could very well have another serious side effect on some employees out there.

But in addition to all of this we find that Eastern Provincial Airways by virtue of the fact that requirements - flying for bush operations in

Newfoundland have gradually lessened, gradually decreased because of improvements in transportation, road connections and so on and so forth. Because of this and because of the greater need in Labrador and Churchill Falls and so on and so forth, we find that Eastern Provincial Airways have been more or less obliged to relocate the bush operation as it were, small aircraft operations from Gander to Goose Bay, because actually that is where the work is, and that is where the action is, and with those small aircraft you have to be as close to the job as possible. And we find that E.P.A. have just about closed out their bush operation at Gander, and will be moving entirely into Labrador.

Now Sir, so much for all of this. All this has come about I suppose in the name of progress, and there is not much we can do in terms of trying to fight progress, in fact you cannot fight it, we know that. But Sir, perhaps the most unkind action of all, was the action taken by this Provincial Government as announced by the hon. Minister of Supply and Services some time ago, when he made an announcement outside this hon. House, indicating that the Government, the Provincial Government were about to set up maintenance facilities for the maintenance and operation of their own aircraft which numbers, thirteen, or fourteen or fifteen or something in that order, set up maintenance facilities at Torbay.

This work as we know Sir, was formerly done at Gander, done by Provincial Eastern Airways on a contractual basis. Now Sir, as far as we are concerned in Gander, as I said the main reason for the existence of that particular town was because of the airline industry. Goodness knows we have had setbacks and difficulties enough this past eight or ten years in trying to maintain a status quo as it were. We have been fighting probably a losing cause with major trans-Atlantic carriers, major domestic carriers. Many cases, changes which have been made by those people have been changes made in the interest of progress. But as far as we are concerned in Gander Sir, there is no justifiable reason why this Government decided to take away the maintenance and operation of

their aircraft at Gander and relocate it to Torbay, because Mr. Speaker, the facilities were there, the men were there, training facilities were there, because the Gander Vocational Training School have set up an aviation mechanics course - it has been in operation now for two or three years. They have done a masterful job. They have been recognized by the Department of Transport as doing a good job and licences were issued and so on and so forth. So the qualified men were there to do the job - if requirements meant that other people were needed, the training facilities were there. The facilities were there in terms of hangers and so forth. And certainly from the point of view of operation, Mr. Speaker, for water bombers, the logical place was to be located in Central Newfoundland, because Sir, I do not see the idea of a water bomber being located in the area of St. John's. I am doubtful - when you look around the Avalon Peninsula and the area surrounding it, as I heard one gentleman say, "if there is wood enough to make a yoke for a goat," so I certainly cannot see why the Government should be so interested in having their water bombers located in an area where there is very little requirement, whereas in the Gander area, Central Newfoundland, we do have much viable timber, and in addition to that, Gander being centrally located, bombers could be dispersed throughout the Island at a minute's notice, and wherever they might have gone, east, west, north or south, they did not have too far to go.

Sir, many people in Gander have taken exception to this. We realize now that the move has been made, representation has been made from the Gander Chamber of Commerce, and I presume representation will follow from the town Council and other groups. And while we cannot forgive Government for taking that action which they took, we do hope that they will see the error which they have made, and that they will not lose sight of the fact that any future development in terms of aircraft maintenance and operation must be in the Central Newfoundland area. Since Gander is equipped for this particular type of operation, then that is the logical place for that

to be done. Now Sir, much has been said and much has been written about the prospects for future development of the trans-Atlantic feature at Gander in an effort to try and regain our position in terms of trans-Atlantic flying. We know, on the basis of studies which have been made, and I would presume that the Provincial Government are aware of some of the studies which are being made, we do know that in the main, the competition to Gander and Goose comes from American airports in Bangor and Niagra Falls.

Sir, it might be worth mentioning that Bangor and Niagra Falls were former SACK bases, Strategic Air Command, operated by the United States Air Force. Those bases were closed down. There was no further need so far as SACK were concerned, and the bases were turned over to Civilian and Commercial bodies for operation. We know that much work has been done in those particular bases. We know that the Governors of those States and other



MR. COLLINS:

Governors of those States and other people in authority, that is the Governor of Maine and the Governor of New York and other bodies and people of import in those States, have gone out and done a real good selling job in attracting Trans-Atlantic flights. They have made facilities at the airports. They have improved what was already there, if that was needed and in a great many cases, it was not needed. But where the need for improvement did arise, they took quick and immediate action, and we find today that the main competition in terms of Trans-Atlantic flights, which would at one time, would come into Gander and Goose, the main competition now comes from Bangor and Niagra Falls and, of course, this is the business which we have to get back, if we are ever going to restore Gander to its previous international status.

Now, Sir, as I have said, much work has been done. The Minister of Transport has already announced that the fee structure, at Gander, that is the landing fee structure, is to be changed. It is being reduced from \$1.51 per thousand pounds to \$.50 per thousand pounds and no doubt this will mean something. It is possibly a good, first step but much remains to be done. There is a tremendous selling job to be done, a bigger selling job now than ever before. Because once you have lost something, it is always more difficult to get it back. There is a tremendous selling job to be done. There is a need now for improved facilities, because we have to compete with those airports, which I have mentioned, which do have top-notch facilities. One of the first things which must be done is that the runways at Gander must be lengthened. There is not much point in reducing the fees and making other ground facilities more attractive so on and so forth, if we do not have the runways, whereby the aircraft can come in, and at the present time, the runways in Gander are so short that some of the larger aircraft, when they are flying at load capacity on warm days such as, we will have in Newfoundland from now to October or November, and that is the peak tourist travel season.

4403

Mr. Collins:

Mr. Speaker, the larger ones can come in under ideal conditions, provided that they are not fully loaded and provided the temperature is not too high, but under fully loaded conditions and temperatures in the order of seventy and seventy-five degrees, well they might be able to do it. There is very little safety factor. All pilots in those aircrafts would like to have lots of space left in the event, that they might have to abort. What I mean by "abort" in case they might have to cancel the takeoff. This is where the problem occurs in the takeoff of the aircraft, and they like to have lots of room left, in the event that some mechanical fault might occur or anything else whereby the takeoff would have to be aborted and Gander runways are not long enough for that. As I say, Sir, that one of the first things we must have done is to have the runways lengthened.

There are many other requirements, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that the Premier, and he always goes out of his way to say how much he likes Gander, how much he loves Gander, etc. He spends a lot of time in Gander. This is where the idea of Confederation was born and all the work he has done there and plans to do. I would certainly hope, Sir, that the Premier is truthful, when he says this and that he does recognize the problems which we have and that he does have a sympathetic ear to people who come in here to visit with him and that he will do all in his power and make sure and use all of the resources of the Government, of the Provincial Government in bringing to bear on the Federal Government all the power we can to impress upon them the importance of the airport at Gander, the importance of the town, which has been designated as a "growth centre." And the importance of the town and its relationship to the future development of central and eastern Newfoundland and that everything, within his power, will be done to have the much needed improvements brought about so that once again, Gander can play its part in the

Mr. Collins:

international aviation field.

Sir, there is a lot of information in this report, which I am reluctant to read even in this hon. House, because once I mention it in the House, it becomes public knowledge. Much of it might be of use to our competitors, but I am sure the Provincial Government must have a copy. If they do not, I will certainly supply them with one, and as I have said, Sir, hopefully, we are on the right track and we will be back in business in Gander sooner than one might think.

Sir, there is one other topic which I wanted to mention and that is in Bishop's Falls; I am sure the Minister for Mines, Agriculture and Resources will remember that last summer we both were attendants at a field day - he is not in the House this morning - we both were in attendance at a field day in central Newfoundland in conjunction with the Wooddale Development - Woodland Farm and Production Development, a group of farmers who are operating in the Peters River area. It is a very fine farm locality. It has been approved by the Provincial and Federal authorities as being ideal for different types of farming, mixed farming. Those people have many problems in that particular area which are beyond their capacity to solve immediately and quickly and effectively. They made representation to various Government departments. I have noticed that they have submitted a very good brief concerning hog production and sheep production and beef production and so on and so forth. They have expressed the need, a great need for a slaughter house and for road improvements and so on and so forth. In fact, they have gone so far as to submit their brief to all the Government departments involved and have written each one individually.

The first letter, with a copy of their brief, was to Mr. Hobbs of the Newfoundland and Labrador Commission, outlining the urgency of an extension of electrical services, because we all know that in this modern

Mr. Collins,

age that electrical services are necessary in dairy farming and vegetable farming. They have also written to the hon. Minister of Highways outlining the urgent need for upgrading and maintenance of road facilities from the Trans-Canada to the site. They have also written to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, outlining the need for water supply and a water connection from the proposed Northern Arm Brook Water Development and they have also, of course, written the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, outlining the need for various - outlining the need for assistance for various projects in the actual farming itself.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that all of those hon. members will read what those farmers have to say and that they will be kind in their appraisal of the situation there and that everything possible, to developing what could be a very substantial farming area, everything possible will be done by this Government to assist them.

Sir, before I sit down, I would like to make some reference to the proposed distribution centre for Grand Falls. It has been a topic of much controversy during the past year, I suppose. We have all been very much encouraged by the Premier's statement a while ago that he had become interested in it personally, and he came up with an idea that possibly the junction of the Bay d'Espoir and Trans-Canada roads was the ideal location; just east of Bishop's Falls, as the ideal location for Island wide transportation distribution centre both rail and road and bearing in mind that the town of Botwood, the port of Botwood which is one of the better ports or the best port, I suppose, on the east coast of Newfoundland where considerable port facilities do exist and shipping already takes place, in that Price Newfoundland Pulp and Paper and American Smelting and Refining Company's ore is shipped to that particular port and some raw materials used in the manufacture of the paper, are brought in there, of course, and looking to Botwood as being able to provide

Mr. Collins.

the port facilities, the water facilities. Certainly, I would hope that the whole area there would be or can be developed in terms of transportation and in terms of being of greater assistance to that particular area.

Sir, it goes without saying that all of the area of my district, in central Newfoundland in general, but particular Northern Arm and Peterview and Glenwood and Appleton and Gander area itself - there is a tremendous amount of wood available both for lumber, for sawmill operations, for export pitprops and certainly for pulp wood. We are looking forward to the development of the other mill at Come-by-Chance, and we would hope that the Government, being aware of the vast resources of that particular area, will have some plans whereby we will see the development of integrated sawmills, not only to harvest some of the best wood in the country, but also to take care of some of the most pressing unemployment situations that we can find in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the important things which I wanted to mention. I hope that the people's plea, my plea on their behalf will not fall on deaf ears. I am afraid that they have fallen on deaf ears before, but I would truly hope and truly suggest that the Government and the ministers responsible would take a good look at this and see what can be done to assist the people who are so willing to do a lot of things themselves, but must, of course, depend on Government to provide financial assistance and other assistance of an expert nature. Thank you, Sir.

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, in speaking in this budget debate, I think there is little enough heard from Labrador, so I will not devote too much time to the actual budget that was read in this hon. House of Assembly in this session. It appears to be very obvious, Mr. Speaker, that



Mr. Burgess.

based on the attitudes and statements and policy statements of this Government during the last few months, that we are obviously in an election year. We, also, witnessed the affair, televised in this House of Assembly of Mr. Shaheen relative to the Come-by-Chance complex and this also was an eye-opener, as far as I was concerned, as a member from Labrador, looking at the thing from a far-off view point.

Now this televised affair of the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, did more to point out the inadequacies and the fiscal irresponsibilities of this Government than any other single thing that has happened in this House of Assembly, at least, since I have been sitting here since 1966.

I would appear that this Government enjoys a very unique relationship with Mr. Shaheen in that Mr. Shaheen signs the cheques and this Government signs the receipts, on behalf of the people of this Province, and that is a very, very unique relationship indeed. The basic essence of what I got out of this hearing in the House was essentially that if and when this project is to go ahead, if there are any profits in this venture, Mr. Shaheen will get them and if there are any losses the people of Newfoundland will assume them. That is about as basic as you can get and that is why I say that it is a very, very unique relationship. But, however, Mr. Shaheen is not the first entrepreneur that has taken advantage of the fiscal inability of this Government, and I think that this is becoming increasingly obvious to the people of this Province and will be certainly shown, I am sure, in the event that an election is carried out this year.

Now, we have heard many statements, Mr. Speaker, about the benefits to the people of this Province brought about by this Government and its Premier, since, essentially, there has only been the one Premier since this Province came into Confederation.

Now, this is quite true. Nobody can but deny that under the

Mr. Burgess.

leadership of the hon. the Premier that gains were made. But one thing that stands out in my mind, Mr. Speaker, is that after twenty years, after twenty-one years of virtual, one-man rule, this Province, which is a part of the Canadian whole, presently enjoys the highest unemployment rate of any Province in Canada. It has the largest per capita debt, even though we have the smallest population apart from Prince Edward Island. We have the highest cost of living in Canada, and we have the lowest per capita income in Canada.

Now, I think that these facts should be equated in the minds of people with the statements of all the advantages that have been brought to this Province by this administration. I think that it is becoming increasingly obvious to the people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I talk about this Province, and I think of Labrador, the area of Labrador West, which I represent; Labrador, being a vast, largely unsettled part of Canada, to the west of this Province and in the eastern corner of Canada, and comprising the Province of Newfoundland, and it is very rich in its natural resources.

Now, this Province has, of necessity, got to depend on the development of Labrador. It has to depend to a vast degree on Labrador West, when it thinks about its own future, the future of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Labrador, comprising of over 100,000 square miles and for the most part undeveloped, when I go to the west and then I leave and go to the south of Labrador or to the north of Labrador, I encounter tremendous variations of conditions.

In Labrador North, the main stay of Labrador North being the town of Happy Valley, Goose Bay and practically the sole source of employment in this area, being the USAF Air Force, since the Canadian Air Force pulled out, and this town

has not got that much of a future at least if you talk to the people who live there and who have a great awareness of exactly where they are going.

Now we have been told on many occasions Mr. Speaker, on many occasions the people of Labrador North, Goose Bay, Happy Valley, they have been told about the American Base and the likelihood of that American Base being there for all of their life time, and do not worry about them pulling out and leaving you high and dry. I imagine that at sometime the people at Argentia were told the same thing and the people at Fort Pepperrell were told the same thing also. But these people have been told this and no later than yesterday I listened to the American Counsel on radio in Labrador being interviewed and he stated that he felt sure that there would be no layoffs no further layoffs. That is since the last layoff comprised of approximately fourteen people at some place two or three months ago. He said that it was not anticipated that there would be any more layoffs as far as he knew.

Now technically speaking Mr. Speaker, that gentleman was correct when he said no layoffs. Technically speaking he was correct. But what about the people who in the last two weeks in the region of thirty or forty who have had involuntary retirement put before them as an actual fact. People who are not yet of age to retire, people who have yet not got enough years of service with the American Government have been told that they are to retire under certain sets of conditions. Now nobody can call this a layoff in the technical sense of the word it is not a layoff. But on the other hand Mr. Speaker, it is a cutback. And these people will no longer be employed by the American Air force, they will not be receiving an income from the American Air force and in all likelihood they will not even be living in the area, of Goose Bay, because of the fact that they will have to leave because there are no other jobs available.

MR. NEARY: Will they get a pension -

MR. BURGESS: Yes, it is a reduced pension. I was supposed to get the figures this morning if Eastern Provincial Airways had been on time, but I did not get them. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to relate or read some excerpts from a meeting held in Goose Bay on January 11, 1969 when there was a tremendous controversy over the decision of somebody not to establish an industry that the people had been told they were going to get in Goose Bay prior to the last provincial election. And there was a tremendous amount of controversy I do not think that town has ever seen the like of it or ever will again. The emotional arousalment of the people in that they feel that they have been so blatantly fooled and that the Government had not lived up to its promises. And some of the excerpts Mr. Speaker, from this meeting on January 11, when the people were told that half a million cords of wood would be shipped annually to Stephenville, by eight ships of ten thousand tons each. One ship leaving Lake Melville every day, one ship arriving at Stephenville/<sup>every day</sup> and one ship on standby.

There was three hundred thousand cords to be shipped to Europe annually. The jobs that were to come out of this increased industry as the people were told were to be 1036 loggers. There were going to be eighty people employed in the peeling of the timber, There were going to be employed 362 on lakes, rivers and loading etc. There were going to be 104 employed in offices, engineering mechanical maintenance etc. And the people were told (quote)"in Labrador because of the great amount of turnover there would be, I say, "there will be not less than 6000 men cutting that 800,000 cords of wood annually!" And I use another quote Mr. Speaker.

"You are going to have 900 to 1000 jobs here in Lake Melville not counting 6000 to 7000 loggers who will come in not next year, or the year after, or the year after, this year 1969, you are going to see in Happy Valley this number of jobs created. There will be at least 8000 jobs in Lake Melville." And at that point there was laughter and booing and the Hon. the Premier said,"laugh now, he laughs best who laughs last."

These men 6000 loggers will come from all over Labrador. But there

will not be enough men. You could not get in Labrador 6000 loggers. They are not to be got. But all the men in Labrador who want jobs in the bush there will be jobs for them. They can work a month or two or three or four or five or six or seven (and I am quoting) or eight or nine or ten months at their own choice. They can come and go at free will. You will have in Happy Valley eight or nine hundred jobs, not counting loggers, but the other various things, some of them five or six months of the year, and you will have an average of \$140 a week salary, some lower than that and some higher."

"Those we cannot get from Happy Valley or North West River or Mud Lake will come from other parts of Labrador. Those that can come or will not come from Labrador will come from the Island of Newfoundland." This was in 1969 Mr. Speaker, in January of 1969. Another quote Mr. Speaker, "anybody who will be on welfare next year will be either a sick man who cannot work and must come to this Government and ask for help and we never refuse, or a widow with no one to support her, or orphans. The only people who will need welfare in Lake Melville when this great project gets going will be old people, sick people, widows, orphans, and cripples. There will be work for every man who wants to. Not only the man from Lake Melville but all over Labrador."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with that point for a moment. And I can understand why the statement was made. Those who cannot get jobs from Happy Valley or North West River, or Mud Lake will come from other parts of Labrador. Those who cannot come or will not come from Labrador will come from the Island of Newfoundland. Now that to me indicates a recognition of a problem that the people of Labrador are faced with and a very very serious problem Mr. Speaker. A very serious problem.

In that, in the Iron Ore Industry in Labrador West there are employed in Wabush Mines and the Labrador Company of Canada there are employed at least, at least 5000 people. And in Churchill Falls, Mr. Speaker, this year will be the biggest year, there will be 6000 workers. Now I would



like to know what percentage of those workers Mr. Speaker, come from Labrador. And I want you that there are not very many. There are less than a hundred. Out of all those jobs that are available there are less than a hundred people from the coast of Labrador who are working in these jobs. Now if that is not a serious problem I do not know what is. Particularly when you think of the fact that the emphasis of this Government has always been on the creation of jobs. The creation of jobs for whom, and from where? Do we not belong to the Province also Mr. Speaker? We most certainly do. And since these developments and exploitations are being made on Labrador soil the least that can be done is that these people from Labrador be given an opportunity to work there and to earn a living, particularly when you go to the coastal communities and you see rampant unemployment.

This cannot last much longer Mr. Speaker. This obvious and blatant neglect of the people, the residents of Labrador. Now I can understand we are a part of the, certainly a part of the Province. But even if percentage wise proportionately the number of people that we have in Labrador as opposed to the number of people that we have on the island if the people of Labrador could get proportionate employment on the basis of their numbers at least this would come but they do not even get that and nobody gives a hang about them. And it has got to come to an end and very soon. And the people in Churchill Falls and the Iron Ore Companies have got to be told, by somebody in authority they have got to start hiring these people and another thing Mr. Speaker, when I am referring to jobs, I have just returned from Labrador West. I have just returned from Labrador City. And from the time I got off the aircraft on Friday until I left early this morning I had a constant flow of people to my door wondering if I could help them find employment. Now this is a problem that every member faces. I am not saying it for that purpose. But what I am saying is this, Mr. Speaker. That we have a Manpower Office established in Labrador West. And for all the good that that Manpower Office is doing it might as well be on the moon.

These people they hear and they know and they meet their friends a lot of these people, a vast percentage of them come from the Island of Newfoundland. And it is because of the fact that they meet some of their friends who have been there and worked there, either in Churchill Falls Labrador City, Wabush, Twin Falls, and they have come back and told them of the type of employment they have, the conditions of employment, and they have made it sound very encouraging, these people just get aboard the aircraft and go to Labrador, and then what happens when they get into Labrador City or if they get into Goose Bay, and there is a possibility of finding employment in Churchill Falls? What is the first thing they are told when they go to that manpower office? You fill in your application and then they say you have got to go to St. John's for an interview with the Churchill Falls people.

Now if this is not the height of nonsense I do not know what is. What are those people there for? If they are employment offices they are established in the region of Labrador, at least the Churchill Falls, the Churchill Falls people should have some people there who are in a position to interview these people. If a man had enough money to go to Labrador and try for employment and come back to St. John's for an interview the chances are he would not have been up there in the first place. And I think this is arrant nonsense and somebody has got to put a stop to it somewhere. And then when I see residents of my own town, Labrador City, when they want to go over to Churchill Falls and they go to the manpower office and they are told you have to go to St. John's when they only live a hundred miles away from the site, the work site, and somebody somewhere has got to put their foot down and tell these people that they have got to start making, considering the people who live in Labrador, the livyers.

Now Mr. Speaker I would just like to read just another few quotes from this meeting in Goose Bay, (I deviated there a little)

MR. HILL: What about Labrador South?

MR. BURGESS: I will get to that in a moment.

MR. CROSBIE: Do not forget Labrador South it is forgotten otherwise.

MR. BURGESS: This is another quote from the Hon. the Premier at this meeting in Goose Bay. "Long before the election comes my words will be shown to be true or false." What is true or false. The first thing that is going to happen in Happy Valley is this: (quote) Here is the first thing that is going to happen. You are going to have a housing boom this year 1969. You are going to have a boom building houses. The company of Mr. Doyle will tell you about this. The company at once, this summer, 1969, has got to build or get built two hundred homes in Happy Valley. Now you will see, you will see in Happy Valley the biggest building boom of any town in this Province, a housing boom in Happy Valley. That is coming it is coming this year. This present year. It is coming in Happy Valley the housing boom, 1969. January 1969. And what does that mean? It will mean an extension of the water and sewerage system. This means an extension of the electricity system. That means extending the schools that means providing more school accommodation. That means providing more hospital accommodation. When you have a housing boom in Happy Valley the boom will make itself felt in practically every direction. The first thing the company has to do is put up a building, a motor transport pool, and store, that building is 150x100x24<sup>feet</sup> and then the main office which is a two storey building 50x100 feet. These two buildings will go up this summer in Happy Valley, because the main office of the company for Labrador will be here for Happy Valley. Then there will have to be built bachelors' quarters, a recreation centre, Mr. Speaker. That is a good one. That is the one that the sod was turned on in 1966 I presume. A dining hall to accommodate four hundred to five hundred men. That would be men who would come in without their ~~families~~ <sup>families</sup> to work in the bush. Now when you get that kind of development in any town here is what happens. Immediately there are more jobs, more garages more gas stations, more barber shops more beauty parlours more taxi drivers more truck drivers more hotels more motels, boarding houses, restaurants and

snack bars, and before you know it you have got a boom. Well we certainly had a boom in Happy Valley and Goose Bay in that year there is no doubt about it. Some boom, if that is a boom I would hate to see a failure.

And then the Hon. Premier went on January 20, 1969 in Spruce Park a ceremony of opening a manpower office in Happy Valley to be followed by the opening of a school to take in as a start 250 men. These men are to receive upgrade training for various jobs in this project. In that school

MR. BURGESS: schools 250 men will be trained, three, five, six, ten months whatever it may take. They will be given special training handling equipment, handling jack ladders, handling peeling, handling various jobs, there are nearly 900 of them. They will be given training and while they are getting this training they will be paid salaries or allowances.

Now, I would like just to point out, Mr. Speaker, the upgrading school finally opened in February of 1970 and it has a total of seventy students and training is strictly academic in key subjects up to Grade IX. Now these are the things, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Goose Bay have been told.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BURGESS: I will get to it, if the hon. minister will just sit tight, I will get to it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Goose Bay, I have heard also on the radio yesterday, that the town of Happy Valley council, the mayor and some of his councillors are coming down here to talk over just some of these same subjects that have been discussed so often since 1966. They are coming here now to discuss this same thing.

Once, again, as I have said, in Election Year they are going to be regaled with the same promises, but I am quite sure based on their performance, and their dedication to the job that they have assumed on the council, that they will take a lot of it with a grain of salt.

MR. ROWE, F.W. Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. friend is very much intrigued by his statements, this is an Election Year. I wonder, if he heard any prediction made last year that 1969 was to be an Election Year? It seems to me I heard some predictions, I am wondering if my hon. friend has heard these same predictions?

MR. BURGESS: No.

MR. ROWE: F.W. You did not hear any last year at all?

MR. BURGESS: I am quoting a statement, I believe, the statement was made in



MR. BURGESS: the House by the Leader of the Government, that there would be an Election this year. It is still early in the year.

MR. ROWE: F.W. There was a statement made, that there will be an election before December 1st. 1971, that was the statement.

MR. BURGESS: Before December 1st?

Mr. Speaker, the council, as I have said, based on their performance, their very capable performance, I am sure that a lot of things that they will be told this time, as I said, will be taken with a grain of salt.

Now, when we talk about the coastal communities, Mr. Speaker, one point that I have been asked to emphasize or make, is the fact that, I think, one of the most capable and man of integrity that I have ever met, the former Minister of Fisheries is Mr. Maloney, now being in the position he is in, on the Salt Fish Marketing Board, I would just like to say this for his benefit, I sincerely hope that when he is receiving counsel on this very, very important job that it includes a lot of the people or some of the people from the coast of Labrador, since a large part of their future depends on this Board and its effectiveness. And I would sincerely hope that in listening to the counsel of the many, many people that he is going to have to receive counsel from that it will include some of the very knowledgeable people from the coast.

Now on the coast of Labrador South and Labrador North, Mr. Speaker, we have heard the principle of centralization enunciated by the Government and the concept of centralization, Mr. Speaker, the absolute concept is a good concept in that you group people together where they can avail of facilities that go with large centres. The concept legally is sound, but I am not so sure about the moral aspect of centralization in that, it is required that it is necessitated that you dictate to certain people where they live. But, the point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that when you are talking about centralization, I would like to refer back to what I said a short while ago, and that being that if jobs were provided in Labrador City and Wabush and Churchill Falls for some of the people on the coast of Labrador, it would not be any problem to get these people to move of their own will and

MR. BURGESS: they would automatically comprise a Labrador community in the west of Labrador that is essentially composed of a cosmopolitan group. And there is no sense in my mind, Mr. Speaker, in telling somebody in a small coastal community that we are moving you to Cartwright, as nice a place as Cartwright may be, but what is the sense in relocating them in Cartwright, if there is no work for the man to perform? The work is available in Labrador City and Wabush and Churchill Falls, and this is where these people should be channeled to. They should be directed, you should have people from the Manpower and from the industries in Labrador who make periodic tours of the coast of Labrador to find people that they may require in their operation.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BURGESS: Well, if they have an hon. member like me to look after them, they will be secure. But, the point I am making is this, that there are no, a single industry that is fine, there are somewhere in the region of 10,000 jobs being provided in these three projects, and there is not a hundred people from Labrador who are employed in these. That is the point I am making, and I have stated earlier, that if they were proportionally employed, there are 40,000 people in Labrador at the moment, there are a half a million here, but we are not looking for that many jobs, but even if we got proportional representation, as far as jobs go, but we do not even get that. And I think, it is a shameful state of affairs.

Mr. Speaker, while I am still on the matter of Goose Bay, while I was on my way home last week, I was approached by some people who were employed by Eastern Provincial Airways and now since the bus operation has been practically eliminated or given to another company for reasons best known to the Government, it means that some of the people in the employ of Eastern Provincial Airways in Goose Bay have been laid off. And as I have said, their future is not too bright in that there are not too many other jobs that they can apply for in that area, despite the fact that some of them have relocated

MR. BURGESS: from Gander up to Goose Bay, some of these people have been laid off.

Now I can vividly remember statements by the Government about any changes that would be made in E.P.A. or during the Leadership Convention that it was apparently the design of one individual or his family to transfer the operation of E.P.A. to Montreal and then the great furor that was created because of men taking jobs away from Newfoundlanders. Well the transition from taking this bus line operation from Eastern Provincial Airways and giving it to another company has essentially done the same thing, it has done away with jobs for Newfoundlanders, and this was a decision of the Government, whatever department it was and for whatever reason. I only hope that every effort will be made to try and get these people or to retrain them or put them in other jobs before the lay-off becomes effective.

MR. HICKMAN: There are twenty laid off in Forteau and sixty-five (inaudible).

MR. BURGESS: Yes, and there are some more expecting it in Goose Bay also.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Labrador Affairs asked me to mention Labrador West and this is what I intend to do now. Now in Labrador West unemployment is not at that great high of peak except now as I have related earlier, Mr. Speaker, in that there are twice the number and I would say it runs well in the hundreds of people coming in to try and find employment on the work sites in Labrador West. But when you think of the livers, there is not that much unemployment, and

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. BURGESS: Well, that is right, they are trying to fit a lot of these people in now, but you will always encompass the same problem on Bell Island, I am quite sure, in that it is very difficult to come up with jobs immediately for these people. But I must say the companies are making a valiant effort to employ most of the sons and daughters of employees in Labrador.

MR. WINSOR: Would the hon. member permit a question? Would he have any idea as to the number of people who go in there on spec looking for work?

MR. BURGESS: I am afraid I could not give you an accurate account, but I would say it must be in the region of a hundred a week, this is in the summer months now, this is a seasonal thing. You will always get small groups of people who come in at any time of the year, but I would say particularly when the weather gets like it is today, at this time of year, you will get fifty to one hundred a week who will come in looking for work, and a large percentage of those would be unsuccessful and I know that this is a sizeable drag on the Department of Labrador Affairs, its revenue in that these people come in, they cannot find employment, they do not have that much money with them, and it is necessary that the department pay their fare back out again. I am sure, if you check through the records of the Department of Labrador Affairs you will find that there is a very substantial number of these people, who it was necessary for the department to pay their way out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in Labrador West I have dealt at great length on various occasions with the situation in Labrador West. There is not that much poverty in that area, but the big money that goes with being employed by the Iron Ore Company of Canada (Wabush) the relatively large incomes has caused the cost of living to soar to astronomical heights, that is the only way I can put it. And this is not hearsay, Mr. Speaker, this is based on the Royal Commission Report on Food and Drugs on the essential items that go to keep people going. And what is going to be done about this, Mr. Speaker? What can the people who live on the most westerly tip of the Province, we happen to be a part of the Province, we are told, we are a part of the Province, and yet we are paying for our isolation, and paying right to the nose despite the fact that geographically we happen to be part of the mainland, and that by virtue of our geographical location, in large parts, a lot of the consumer goods which we receive come in via the north shore of the St. Lawrence and the Quebec north shore and Labrador railway, and they are shipped from the mainland itself to another part of the mainland, which is Labrador, and yet

MR. BURGESS: our costs are in the region of fifteen percent higher than they are here on the Island, despite the fact that it is necessary, when you are shipping consumer goods from Central Canada or Toronto or Montreal, they have to leave the mainland to come to the Island, so it can logically be assumed that the cost of transporting them would be higher to the Island here than it would be to an area that is located on the mainland. And this we know for a fact, the various bodies that have made various types of investigations have established the fact, that it is more expensive to ship down to here from Central Canada. And yet we are paying fifteen percent higher than you are here on the Island.

Now there are various reasons for this, I have heard various reasons enunciated. But, I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that one of the major reasons being that there are certain people here on the Island of Newfoundland who have the agencies or the franchise for certain goods coming into Labrador, and despite the fact that they never see these goods when they are shipped from other parts of Canada, despite the fact they never see them, they never handle them, the consumer has to pay the percentage that these people receive for delivery of these goods directly from their source. And I suspect, Mr. Speaker, this is in large part a reason that our cost of living is so much higher than here. And to compound that frustration, Mr. Speaker, it is a well known fact, that the highest cost of living in any of the provinces of Canada exist in the Province of Newfoundland and on this Island, and we are higher than the Island, and the Island is higher than Central Canada. And if that is not enough to frustrate people, I do not know what is. I mentioned it before, even our brilliant Newfoundland Liquor Commission, they charge us forty cents more per bottle of liquor, than is in the schedule of rates, or that you would pay for it here in St. John's. Despite the fact, that we are paying the highest price for liquor in Canada anyway. But, no the people of Labrador can afford to hick in this other forty cents for transportation despite the fact that



MR. BURGESS: it does not even cost that forty cents in most instances, in that the liquor is shipped, not via Newfoundland but from wherever it is distilled.

I have had meetings with some people this weekend, Mr. Speaker, and it is going, to come, to amount to a very emotional issue in the very near future, and I would say that before the end of this year comes about, we are going to be faced with a very emotional situation in Labrador West and possibly in Labrador North, in that we are paying sixty-seven cents for a gallon of gas, Mr. Speaker. Sixty-seven cents for a gallon of gas and despite the great promises that have been made to the people of Labrador West about keeping the bush roads open, the road from Wabush to Javelin, the road from Labrador City to Duley Lake, which are impassible nine months of the year anyway, the other three months you can only get over them on skidoo, when there is hard packed ice and snow

MR. T. BURGESS: We still are paying more than anybody else in the Province for a gallon of gasoline and we have no roads. When is something, or what can be done about this problem? It is perfectly understandable for this Government or any other Government to stand up and say that times are hard, there is not that much money around, times are hard and we just cannot afford to put in hundreds of miles of roads or road networks.

I tell Mr. Speaker, that there has to be some, in the interim period, until such times as somebody gets in a position who is not going to neglect Labrador to the same degree as she has been neglected, until somebody gets in a position where they will make a determined effort to do something, there should be some concessions to the residents of Labrador particularly in this area. We have to have some form of concession in terms of the purchase of our gasoline. I have said it so often in this House that the taxation on gasoline is mainly for the purpose of building and maintaining roads and since there is no building of roads going on in our place, and very, very little maintenance going on, I do not see why we should have to pay this tax.

The people feel very, very strongly about this issue. I have requested of this Government even to exempt us from the last additional tax that was put on gasoline, I think it amounted to five cents, and it would have meant so much. It would have meant a little financially, and it would have meant a tremendous thing psychologically to know that at least this Government was giving some due recognition to the conditions that we are having to face up there. When I talk about the establishment of vital link connections or the narrowing of the gap in thinking that exists between the residents of Labrador and the Government of this Island, well that would have done, it would have helped to offset it to a great degree.

If that additional tax on gasoline, even if we had been exempt of that in Labrador it would have gone so far. But no, it was not even given consideration. The answer came back within five seconds that it was not going to be done at this time. Well if it was not going to be done at that time, when is it going to be done if ever? If it is not going to be done, when are we going to get our roads?

I can remember at the official opening of Wabush mines Mr. Speaker, when the hon. the Premier was there and he said that he would keep the roads, the bush roads particularly to allow the people to go hunting or fishing in the summer, when the hon. the Premier said that these roads would be kept open all year round. This has not transpired, this has not happened at all.

We have heard talk about the establishment of a Provincial park at Duley Lake, everything is there that could possibly be needed. The companies have bulled the road out to this area, eight miles outside of Labrador City. The companies have installed a bridge, a bailey bridge to cross the river to get to this park site, and does the Department of Highways keep this road open? No they do not. It is practically impossible for the major part of the year to take your automobile out there anyway, because, the road is in a completely unkempt state.

I would like to know when some of the promises that have been made to us up there in Labrador are going to be kept or implemented. Now Mr. Speaker, to make the matter worse this is the road that the people who are developing the Mount Wright project are using it and they are hauling tons and tons of supplies by vast tractors over this road to their site at Mount Wright near Gagnonville and they have what little, what few automobiles in terms of four-wheel drives that could get out around that road to the park site, or to the fishing grounds, or fishing lakes, even they cannot make it now, because, these tractors and this equipment, these very heavy loads have completely ruined this road.

The people with their cabins out in this park area cannot even get out to see that they are maintained, or that they have not been burned down or what ever you have. I do not hear too much being said on our behalf anyway by the Government.

In relation to transportation Mr. Speaker, the people of Labrador, well there is going to come a period in the very near future when we are not going to ask any more, and it is coming very close. We are not going to ask we are going to demand. The people of Labrador demand that the Government act on the recommendations of the Standing Committee on transportation and

communications that visited Labrador last year. The people demand that even though this is a federal committee, we demand that the strongest type of representation on our behalf by the people who are supposed to be looking after this Province, be made to the Federal Government that the recommendations of this Standing Committee be implemented. When I say implemented, the main recommendation being an immediate link between Labrador and the North Shore of the St. Lawrence, and that some pressure be brought to bear on the Federal Government in order that they bring about a meeting of the minds of the Government of Newfoundland and the Province of Quebec. It might be a little easier now that you have a Liberal Government there to work out the feasibility of establishing this road link from Labrador to the rest of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, there is coming a time in the very near future when we are not going to ask these thing anymore, we are going to demand them. If we do not get them, this Government will accept the consequences. We have the apparent delay, or the opinion that was always stressed in this House at least since I came into it in 1966, and sometime before, that this road link through Quebec to the North Shore of the St. Lawrence was never considered because there was in the minds of some people the idea that this Trans-Labrador Highway should be the first thing to be discussed and the first thing to be built. While I see a great need for the Trans Labrador also, it is obvious to anybody with any engineering ability whatsoever, that this is the much more complex section of the roads to be built, and then when you think in terms of when it is built, the necessity of putting this tunnel under the straits at fabulous cost, why not do the other end first and at least make the people of Labrador West and Labrador North feel at least that they have some contact with the rest of Canada.

I have spoken about this matter quite often too Mr. Speaker, the people of Labrador are being discriminated against in the most blatant manner by the airlines that service Labrador, and I am referring to Quebec Air and Eastern Provincial Airways. I have been told, I have sat down with some of these people and they seem to be reasonable people, and they maintain Mr. Apeaker

that in order to keep the service in operation, it is necessary to charge the rates that they do, the rates being thirty-five to forty per cent more than the people in the rest of Canada have to pay, particularly when they travel Air Canada. There may be a lot of justification in their statements in that they have to charge in order to maintain their northern stations, and in order to keep the airlines operative. There may be justification in what they say but I fail to see, I fail to see how a rate structure of this nature Mr. Speaker, can be sanctioned by a Government body. It has to be sanctioned by a Government body, either the Air Transport Commission or the Department of Transport. How they can sanction a rate structure that is obviously discriminatory towards a certain section of Canada is beyond me.

If they have sanctioned it, it means that they see justification in the airlines making this rate structure. If they think that it is justified why are not some subsidies implemented in order to make the people of Labrador at least on some kind of a par with the rest of Canada? No, this situation has existed for years and years, and I have not heard anybody from the Government even talk about it. If they talk about it it is being done in private and private is not where the business of the people should be discussed.

Mr. Speaker, if any hon. member of this House had occasion to listen to a radio program, Labrador Affairs last Sunday morning, I am sure a lot of them were amazed to learn some facts about some of our fishing industries here on the island who were desirous of shipping fresh fish into Goose Bay and the Labrador West area, Labrador City and Wabush. Until last week Mr. Speaker, the freight rates per pound to ship fish into Goose Bay was twenty cents a pound. It has since been reduced in the last week and a half to twelve cents a pound. It had been twenty cents a pound for a long time, for years and years. At the same time Mr. Speaker, Moncton was shipping fish into Goose Bay, fresh fish which the housewives love to see coming in, love to be able to avail of it, at the same time, for that same period Mr. Speaker, there was fish being shipped, fresh fish being shipped from Moncton, New Brunswick into Goose Bay at twelve cents a pound. I am sorry Mr. Speaker, fourteen cents a pound.

4427



Here we are in the same Province, or it is supposed to be part of this Province, and we were paying the consumer automatically had to pick up this great cost, and it was costing twenty cents a pound to ship this fish into the western part of the Province, and it could be shipped from another Province for fourteen cents a pound. I might add Mr. Speaker, that it can be, at the same time it could also be shipped from St. John's for seven and one half cents a pound to Montreal and eight and one half cents a pound to Toronto, but the people of this Province in Labrador had to pay twenty cents a pound. Now if anybody can point out the logic of this, or if anybody can say that there is no discrimination when conditions like this exist, well if it is not discrimination, it is just that we are there and we have been completely forgotten. If anybody can tell me that this is logical or just to the people who comprise that part of the Province, I just do not know how they can justify it.

The House at its rising do adjourn until 3:00 p.m.



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR**

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

---

**Volume 1**

**Number 72**

**4th. Session**

**34th. General Assembly**

---

# **VERBATIM REPORT**

**TUESDAY, MAY 19, 1970**

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

The House resumed at 3:00 P.M.

MR. T. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the problems of transportation when the House closed at 1 o'clock, that we are encountering in Labrador, and based on discussions which I have had with various groups and people in Labrador, I want to make the following recommendations to this hon. House, on behalf of the people I represent. And I was in the midst of saying that this Government should apply all possible pressure on the Federal Government for the implementation of the recommendations of the Standing Committee of the House of Commons on transportation and communications. And with reference to the planned Labrador Highway that has been spoken about in this House quite often, that this Labrador Highway be designed in an effort to connect the centers of population that presently exist in Labrador, and not directly from the Strait in a northwesterly direction to Churchill Falls. It should encompass the present communities in order that these people will have a means of access, or exit from the areas which they live.

When I am talking about the Trans Labrador Highway Mr. Speaker, I want to make reference once again to the road that was constructed partly from Goose Bay to Churchill Falls, and I have stressed the fact quite often before Mr. Speaker, that this road was partly completed and then all the equipment was pulled off it, and it means that essentially the money that was spent on it has been wasted, and I would like to know, somebody somewhere in this House to tell me when work will proceed or continue on this road where a vast expenditure of the people's money has been made to date.

The people of Labrador would like to see the strongest kind of representation on the part of this Government to the Federal authorities in order to ensure a fair airline rate structure, and also the establishment of instrument landing equipment at the airport in Wabush in order that we can benefit - it will increase the frequency of landings and take-offs that occur in that area. It is not an uncommon thing Mr. Speaker, in Wabush to be without air service for as much as a week on end, because of poor weather conditions, and I think that with the establishment of

instrument landing equipment, I think that the frequency could be brought up to a great degree. Mr. Speaker, it was announced in the House of Commons approximately a year ago about the establishment of a Maritime Freight Rate Subsidy Act, and this encompassed the Island of Newfoundland, and did not include Labrador for reasons best known to the people who made the law in Ottawa. Now I do not see any reason, if Labrador is to be considered an integral part of this Province, I do not see why we should be left out of any Government-sponsored program or legislation, or anything else. Because this only helps to more or less convince the people that we just do not belong to the Island, to the Province of Newfoundland, to the Island of Newfoundland. And I would like to see more said by the people in Government as to the inclusion of Labrador in this Act, in the Maritime Freight Rates Act, because as I have stated this morning Mr. Speaker, our cost of living is very high and the retailers mainly account for it by stating that their transportation costs are very high. So I would like to see somebody in our Government, particularly the ministers who are sitting in this House in Government, who are representing the other sections of Labrador, I would like to hear some participation on their part in trying to have the people of Labrador, whom they represent, included in any Government sponsored program.

And on the transportation aspect of it Mr. Speaker, the gasoline tax has got to be dropped for Labrador until such times as roads are provided, and particularly when you stop and consider Mr. Speaker, the climatic conditions which exist in Labrador, and the use of skidoos for instance, where in lots of cases and for very extensive amounts of the year, the only means of transportation available to the people of Labrador are by skidoo. And I think that, particularly in the purchase of gasoline to operate a skidoo, that some consideration should be given to the people of Labrador to see that they do not have to pay this taxation on gasoline for the operations of skidoos.

Now Mr. Speaker, many times in the past I have stressed the fact that because of the isolation, and because of the psychological isolation of

the people of Labrador; and the only means by which they can reach the outside, is by air travel, I feel that the liviers in Labrador should be allowed to claim travelling expenses to and from Labrador until such time as roads are realized.

I would also like to suggest Mr. Speaker, that tax on accumulated bank interest be eliminated for the residents of Labrador. Also Mr. Speaker, that residents of mid and northern Canada be allowed tax reductions on clothing and fuel oil bills. Also the residents of mid and northern Canada be given low rental housing or some incentive in order that the people will go there, and it will be an attraction, that they will go and help to develop the vast resources which are in Labrador.

And with that in mind, I would like to suggest, and I have heard this mentioned in Ottawa on a number of occasions, that a Northern Canada Savings Bond be implemented, which will be tax exempt or given a high interest rate. And this bond be available only to the residents of mid and northern Canada, because we have to attract and retain competent workers to develop this area.

Now Mr. Speaker, I spoke in this House quite often about communications in terms of Television and Radio, and the request has been put forth by the people of Labrador West particularly, that the CBC build a local radio station in Labrador West, and that the present CBC facilities at Goose Bay be improved to bring all of the Coast of Labrador into contact, because this is not the case at the moment. You have areas of the Coast of Labrador and they do not know what is happening on the Island of Newfoundland or in the rest of Canada from one week to the next, until such time as a boat or an aircraft arrives. And I think that this is a completely intolerable situation when we think of this wealthy affluent country of ours. And I would like to know Mr. Speaker, what if any, what steps have been taken by this Government and particularly the members who represent the coastal communities of Labrador, what they have done relative to the reinstallation of the telegraph service along the Coast. If I have occasion to call one of the coastal communities today Mr. Speaker, I have to do it by radio-telephone. Well in the major portion of the Coast



you have to contact them by radio-telephone. And if this is not consistent Mr. Speaker, to the expressions of interest concerned and doing, that I have heard since I have been sitting in this House in 1966, it is in no way consistent, particularly when you travel down around that Coast and see these people and talk to them. It is in no way consistent to the opinions that are presented to this Island about conditions along the Coast. And I think that something has to be done to remedy this situation, otherwise as I have said this morning, the consequences will have to be accepted by this Government.

When the subsidy of Eastern Provincial Airways, the Government subsidy that applies to people travelling back and forth between the Island part of the Province and Labrador when this was introduced, Mr. Speaker, it has been modified to a great extent since. As a matter of fact half of it has been taken away. There was no consideration given at this time to the fact that there are two airline services in Labrador. And one as far as a rate structure goes, one is equally as bad as the other in the high rates that they charge. And Quebec, here is another airline which services Labrador, and I have not heard any representation from this Government to the Department of Transport or the Canadian Transport Commission to ensure that they also bring their air fares down to a reasonable rate.

And even the Air Canada flights which go into Goose Bay Mr. Speaker, charge ninety percent more for freight rates than they do for the same mileage anywhere else in Canada. Now later on in this Session Mr. Speaker, if it continues on very much longer, I would like to see also, an amendment to the Education Act, relative to school buses in Labrador City and Wabush, in that whatever subsidies this Government gives towards the operation of school buses that it apply to Labrador City and Wabush. And I would like to see an amendment to the Education Act to encompass this.

Mr. Speaker, the establishment of small industries along the Coast are vitally necessary for the welfare and well being of these communities and the people who live in them. We have to have, I sincerely hope that the DREE program will in part look after some of these problems, the

establishment of smaller industries that will employ some of the people in these coastal communities, but I am afraid that we have heard so much about ARDA, FRED, and now it is DREE, that it may just go the same way as the other programs went. I sincerely hope that this DREE program would in some measure, some way, shape or form, take care of some of the problems that exist in these coastal communities.

On private members' day Mr. Speaker, for the last five weeks we have been hearing a discussion on the proposed Bonne Bay park, and the White Paper issued by the Government in rebuttal to this has been very specific in that it outlines the great number of provincial parks that exist on the Island of Newfoundland. Well there are no provincial parks in Labrador Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that they have been promised, like everything else they have been promised before the provincial election of '66, and possibly the provincial elections that went before. But as for implementing or carrying out these promises, they are completely forgotten about again, and the only time they are used or taken out of the dusty ledgers on which they lie, is just prior to the next provincial election.

Now when is this Government going to live up to its promise of the establishment of provincial parks in Labrador? When is it going to live up to its promise of the establishment of a government building in Labrador? In Labrador West - where instead of the people everytime they have any query as to the administration of government, it has to be done by long distance phone, or to the Department of Labrador Affairs, and in essence you have people who are acting in the capacity of directors of Labrador Affairs, and all they have is the title, because they do not have any responsibility to go with the title. And as a result they are completely hamstrung and unable to do anything to rectify a lot of the problems that the people face. And we were promised, there was a site established in Labrador West for a government building, but it has not materialized. It has been forgotten - the promises thrown out the window like so many more. I would like to hear somebody say when this is going

to be established. But possibly it will be - we will be told all about it just like the people of Goose Bay will be told in the next week or two, about the paving of roads in Happy Valley, about the establishment of the arena, the construction of the arena and many, many more things that were promised time after time and never materialized.

The problems of Labrador are great Mr. Speaker. It is just impossible to outline them to any degree of satisfaction in a ninety minute speech in this House of Assembly. It is impossible, because you could go on for hours and hours. And the point I am trying to make Mr. Speaker, is that this administration, which is established on this Island, has got to become more aware of the problems of Labrador, and the problems of the people of Labrador. I do not know what it is nor why it is that every suggestion that is made, and the reasonable suggestion, the reasonable criticisms of this administration. they are not even given any serious consideration, not even given any serious thought, let alone consideration. And I just fail to see why this situation should exist, particularly when the future of this Island rests on Labrador.

We have just got to have a change in attitude, and I can assure this hon. House that it will be demonstrated that this change of attitude is needed in the next provincial election, and that will be

MR. BURGESS: That will be demonstrated very vividly. Whenever that hon. gentleman feels like disagreeing with his Leader over there, he thinks of two sides of everything, his side and the outside. I would like to ask that hon. gentleman, if he could explain, to the people of Labrador West and the people of his own district, why the delay even in the payment of this subsidy, which was only a sop anyway? People have been waiting as much as two and three months for this rebate on this subsidy, because it is the only function that the Department of Labrador Affairs has to perform, and that is the processing of these rebates. I would like to know why a person has to wait two months or for one or three months whatever the case may be?

I would, also, like to know Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources received - he is not in his chair today, so I would just like to state the point, and I will put in on the Order Paper. I would like to know what he did with reference to the petition, which he received from the residents of Cartwright not too long ago relative to hunting rights? I would like to know, if he even deigned to answer?

MR. CROSBIE: What happened to the chicken house? What about the chicken House in Cartwright? If the hon. member ever came to roost in the chicken house.

MR. BURGESS: I am afraid that that chicken house is going to be made into one of the historical land marks of the southern coast of Labrador in times to come.

MR. CROSBIE: The Rocky Harbour Rooster.

(Inaudible)

MR. BURGESS: I believe it was. I was contacted about it and it was presented in the form of a petition, and there has been no answer received.

MR. CROSBIE: Cartwright Cock-a-doodle-doo!

MR. BURGESS: As I have said, Mr. Speaker, the people of Labrador are

Mr. Burgess.

not a very demanding people. All they want is a reasonable amount of consideration and not the current lack of consideration that exists. I would sincerely hope that from today on, that Churchill Falls, this construction site there, I do not think there should be a semi-skilled or unskilled worker on that site who has not been given the opportunity first of all from the coast of Labrador to be employed there, but unfortunately this is not the case. Now during the last couple of days in the House or a couple of weeks in this sitting, Mr. Speaker, we have heard various debates on many, many issues and one thing that occurs to me is the notice of motion on the part of Government to amend the Revenue and Audit Act and if, as I suspect, this amendment to the Revenue and Audit Act is to make legal this deposit of \$1 million outside the Province in a bank in the United States, if this is the case? if it is not the case, I am wrong. But, if it is the case, it reminds me very much of the contraventions of existing statutes that were blatantly carried out here in this House with the establishment or the right to let the union that is presently in Churchill Falls establish in Churchill Falls and then to have a law passed in this House a year later to make that Act legal.

I do not think anybody, the law is the law, and if this union was established in contravention of the existing statutes at the time, I do not think it was right for this House to pass legislation to make it legal at an extremely later date. This has been evidenced now, Mr. Speaker, in the type of treatment that the people in Churchill Falls are receiving. Because they have no recourse, practically no recourse for their grievances at all, and it is because the people who are supposed to represent them were given a "carte blanche." Just walk in sign a contract and the dues are yours, the monthly dues. They



Mr. Burgess.

did not have to accept any responsibility for the carrying out of their functions as a representative of a group of workers.

MR. CROSBIE: They need an ombudsman up there.

MR. BURGESS: The ombudsman would get an ear full, if he went in there, in Churchill Falls.

Mr. Speaker, Labrador has to be brought into the main stream of this Province. It has to be brought into the main stream of Canadian living, and it can only be brought about by a change in attitude on this Government's part towards Labrador and its people. The situation that presently exists in the vastly wealthy timber areas of Labrador South and North, these have to be developed and when they are developed, the people who live in the areas, the people from Labrador should benefit from them, but I would like to know when these resources are going to be exploited and developed and not just put in the hands of one or two entrepreneurs who will develop them when they see fit. You have to have strong and able representations to the Federal authorities on the part of the people of Goose Bay relative to the effective use of the airport facilities, which they have there, which are the best airport facilities on the Eastern Seaboard. Nobody is talking about the utilization of this facility and it not alone has to be talked about but something has to be done about it, so that the people of Goose Bay and Happy Valley, whose lives revolve around this facility, they have to be given an easy conscience in that they know that they have a future and not be sitting on the edge of a knife, indefinitely, depending completely upon the American Government or the Pentagon.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would just like say that once again, unless there is an immediate change in attitude on the part of this Government towards Labrador, they will have to accept the consequences.

MR. R. BARBOUR: Mr. Speaker, first of all, Sir, I would like to congratulate the hon. the Premier who is now the (Acting) Minister of Finance on the great budget he brought down a few days ago. A budget that had in it lots of meat, lots of flavour, lots of spice, very digestive for the taxpayers of Newfoundland, even though, many people received raises not one cent was taxed on the people. So, I would like to congratulate the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, \$85 million is a lot of money to spend on Education and because it is a lot of money, I would suggest to the Minister of Education and his staff and his officials that they make sure that the children of this Province get what they so justly deserve and that is a good education.

I sometimes wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the teachers and the parents may be falling down just a little on the job. Because, as I listened to an educator at a little meeting over the weekend in which he made the following statement: half of the pupils leave school before they complete their Grade XI and because of that, I think, we, the older people and the teachers should try and impart instill into the minds of the children at the tender age, when they go to school, as soon as they can become responsible enough to know the benefits of education, to try and tell them what it is to have an education today. Because, Mr. Speaker, the pupils who leave school without their Grade X or XI, so far as I am concerned, are committing themselves to slave labour for the rest of their natural lives. It is true, when they do leave school, with their Grade XI, some of them may not have the necessary qualifications to go to the University, but they can go to trade schools. They can learn trades and they can fit themselves in whatever work they care to take up.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, there comes to my mind a verse from

Mr. Barbour.

the Holy Scriptures. I think it is found in proverb; 22 and Verse 6: "Train a child up the way he should go and when he gets old, he will not depart from it." Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is very essential that the teachers, that the parents co-operate, one with the other, to see to it that the child is given every, every opportunity to get a decent education.

Mr. Speaker, while watching television, because I am interested in politics and because I want to see what kind of a man will lead the Tory party, not to winning an election, when the next general election is called, because he is still going to be on that side of the House and we are going to be on this side of the House after the next election is called.

Mr. Speaker, this gentleman, according to his colleagues, who did not sit in the House of Commons twice during 1969, could not have thought very much about the seven districts in the riding which he represents and one of these districts in that riding is my district, the district of Bonavista South.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How many times did he sit in the House of Commons?

MR. BARBOUR: One, two - two times or twice during 1969.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is two months in the whole year?

MR BARBOUR: Right. This comes from his own colleague.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sat two months out of twelve months.

MR. BARBOUR: No! two days. Two sittings only. Two sittings. Not two months, not two weeks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Ah! the hon. gentleman must be wrong.

MR. BARBOUR: No, I am not wrong. No I am not wrong.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Two days in the House of Commons in a year?

MR. BARBOUR: That is right. That is right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did he draw his pay?

MR. BARBOUR: Well I guess, if he did not draw it, may be he did not need to draw it, because they tell me he is a millionaire.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Two days! This cannot be right.

MR. BARBOUR: That is right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Two days in a whole year?

MR. BARBOUR: That is right. His own colleague said this.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member will yield, because what he is now saying is so astounding that I want to be sure that I understood him. What I thought he said, was that Mr. Moores who represents a constituency, a Newfoundland Federal seat in the House of Commons, that Mr. Moores, in a whole year, sat in the House of Commons only two days. That is what I thought he said. That cannot be right. Would the hon. gentleman confirm that? Two days in a year or in a week, which is it? Two days in a year or two days in a week? Would the hon. gentleman confirm that?

MR. BARBOUR: Two days in a year, 1969 and part of 1970.

MR. CURTIS: Perhaps he could tell us where the information comes from.

MR. BARBOUR: I heard it from one of his own colleagues that sits in the House of Commons with him. Everybody heard it. They read about it. I read about it and I heard it. This very same man, Mr. Speaker, this very same man, Mr. Speaker, said that as he travelled Newfoundland, as he travelled Labrador, as he went around this great Province, he said, "nothing, nothing but isolation." God help us, if we have isolation now. What did we have before 1949? I want to tell Mr. Frank Moores, the Leader of the Tory party..

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible).

MR. SMALLWOOD: What stout defense he is getting! Notice the stout defense! The warmth, the enthusiasm of his defense.

MR. BARBOUR:     Mr. Speaker, I had a big button and you know what was marked on it, "I'm For Joey." I came away and forgot it, because I would have worn it.

                  Mr. Speaker, I can assure Mr. Frank Moores that there is no isolation in the district of Bonavista South. There is none! There is none!

MR. MURPHY:     Would the hon. member yield?

MR. BARBOUR:     No, I will not yield. You will get your turn.

MR. MURPHY:     Would the hon. member challenge Mr. Moores to run in Bonavista South? Would he challenge him?

MR. BARBOUR:     I am a bayman.

MR. MURPHY:     Go ahead, I do not care what you are. Challenge Mr. Moores to run against you.

MR. BARBOUR:     I have already challenged.

MR. MURPHY:     I bet you will not get ten per cent of the votes.

MR. BARBOUR:     I have already challenged - who get the floor, Mr. Speaker? Who got the floor? Who got the floor?

AN HON. MEMBER: Give him a chance, please!

MR. SPEAKER:     Would the hon. members like to continue in this vein?

MR. BARBOUR:     Mr. Speaker, in a jovial mood, I did joke with the little chief, not the big chief, the big chief is over here, and I said to him that I would challenge him to come to Bonavista South, but the hon. member knows that it was just in fun. But, if he is serious, I will take him on. I will take on Frank Moores, too, because I have done more for Bonavista South than Frank Moores has done. You are talking about isolation. I said there was none in Bonavista South. There are forty-three communities, every community has electricity.

MR. CROSBIE:     They are all gone Tory or Reform Liberals.

MR. BARBOUR:     They are not Reform Liberals. They are not gone Tory. There are more solid Liberals than ever there were.



MR. CROSBIE: There was a meeting down there..

MR. BARBOUR: What meeting?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Tell us about the meeting.

MR. BARBOUR: Yes, what meeting? What meeting do you want to know about? Is it the one in which the Tories tried to elect candidates, and they had to have two meetings and then they got the five or six, and they could not get anyone outside town of Bonavista - they could not get anybody anywhere else in that area so they had to pick six people?

MR. MURPHY: We did not twist any arms.

MR. BARBOUR: We did not twist any arms either. But remember this, the hon. - remember this, at the Newfoundland Hotel, I noticed that there was a lot of arm twisting on Thursday and Friday.

AN HON. MEMBER: Arm bending that was.

MR. BARBOUR: Mr. Speaker, roads in every community, nice Federal postoffices in a number of communities..

AN HON. MEMBER: Lovely, Welfare offices..

MR. BARBOUR: Three plants, two fresh fish plants and another unit as the Queen Crab Plant, which I will come to later in my speech, but Mr. Speaker, what I wanted to say was this: in the Throne Speech, I spoke for ninety-seven minutes. I can assure

MR. BARBOUR: assure the hon. members, I will not be that long, this time, because you see, I want to get out of the House, I want to get into my district, I want to move around amongst my people. And I do not drive around in a car waving my hands, like a seal flicking its flippers.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will the hon. gentleman confirm about this two days in a year, is that right?

MR. BARBOUR: That is right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Only two days?

MR. BARBOUR: 1969, and I think 1970.

MR. MURPHY: What days were they?

MR. BARBOUR: I do not live in Ottawa.

MR. MURPHY: It is rather a hard statement to make ....

MR. BARBOUR: It is not a hard statement to make, when it came from one of his own colleagues.

MR. MURPHY: Is it Mr. Moores you are talking about now?

MR. BARBOUR: Sure, Mr. Moores, because he spent his time going around Canada campaigning to try and strengthen the National Tory Party.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Two days out of 365?

MR. BARBOUR: Right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Two days?

MR. BARBOUR: Two days, yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Two days? Two days, two days out of a year? Two days in a year?

MR. CROSBIE: Forty-eight hours.

MR. BARBOUR: Then at that rate the National Leader, the hon. Robert Stanfield said that there were hundreds of thousands people all over Canada living in poverty, but Sir, very little poverty in Newfoundland and Labrador today.

MR. WELLS: Oh! Ho! Ho!

MR. BARBOUR: Today the flour sacks, today the brin bags are all over.

MR. WELLS: It only goes to show how much the hon. member knows about

MR. WELLS: his Province.

MR. BARBOUR: It must be in yours, it is not in mine.

MR. WELLS: It is not in my district, very little....

MR. BARBOUR: And I am sure it is not in mine.

MR. WELLS: Have you been down to Bloomfield lately?

MR. BARBOUR: I beg your pardon?

MR. WELLS: Have you been down to Bloomfield lately?

MR. BARBOUR: Bloomfield, I have relations down in Bloomfield. I stick a poster on every move that is made down there.

MR. WELLS: Lethbridge?

MR. BARBOUR: Yes, Lethbridge.

MR. WELLS: No problem in those three communities?

MR. BARBOUR: The great National Leader of the Tories said, across Canada there was six percent unemployment, and he said in Newfoundland there was fourteen percent. I am not prepared to deny this, but I doubt it very much if it is fourteen percent.

MR. MURPHY: Twenty three.

MR. BARBOUR: No it is not twenty-three.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader, my friend who I love very much, my member, the member for St. John's Centre -

MR. NEARY: Who you gave a cup of coffee.

MR. BARBOUR: Yes, and if he comes again, we will give him another cup. He said, on a certain radio on Monday, April 20th. this is the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, said that when the budget is brought down it will be a good budget, the 20th. of April on a Monday, it will be a good budget and it was a good budget, one of the greatest since I have been in this hon. House, and I have been here now for eleven years.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to come to the fisheries in my district and also the Queen Crab Industry in my district. I am happy to say that the Bonavista Cold Storage Limited now have seventy people employed in their

4444

MR. BARBOUR: Queen Crab Plant. And they are happy to hear that the hon. Jack Davis with the hon. Acting Minister of Provincial Fisheries here in this Province have made announcements to the effect that money will be spent to continue experimenting on canning of crab at Bonavista and provision has been made for expansion to the plant so that other native shell fish will be canned. I talked with the new manager of the fish plant, I talked with him and he told me, his name is Mr. Pottle by the way, he told me that the trap you catch the queen crab in is made like an ice cream cone, it is made with steel straps and it is covered with nylon webbing, nylon net. They fish in 150 to 187 ft. of water, and at the present time there are four long liners out of Bonavista bringing in good catches everyday. I am also very happy too that P. Janes. & Sons Limited, Hants Harbour, have taken over the plant in Salvage and they too are into the crab industry, and there, there are three long liners which catch the crabs, bring them in, store them in the store until they are picked<sup>up</sup>/by truck. This store at the present time has wooden flooring, they intent this summer to put a concrete flooring there and to handle not only queen crabs but other shell fish and salmon and lobster and codfish, and by the way, Mr. Speaker,

AN. HON. MEMBER: How do you catch the crab fish?

MR. BARBOUR: Well, the crabs as I have said are caught in traps made in the shape of an ice cream cone.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Would they be like lobster traps?

MR. BARBOUR: Well, no, a lobster trap is not made like an ice cream cone. No it has three-eighth steel cover rod, which builds the trap, then it is covered with nylon netting, and they go so deep as 150 to 187 ft of water to catch these crabs. They crawl into it, yes. It might be interesting to know that the men are not allowed to process the queen crab, it is done by the women.

MR. COLLINS: Why are the men not allowed to process them?

MR. BARBOUR: Well, because it is a food very delicate and must be kept very

MR. BARBOUR: clean and they know that the ladies are tidy, they are dressed with their beautiful white caps, their beautiful white gowns, and even their finger nails are spotless, and it is up to the ladies to do this. The part the men play is boiling the crabs, which takes seven minutes, and then they are passed on conveyors into the plant and the ladies take over. Last year they were doing it up in five pound packages, this year they are going to do them in one pound packages and half pound cans, and the market is very brisk, as you know not only to the mainland, but to the United States and even to England they export the queen crab. So it is an industry, that is certainly making headway, it is an industry that is employing a lot of people, it is an industry that is helping the people to get a decent living.

MR. NEARY: It is gone pass the experimental stage now?

MR. BARBOUR: Well, they are still experimenting on them, because they are not satisfied with it yet, but there is going to be such a demand that they are going to make sure everything is in order.

Mr. Speaker at Charlèston we have a fresh fish plant and somewhere around fifty or sixty people are employed there, and they do not only process the codfish, they do not only take the flounder, the lobsters and salmon, they also take potheads and store them and freeze them for the mink farms. As I said, the lobster fishery, the salmon fishery and the codfishery is off to a very good start in Bonavista, and I understand the price of lobster per pound is somewhere around seventy-five cents, and salmon with the gut in, is also seventy-five cents a pound.

Mr. Speaker, there is one little community known as Newman's Cove where ninety-nine percent of the men are fishermen, They need a small bait depot so that they can be provided, Sir, with bait instead of having to go eight miles by car or by motor boat to the bait depots in Bonavista to get their bait for the days fishing. I am working hard on this, and I am going to keep after our great Liberal Government in Ottawa and see if something cannot be done about it, because Newman's Cove is certainly a self-supporting community, hard working, honest fishermen, and there is nothing too good for



MR. BARBOUR: the fishermen of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I am not so sure, that I am pleased with the way Manpower and a committee from the Board of Trade are handling the jobs for the students who attend university and the students who attend high schools. My knowledge that I have received is; if you are a graduate, there is a chance you can get a job with Manpower, because they co-ordinate with the Board of Trade or the Board of Trade with them. But, if they are just a couple of years in the university, their chances are very slim. How then in the name of God are the high school students, at the age of seventeen, sixteen, or eighteen years old going to get a job? You know what, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned Manpower is not doing that job it is suppose to do, for instance, if you want to go down to Churchill Falls to work, if you have a friend working down there, and you write him, he will talk to the foreman and the foreman will pass this person's name with Manpower and he has a much better chance of getting down there, than he has going down to Manpower with all his qualifications and getting a job.

MR. WELLS: What are the Government doing about it?

MR. BARBOUR: It is a simple matter, but we are interested, very much interested. I spoke about it in my Throne Speech, and I keep hammering on their doors, day in and day out and we will make progress sometime. But, I ask you, I ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition, what would the Tory Government do about it?

MR. MURPHY: We will, if we get the chance.

MR. BARBOUR: You are never going to get that chance. I am going to be here for another ten years, and I will be over here, and you are going to be over there.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about resettlement, I came from Bonavista Bay and I know for a fact that every family that has moved to the mainland to Bonavista North or to Bonavista South, particularly so all of the people that came from Pinchards Island and went to the mainland of Bonavista North are very happy and very contented, but there is one thing I do not like about

MR. BARBOUR: this, if a man <sup>'s</sup> say in Tickle Cove, and he wants to move to a growth centre, he can go there, one family can move, but if a man wants to go up to a place where it is not a growth centre but he can make a living, well then there is a nigger in the woodpile somewhere, you cannot make much progress. I would like to see that abolished, and I would like to see a man wherever: he thinks he can make a living be permitted to go.

MR. MURPHY: He is not eligible for any help if he does not go to a growth centre.

MR. BARBOUR: Well, we help those who need help, that is the policy of the Liberal Government, to help those who need help.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about pavement, roads, as you know, the Liberal Government has paved twenty-two miles of road from Clarendville into Lethbridge, two or three miles outside to Southern Bay.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARBOUR: Look when Confederation came, there were only cow paths. There was no Barbour Street then, there was no Barbour swimming pool then, there was no Barbour Bridge then, but it is all now.

MR. MURPHY: We should have called it Barbouration, instead of Confederation.

MR. BARBOUR: My hon. friend can laugh at Barbour roads, go over there and see the difference there is in Barbour road, than what there was when I went there, go over and see it, two and three cars can pass abreast. And I have seen as high as sixty-four cars from the Terra Nova Park going into the community of Terra Nova. And take a dip, take a swim in the Barbour swimming pool, where we have a ladies' dressing rooms and mens' dressing rooms, where we have picnic grounds, where we have tables, where we have chairs, where the kids can wade and play

MR. COLLINS: ..... afterwards getting fixed up.

MR. MURPHY: We have a car wash here on Elizabeth Avenue where I saw hundreds today.

MR. BARBOUR: They do not was their cars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is lovely to have a sense of humour ah?

MR. MURPHY: It must be.

MR. BARBOUR: There is no pollution in the Barbour swimming pool, I can tell

MR. BARBOUR: that, because it is kept clean, they do not wash their cars there, they are not allowed. Please do not make fun.

MR. MURPHY: We are not.

MR. BARBOUR: We are not fun, you are make fun at your betters.

MR. BARBOUR: making fun of your betters

MR. MURPHY: He saw forty or fifty cars at the Barbour swimming pool that is all I know.

MR. BARBOUR: Mr. Speaker, I was on pavement

MR. MURPHY: Kind of slippery

MR. BARBOUR: You know it is wonderful. The people are delighted. They are clapping their hands, because now the dust within the next couple or three years will be eliminated not all the way from Port-aux-Basques to Cape Bonavista, not all the way from the Straits of Belle Isle to Cape Bonavista, not all the way from St. John's to Cape Bonavista, but there will be no dust at all because after the next three years we will have all of the Cabot highway paved on the Bonavista peninsula from Clarendville to Bonavista. That is a great achievement, and I am happy, I am happy that I was able to play a small part in it. Furthermore, Eastport Peninsula will be paved, Happy Adventure, Sandy Cove and Eastport itself, and I hope in my hon. friend's district from Bonavista North, where the Park boundary pavement is just two miles outside of his district, a place called Sandringham will also be paved too. I am working hard on that, because who knows Mr. Speaker, who knows, I am a native son of Bonavista North, and perhaps some day I would like to go back there and run in that district to prove once and for all, I am not only the boss of Bonavista South, but I am the boss of Bonavista North too.

Mr. Speaker, when work starts at Come-by-Chance, I hope it will be shared so that not only will Placentia area, Trinity South area, but all districts, at least get a part of the job that will be there. In my district we have nine community councils and one town council, and you can see the difference. Specific improvements have been made because people are involved. People are concerned. People are interested because they have their own local government and Mr. Speaker, what I appreciate about it is this, the ten councils keep in touch with the member so that he can knock on the doors of the Cabinet Ministers office until he can

get what he is looking for. And I want to say here and now, I am very pleased, not exactly one hundred percent pleased, but very pleased just the same with the result that I get.

In Happy Adventure I had the honour a few years ago to turn on the water. I am happy to say now they are not waiting for DREE, but they have contacted this Government, and Happy Adventure Mr. Speaker, now has not only the water, but they have the water and sewerage line in their community. Last week it was my pleasure to make appointments with the town council of Bonavista to meet with the hon. the Premier, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Our discussions were very pleasant, and we are sure that something will come out of it, and before too long the town of Bonavista will also have its water and sewerage.

Mr. Speaker, I would like for the Minister of Health, (he is not in his seat, he is a very busy man) I would like for him to use his influence and to try and help the committee in Musgravetown to find a doctor. Before Medicare came into force, apparently all the doctors that went and stationed at Musgravetown, after they made enough money, departed. And that has been what is going on for a number of years, so we are badly in need of a doctor in Musgravetown, and I hope we will have one before too long.

Mr. Speaker, I know there is legislation before the House, but I would just like to touch on it. My heart was gladdened when I heard the Minister of Labour make a ministerial statement yesterday Sir, to the effect that there was going to be an increase somewhere around fifteen cents per hour, for people working by the hour. I was more than happy when he said that people working in fish plants after forty-eight hours will be paid time and a half. This is long overdue and I am glad that the minister has seen fit to make this become a reality, and I understand it will come into force around the first of July.

MR. MURPHY: Good Tory philosophy.

MR. BARBOUR: Mr. Speaker, speaking of Tories, there are now forty-four thousand card-bearing Liberals in Newfoundland - forty-four thousand, who made application, been accepted, not Liberal renegades, not Reform Liberals, but real genuine, from the crown of their heads to the soles



of their feet, all Liberal.

MR. MURPHY: That is about a fifth of the voting population.

MR. BARBOUR: Never mind about the fifth. When the next election comes we will have two-thirds of the votes of Newfoundland, and we will be returned again. We have not started leading yet, and because we are not started, wait until we do start. The hon. member has not taken part in any Federal election. He has been too busy looking after his district. Wait until the next Federal election takes place.

MR. MURPHY: He will have lots of time then to take part in Federal elections.

MR. BARBOUR: Because I like him, you know, because I like him, I just like to pass him off. Mr. Speaker, there is somebody else I would like to congratulate today. The hon. minister to my right. Something that I have been thinking in my own mind for quite a while. We are doing away, and I think in some places, it has already been done away with, the slip, the paper, the dole paper. And it is going to <sup>be</sup> replaced (I am talking now about people who are on short-term assistance, not long-term, because they get cash) I am talking about people who through no fault of their own, who get seasonal employment, then sometimes have to go on relief - no longer will they have to ring up over the telephone and say to the clerk, "I do not want to come in this shop because Aunt So-and-so is there, or Uncle So-and-so is there, he is going to see me with the dole order." Now they are going to be just as important as anybody else, because they will have the money in their pocket to go into the store and buy their groceries, and buy their merchandise the same as a millionaire's wife would do. I say it was long overdue. I congratulate this minister. In fact Mr. Speaker, during my eleven years, this is no ~~speax~~ to any other member that has been in Welfare, but I think this man is a live wire, and he is going to change the pace of the Department of Welfare to such an extent that I doubt very much if he will get out of it - if he wants to be transferred to some other Portfolio, because he is doing such a good job. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the end of the road, and I just want

to say this. I thank you Sir for bearing with me. I thank all hon. members for listening to me, and I said when I started I would put nobody to sleep and I have not seen anybody falling to sleep yet. So I am glad you did not fall asleep while I was speaking. And before I take my seat let me say this. If the Fishery shows up the way it is beginning to show, we could have another very good year in Bonavista South, because last year 1969 was one of the greatest years we have had in the last three decades, the last thirty years. And so far as I am concerned, their member, I will leave no stone unturned, no grass will grow under my feet, I will be on the job fighting and working as all hon. members should to help those who sometimes need help.

MR. B. ABBOTT: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity of participating in this Budget debate. All hon. members will agree that this House should be a place where deep divisions exist, but equally deep feelings of appreciation for all members, each endeavouring in his own way to make his contribution in his day and generation. I have seen this House rise to heights of grandeur. I have also seen attempts to stifle debate, and I say now Mr. Speaker, when that day arrives freedom dies. We do not all see things the same way. It is essential that each of us should come to realize that the other member has the same desire to help his Province. We disagree as to the means of achieving objectives. Statements are made against minorities, time after time, and such statements are repugnant to most Newfoundlanders.

John Ballantine Goff said the following when describing minorities. He said; that the chosen heroes of this earth have been in the minority. There is not a social, political or religious privilege that you enjoy today, that was not bought for you by the blood and tears and the patient suffering of the minority. It is the minority that have achieved all that is noble in the history of the world. That was Ballantine Goff.

Some of us I predict, will look back on certain days in this present sitting of the House, that we would like to forget just as we try to forget some of the name-calling. The atmosphere of the House has been polluted when members have charged and counter-charged, many visitors have thronged

the galleries. Young people from our schools and the Avalon Peninsula and other places have visited the people's House and discovered very prevalent enmity, mistrust, bickering, cross-firing, and indeed vilification.

Are we not living in an age of dialogue when one can determine his action, political or otherwise. I should like to assure the hon. the Premier that I disagreed with his economic development policy, and express concern with the financial position of this Province. But I did not betray the Liberal Party. All hon. members of this House are identified or belong to a certain church, or some religious denomination. Because one does not subscribe to every cotton-pickin' in his church's theology, is he a traitor? If you are a member of a fraternal organization, it does not follow that you must subscribe to all the workings of that society, but you are not expelled, and you are not told that you have no seat in the Lodge room.

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. the hon. the Premier call Sir Winston Churchill a traitor, or a renegade, when he denounced his Party for a wreckless extravagance. He voted against his Party. He was indignant that the Government at that time proposed to have an army of 150,000 people in Britain. Churchill walked away from the Conservative benches and took a seat with Lloyd George. Some of the men that I have heard the hon. the Premier eulogize time after time, like Squires, Bond and Morris, they too, saw fit to differ with their leaders. And I submit Mr. Speaker, many of those sitting opposite me now were not always Liberals.

Mr. Speaker, one thing we should bear in mind, that circumstances and conditions governing the functioning of this House today, especially in the realm of communications, have changed radically in the last twenty years. The media of communication and commentary can now bring our weakness and misdeeds, and occasionally even our achievements into every home immediately and with a dramatic affect, not possible many years ago. But while perspective can give us some comfort because it helps us to emphasize and maintain a sense of proportion, perspectives can be damaging and indeed can be dangerous, if it is allowed to obscure the fact that while we may not be any worse or even as bad as our forefathers in politics and in this House, today we must be better, because the problems we now

face are greater in degree and in complexity than theirs. And the penalty for failure to deal with them is correspondingly greater. We must then Mr. Speaker, do everything we can, by our conduct, to justify this House as an institution, and to bring it into better repute than it seems to have gained recently. As one great statesman said to me in Ottawa a few months ago; "it is the duty of a political leader, whether provincial or otherwise, to reconcile the diverse interest within a Party not develop and emphasized them."

Mr. Speaker, when the Speech from the Throne was being debated, I referred to the plight of Civil Servants, police, firemen, nurses, hospital employees, teachers and Civil Service pensioners with fixed incomes far below the poverty level. Many groups were meeting and making their problems known. Brief after brief had been presented to Government through the respective ministers. Some of the briefs never saw the light of Cabinet before the clouds appeared on the horizon.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Never so truer words. Some never saw the light of day. Never saw the light of day from January to September, true.

MR. B.J.ABBOTT: All such groups were told to wait for the budget. The budget was presented by the acting Minister of Finance the hon. the Premier. Disappointment expressed in all areas. Meeting after meeting held. Incendiary remarks were made here and there, and what must have been considered frivolous by the Government became all-important. Discussions took place, offers and counter-offers were made and demanded. Money has been provided for an increase that will meet the moral obligation of the public officials who carry on their work in this city and other parts of the Province.

I compliment the committee of Cabinet for their sense of justice and for their great public relations. Mr. Speaker, I must make a plea for some civil service pensioners who are getting less than sixty dollars per month. It is true that they receive the old age pension, but they are not eligible for the supplement and are therefore finding life very difficult. There is another class who are still living below the poverty level. I am thinking of the adults or families who through mental or physical incapacity are unable to provide in full or in part by their own efforts the necessities essential to maintain or assist in maintaining a reasonable, normal, healthy existence.

I think of the widows and orphans in receipt of short-term social assistance. During the year 1968, and up to March 1969, we were providing short-term or long-term rather, assistance at the following monthly rates: First adult thirty-five dollars, each additional adult thirty dollars, and each child twenty dollars. In other words \$85.00 per month for a family of three.

Since last April 1969, the rates are first adult twenty-five, second adult twenty-five and each child fifteen. The Minister is nodding his head and saying no. These are the rates supplied to me by the Minister, Mr. Speaker, himself.

MR. NEARY: If the hon. gentleman will permit me Mr. Speaker, these are short-term assistance rates the hon. member is quoting now, not long-term. That was the question I think that the hon. member asked me, what was the short-term rates, and that is the answer I gave him.

4456

MR. ABBOTT: Mr. Speaker, I have not...



MR. NEARY: Long-term rates are still the same

MR. ABBOTT: Long-term rates and short-term rates

MR. NEARY: No, long-term are the same as the hon. member 'just quoted first.

The first figures he gave were correct and they are still in existence.

MR. ABBOTT: Very well, I am prepared to accept correction Mr. Speaker. What I meant to say was that in April, May 1969 it was reduced from eighty-five to sixty-five.

MR. NEARY: Short-term

MR. ABBOTT: Now, the point I am trying to make is, there is a reduction. Whether it is short-term or long-term, a reduction, still we find the cost of living going up six per cent. If that makes sense to any hon. member, it does not make sense to me. I am aware of the fact that fuel, clothing allowances are paid if circumstances warrants that. Also, transportation to hospital and drugs if prescribed by a doctor. But to think of a family of three, and in some cases it is a cripple, the father is incapacitated he has not qualified for social assistance long-term, he has to live on that amount. They have to feed themselves, pay light bills, pay water rates, bus fares to and from school for the child on sixty-five dollars a month. This to my mind Mr. Speaker is definitely below the poverty level.

The Government of Canada from the Canada Assistance Plan pays half the cost, they pay half the cost. If it is eight-five dollars, they pay half. That being so, would it not be more humane for Government to say increase the widows allowance, make it \$100. a month for a family of three.

MR. NEARY: It is more than that now long-term. A widow gets more than that now.

MR. ABBOTT: What do they get Mr. Speaker?

MR. NEARY: Carry on, I will check

MR. ABBOTT: The assistance I am referring to takes care of food alone. The Government of Canada irrespective of what amount the Provincial Government fixes for the short-term or long-term recipients, the Government of Canada will pay half the cost out of the Canada Assistance Plan. Why, I know of a Province today that supplements the old age pensioners to the extent of \$150. but that Province is not doing it on its own, it is being assisted by the



Canada Assistance Plan. In other words, if they pay sixty dollars to supplement any amount it is thirty dollars from the Provincial Government and thirty dollars from the Canada Assistance Plan.

Now, as all hon. members know, whether it is sixty-five, or eighty-five or one hundred and twenty, a family of three cannot get very much fruit, very few steaks and very little fresh milk at that rate.

We hear a lot about inflation and what the war of inflation is doing to people like old age pensioners, veterans, civil service pensioners and so on. In this land of ours, elderly people in their pitiful, small homes and apartments are trying to keep themselves dignified, yes neat and clean Mr. Speaker, trying to save a few cents on grocery items here and there, and I am sure that many hon. members have seen evidence of need as they go around this country although, I heard one hon. member who preceded me say that there was no poverty in his district. It is Poverty from the poverty stand point, it may not be poverty from some people's barometers. As I see it, it is any person living on what some of these people are living on and it is the poverty level. There is no doubt in my mind that we have in this country widows, cripples, ex-san patients who suffer from privation, humiliation and indignity. They have suffered for half a century, but thanks to Confederation some of them have been relieved and that is suffering, a degree of suffering that does not exist to what it did prior to Confederation.

When we entered union with Canada legislation was passed to give them definitely a measure of dignity and also a measure of decency for ourselves. Let us as a Government I should say, try and improve their lot by increasing their allowances, by increasing their pensions, at least we should see that they are given an increase equal to that of the increase in the cost of living.

Now Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak on the unemployment situation. Unemployment means the absence of a sense of satisfaction that a man or woman obtains from contributing his share of labour to society. It means a serious lack of income. It affects the well being of its dependents and this means in turn unnecessary decline in the sense of happiness or well being of the family and its environment. It should not be regarded that simply

as one little statistic with which we have to live. Here in Newfoundland we are now faced with the morally reprehensible highest level of unemployment in five years. We are told that the Province of Ontario has the lowest 4.5 per cent. But even that is far above that which was tolerated by the Governments in Western Europe. The Government of Ontario is extremely worried and they say that the Federal Government's inflationary policy is contributing. This too is a matter of opinion. Economists differ in their interpretation of inflation and for the cure of inflation.

The Atlantic Provinces, of which we are a part, altogether have an unemployment figure of eleven per cent, whereas, we here in Newfoundland have, according to D.B.S. fourteen. I think the national average is 6.5

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): 6.7

MR. ABBOTT: 6.7. Economists in the western world know there are two general approaches to managing the economy of an industrial nation. We can either concern ourselves with maintaining price stability, or we can commit ourselves to a policy of full employment. In Canada and the United States the prime concern of Government has been with price stability, and the result is that we have experienced a high level of unemployment in every year since World War II, higher than countries in Western Europe which have chosen the alternative policy, mainly the creation of conditions for full employment. Here we see a difference in policy.

Today in Canada there is a surplus of goods manufactured, but our people are out of work so they are unable to purchase the goods. I am not saying Mr. Speaker that inflation is not one of our problems, but I would say it is not our major problem. Our great social problem, as we all know, affects the vast majority of our Newfoundland people and it is the lack of jobs. Across Canada the figures released in January of this year show unemployment of 485,000 persons. January of 1969 it was 468,000. The rate for male workers in January 1970 was seven per cent and the figures relating to young people between twenty and twenty-four years, 8.1 per cent. Those figures are disasterous. The atmosphere of unemployment is a disasterous one for any people to grow up in.

In Newfoundland we have the high unemployment and we have another serious tax load. Those eligible for income tax are paying a greater rate to Provincial tax than Nova Scotia, P.E.I., and British Columbia. We are paying the highest price for gasoline, seven per cent on soft drinks, chocolate bars, dry cleaning, garage labour, you name it. There is nothing left to tax but sleep, and the air we breath.

Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session I placed a question on the Order Paper, directed to the hon. the Premier. It was relating to the number of post offices in this Province being phased or closed out. I was aware of the fact that this was a matter within the jurisdiction of the Government of Canada. During my visit to Ottawa I was told the Provincial Governments are notified of any post office being closed. In other words, Provincial Government of Newfoundland would have prior knowledge of the number of offices and where these offices are located.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the hon. gentleman would allow me. I know of no prior knowledge. I personally never had any in my life. I do not know of any other minister in this Government who ever has had any. I do not know that the clerk of the Cabinet or anyone in the Government has ever been given any prior intimation. I know of none since I have been Premier.

MR. ABBOTT: Yes Mr. Speaker, I recall the hon. the Premier's reply to that. I am only going, it is hearsay evidence, but I was told in Ottawa.

Now there is another matter which effects my district. I may say many post offices being phased out in Bonavista North. There is one now being phased out in Pound Cove, another one at Brookfield, and no one seems to know anything about it until the offices are closed. This to my mind is a poor way of doing things. If I recall rightly, we have a liaison officer between the Federal and Provincial Governments and if that officer, if that is a part of his duty, then I think the Federal Government or the Government of Canada should be asked to advise this officer of any particular phase-out, whether it is a coastal boat or what ever it is. Post office, telegraph office, where it effects the district and the lives of people, that is what I am thinking about. The lives of people, people are left unemployed, they are thrown out of

their jobs. The job is declared redundant and they have no job. Certainly someone is concerned. If the Federal Government is not concerned, then the Provincial Government is definitely concerned, because, in some cases they could become a charge on Department of Welfare. Then it is the Provinces concern.

I recall twenty years ago in Bonavista North, we had five coastal steamers operating in that area. They left St. John's calling at ports bringing mails and what have you. Today there is not one.

MR. WELLS: And there were many schooners

MR. ABBOTT: And there were many schooners, but I grant you to say no one knew anything about it, no one said anything about it. When the "bullet" was removed from the rails, there was a lot of people talking. These people in Bonavista North, they have been left, they have been told that they are in a dormitory area and this is it. They want to get employment so they must get out and go and seek it somewhere else.

They have a road thanks to this Government. The road built is a dirt road built many years ago, but that road now is of course a typical dirt road. Traffic going over that road has multiplied I would say five hundred per cent. I should like to pay tribute to the people, the men from the Highways Department who are working on that road. They are doing a very commendable job under the circumstances. With a long haul with material for roads, they are doing a good job. It is hoped Mr. Speaker, that the paving program of the Department of Highways will be greater than that announced by the Minister some time ago. Greater especially for that particular area, where there is no means of communication other than by road.

There is another matter which I mentioned in the Throne Speech. It was followed by a question on the Order Paper, and it concerns the catch failure on the Labrador coast by the floaters last summer. I understand from the skipper-men the matter was referred to the hon. the Premier, who in turn referred the skipper-men to the Government of Canada. The Fisheries Department

of the Government of Canada negotiated with the fishermen and the skipper-men. They sent for invoices here and invoices there showing that the losses were as stated, and eventually the men were advised to seek assistance from the Canada Assistance Plan. Well now we only.....

well now we all know what that meant, sick assistance from the Canada assistance plan. These men had never gone to a welfare office. They had never, some of them, a great many of them, have been toilers of the sea and they have been sometimes successful, sometimes unsuccessful. But when they were unsuccessful they managed to get a job here and a job there to carry them over the winter.

However their papers their invoices were returned to them and the skippers contacted the Hon. the Premier again for more information. And from the information that I have they were told that <sup>if</sup> the Federal Government did not assist well then the Provincial Government would give every consideration. The Provincial Government no doubt is giving every consideration I hope to the needs and I should like to inform this House there are fifteen vessels swinging on their anchors in Bonavista North. And they average ten men for a vessel. That is 150 men fishermen, good fishermen too, men who know how to go and find a trap berth in Cape Harrison, Cutthroat Tickle, Indian Tickle, does not matter where it is, right down to the very northernmost northerly point. These men know how to set traps. They know how to man vessels. But here they are walking the streets. Nothing to do. and when men walk the streets in the month of May or June unemployed we know that this does not take long for them to decay, morally. And this is what is happening.

I asked, the question has been asked on the Order Paper what the Government intends to do.

MR. CROSBIE: Not answered.

MR. ABBOTT: Personally I am worried about it. Some of the men are hoping that DREE will take up what they call the slack. That word is commonly known to a great many people. Speaking of DREE Mr. Speaker, I have great admiration and envisage great things from the administration of the minister. of the department responsible for DREE in Newfoundland. He is a young man with a great future. And I believe he is sincere. He is approachable. I think he is dedicated to his task. But I am sure he must be frustrated



when statement after statement explaining and apologizing for the delay after delay from Ottawa. This is not due to the hon. minister and his staff. It casts no reflection on him whatever, but it is obvious that there must be an easy attitude in Ottawa otherwise action would have been taken long ago. Bulldozers and other machinery would be ringing the air. But no. We were told this morning not even the agreement has been signed. Uncle Ottawa must be getting old, like some of us. But there has been an awakening in other quarters, and the sooner Uncle Ottawa gets going the better.

With the emergence in this century of <sup>a</sup>modern industrial society, it is imperative that Governments assume a more active role in providing social measures to protect the individual against the shocks of unemployment, and disability. Now it is true there has been quite an evolution in social welfare. We have seen wealth, and poverty exist side by side. We have seen certain measures like old age pensions, family allowances, veterans allowances, but these measures have insured at least a minimum standard of living. These welfare programmes have produced substantial results. They must now be expanded and in spite of the progress there are many, many of our citizens living in poverty today. We, Mr. Speaker, have a responsibility to adjust the existing programmes. However the provisions of economic security should not and must not stifle individual initiative. Instead a mature welfare system should open the way to new individual freedom and initiative. And as Newfoundlanders achieve greater freedom from want we must strive to create an atmosphere which <sup>will</sup> make possible the maximum use and enjoyment of that freedom.

We must maintain our human pride Mr. Speaker, and our dignity. And we must provide opportunity for individual expression and enrichment. Some of the programmes designed with this goal in mind might include urban renewal and a redevelopment planning in some of our larger cities and towns. Low cost land for housing: This is very essential. Indeed it is imperative.

creation of land bank by municipalities. And an equality of opportunity for education to the highest level for those with the ability to undertake it.

Mr. Speaker, financial and commercial difficulties were among the principal forces which impelled the British North American Colonies to unite. And the colonies had to find new markets, they had to find new frontiers. That solution of course, was confederation. And under the new federal union the elimination of customs barriers encouraged inter-provincial trade and the combined resources of the Provinces facilitated westward expansion. Confederation led to the construction of that great railway from B.C. right across the Dominion. A few years ago we in Canada celebrated centenary, which was a noble development in Canada. And with the development of new resources, population and income grew. Without Confederation the growth of richer provinces would have been slower. And the provinces with their more specialized economies would now have lost the stabilizing effect of the larger structures. So our society is complex and interdependent and we in Newfoundland are a part of that system.

Being a part of the structure we possess the human and the natural resources with which to ensure a real economic growth. So we should get from the Government of Canada substantial increase in scientific economic and industrial research assistance and there should be an improvement in banking and financial arrangements to increase the availability of Canadian capital for industry.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the kind of world that my grandchildren will grow up in. I want it to grow, Newfoundland especially, so that every willing person can find a job and get a fair wage. I care about all young people in schools particularly those leaving school, especially this year leaving school without jobs. They are looking for jobs. No one of them should be forced to quit school because they cannot afford to continue. A great deal has been said of our effort to finance education. In 1968-69 the Government of Newfoundland spent thirty six per cent of its total net general revenue for education, compared with twenty-six per cent for Prince

Edward Island, forty-two per cent for Nova Scotia, thirty-eight per cent for New Brunswick, forty-one per cent for Ontario, so says the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council.

If we look at Provincial and local education expenditures combined we find that Newfoundland spends about the same percentage of its total personal income on education as many of the other provinces. But when we look at actual expenditures per pupil per year we see just how far Newfoundland is behind the other provinces. In 1966-67 Newfoundland spent \$214 per pupil per year on elementary and secondary education. But P.E.I. spent \$288, Nova Scotia \$333, New Brunswick \$383, and Ontario \$541. The average figure for all of Canada Mr. Speaker, was \$478 more than twice the Newfoundland figure. And the expenditure for this coming year will be approximately \$400 per pupil, still less than the Canadian average four years ago. I would say that the Ontario average on elementary and secondary education this year is more than double ours.

The results of our expenditures become apparent, when we look at our dropout rate for the average level of education among our people. Only half of our students who begin school complete Grade XI as one honourable member has already stated here today. Now the other provinces have eighty to eighty-five per cent. A recent study of the number of students enrolled in higher education in Newfoundland indicates that a young Newfoundlander has only one chance of going to University compared to three chances for his counterpart on the mainland. There are many outports in Newfoundland where the amount being spent on education each year is less than half that being spent, say in the urban centres.

Mr. Speaker, society must provide adequate education for all of its members. Including those economically disadvantaged, and those who are displaced by technological development and there are a great many displaced. I believe the seeds of revolution in education has been sown in this Province. The Hon. Minister of Education has done a remarkable job in his complete

reorganization of education department, such as the integration of school boards, reduction in the number of school districts, superintendent and a core of specialists to work with teachers and pupils. There is a growing trend of professionalism among teachers and administrators today which never existed before. New ideas are being tried in the classrooms. And in general a growing emphasis on learning not on teaching/traditional sense of the word and development of the new curriculum programmes and the new educational services. I am especially pleased to note the growing concern for handicapped and children from what I call disadvantaged homes and communities. The financial responsibility for the schools, for retarded children, will now be the responsibility of the Provincial Government. To be honest a great deal has been accomplished despite our limited ability to pay. And as we progress into the seventies, there will have to be a complete revision of our system of financing education, to have the funds to distribute in such a way as to provide greater equality of educational opportunity. We have to narrow the gap between the haves and have-nots and unless this is done we will be condemning large numbers of our students to illiteracy and failure for the rest of their lives.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we look forward to the seventies we know that cultural changes that will take place over the next twenty years will be great even greater and more<sup>far</sup> reaching than those of the immediate past. The task confronting society and education will become even more complex. Planning and developing our educational programme may be very necessary and it is necessary and let us hope that we will all work to that end.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I promised the hon. gentleman that just took his seat that I would get some figures. A widow and two children, the total allowance would be \$140. I think the figures the hon. member was quoting were short-term rates. Now Mr. Speaker, I have long felt that minimum wages in this Province should be reviewed periodically. And therefore I was extremely pleased yesterday when my colleague the hon. minister of Labour announced an increase of fifteen cents per hour for male and female workers

throughout the Province. The same for both, fifteen cents per hour was the increase for male and female.

MR.CROSBIE: Why equal pay for men and women doing the same work?

MR.NEARY: I think the hon. member is asking Mr. Speaker, why not equal pay for equal work?

MR.CROSBIE: For men and women, right- why should not the wages be the same?

MR.NEARY: Well perhaps that matter might be dealt with in the foreseeable future Mr. Speaker, I am sure it will.

MR.CROSBIE: By whom? The next Government, the new Government is it.

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions.

MR.CROSBIE: This Government is not going to be with it, they have not dealt with it.

MR.NEARY: I will deal with the hon. member when I am finished with this particular topic Mr. Speaker. I was going to say on numerous occasions, I have had representations from various groups especially those who are employed with cleaning companies and catering firms. And I want to assure this Hon. House that the Minister of Labour's announcement made in this House yesterday has been greeted with a most favourable reaction from these people.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who just took his seat, made what I consider to be a very fine speech, and I think really in his heart, he is very concerned about the needy people of this Province, and I commend him for that.

But the hon. gentleman, Sir, is a former Minister of Welfare, and I think he also appreciates the great difficulty, in spite of the fact that fifty per cent of the cost of the Welfare programs in all the provinces are paid for out of the Canada Assistance Plan by the Government of Canada. I think he would be the first to admit the difficulties in financing Social Welfare programs in this Province.

Another \$5.00 a month, Sir, increase on short-term assistance for food, I think, would amount to something like between \$2 million and \$2.5 million in addition to what it is costing the department now.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how I can really answer the hon. gentleman. Hon. members on the other side have a habit of making all kinds of suggestions that involve millions and millions of dollars, but they never tell us where the money is coming from..

MR. CROSBIE: You never tell us either.

MR. NEARY: I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if they think that we pick it off the blueberry bushes.

MR. CROSBIE: No, it is extra revenue so the Premier says. Increased revenue comes back every year. It flows in. Supplementary Supply.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there are the gems of wisdom flowing from the hon. member for St. John's West again. I am surprised that he is not wearing his button these days. I notice that the other hon. members on the opposite side of the House have established a new trend by coming into the House wearing buttons.



MR. CROSBIE: It is a new trend. It is a new way.

MR. NEARY: In connection with that, Mr. Speaker, I might say that if I were the hon. members, I would not get too cocky.

MR. CROSBIE: So long as the light holds out to burn...

MR. NEARY: I would not start going around..

MR. CROSBIE: the vile sinner may return.

MR. NEARY: If I were the hon. members, I would not start going around firing people yet. Because, Mr. Speaker, from what I saw and heard of that little meeting they had over the weekend, in between trying to look after the clients of my department, I did not see anything new in what they were talking about. Nothing new, Mr. Speaker, they have been carrying on this very same hate campaign for the last twenty years..

MR. CROSBIE: Let us all have a good cry now. Let us all have a good cry.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, they are..

MR. MURPHY: I resent that remark, Sir, a hate campaign. I do not think the Opposition has ever had any hate for anybody in this House, and I am quite serious.

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

MR. MURPHY: It is an explanation for a very dirty, ignorant remark.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the only difference I see in what has been happening over the last twenty to twenty-one years is now that they have been joined by a group on their right, and I am surprised that they are not coming into the House wearing their Premier Moores' buttons these days.

MR. CROSBIE: They had a few people leave them. The hon. gentleman left them, the hon. minister.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not think out of this little get together over the weekend that any real policies or platforms have developed. I think

all we see, Sir, is a continuation of an attempt on the part of the Tories now joined by the renegade Liberals, the "would-be Tories."

All they tried to do was attempt to focus the intention - they tried to focus the attention, Mr. Speaker, on the mistakes of this administration.

MR. CROSBIE: So, we should forget them.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me ask you a very simple question. What would happen, if this administration did not make the occasional mistake?

MR. CROSBIE: Every day.

MR. NEARY: What would they have to talk about then, Mr. Speaker? Would they not then have to change their tactics? Then they would accuse us of not doing anything, because an administration that does not make mistakes does not do anything.

MR. CROSBIE: We have heard that for twenty years. That is worn out now.

MR. NEARY: The only conclusion that I can draw from this little get together, Mr. Speaker, that took place over the weekend is that it is just a rehash of what has been going on now for over twenty years, and I might add, Mr. Speaker, with very little success.

MR. CROSBIE: A mistake for twenty years.

MR. NEARY: If my hon. gentleman is inviting more comment on this little get together over the weekend, I might say, I do not think anybody in this Province, Mr. Speaker, was terribly surprised at the outcome of the election. It certainly was not a cliff-hanger. I think it was a foregone conclusion of who was going to win it. There was some doubt at one stage, because of the controversy that arose between Mr. Moores and his colleagues in Ottawa, but they seem to have that straightened out and then things reverted to normal and the Tory party wound up with another millionaire leader.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Moores, with a greater majority than the Premier had. Sixty-nine per cent. That is right. Sixty-nine per cent.

MR. CROSBIE: The Premier only had sixty-two per cent.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we have heard ..

MR. CROSBIE: Only sixty-two percent.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we have heard accusations made about the Liberal convention last fall about committed delegates.

MR. CROSBIE: Never.

MR. NEARY: Now who were the hon. members trying too fool, Mr. Speaker. There were more committed delegates at that little get together over the weekend than there were at the convention that was held by the Liberal party last fall. There were no surprises, no surprises in that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: No arms twisted.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, we have the hon. members walking in with their buttons, getting cocky. The election is won. We may as well all go now and look for jobs, go down and look for unemployment.

MR. CROSBIE: Button, button. Who will have the button next?

MR. NEARY: The hon. member will have the button next. I am surprised that he is not wearing one now.

MR. CROSBIE: I would not be surprised at all. There will be a lot more, too, after the election.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, ..

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, may I permit a question..

MR. NEARY: Yes, sure.

MR. EARLE: The minister seems to be protesting quite a lot. Why is he so interested in something which is so insignificant?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest surprises, I might say for the interest of the hon. gentleman who just asked me a question, that came out of the Tory convention, and this was televised and everybody

in Newfoundland could see that eighty per cent of the resolutions that were adopted at the Tory convention were an endorsement of the programs that have been carried on for this Government - by this Government for the last ten or fifteen or twenty years. Eighty per cent of the resolutions which will form, which is supposed to form their platform for the next election, Mr. Speaker, we are already doing it, including an endorsement of the principle of centralization, Mr. Speaker. So, as I say, there is nothing new, and if I were the hon. gentleman I would not get too cocky, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: You are like the Rocky Harbour Rooster.

MR. NEARY: Yesterday..

MR. CROSBIE: Too cocky.

MR. NEARY: I will deal with the hon. member shortly, Mr. Speaker, if you will just be a little bit patient.

MR. CROSBIE: And the Mary's Harbour Cock-a-doodle-doo.

MR. NEARY: But I was rather impressed with the speech of the hon. member who just took his seat, Mr. Speaker. I am sure he was very sincere. I want to tell him this, that it is with no feeling of pride that I submitted the 1970-1971 budget of the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation. I am under strict orders, Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues to hold the line in all areas of expenditure. Yet, there is so much to be done for so many with so little.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while there is no one in this Province happier than I was to see the emergency increases, we are giving to the 13,000 Government employees, to help them combat the air-borne consumer price index. I am also deeply conscious of another group that my hon. friend referred to this afternoon, the 83,000 men, women and children, at the end of March, dependent on assistance

Mr. Neary:

from my department to keep body and soul together.

Now that same air-borne consumer price index, Mr. Speaker, hits them harder than anyone else, because they began with rates set as a bare minima several years ago and you know, Sir, what has happened to the consumer dollar since then.

Now, Mr. Speaker, besides the immediate and urgent needs of these 83,000 Newfoundlanders to which I honestly must profess or deny fair treatment in this budget, the Province has all kinds of other needs; senior citizens' homes in central and western Newfoundland and Labrador, a home for mentally retarded and physically disadvantaged adults, Sir. These are urgently needed and we badly need increases in receiving and foster home rates, probationary and rehabilitation services, just to mention a few, Mr. Speaker, of the needs, just to add strength to the hon. member's argument..

MR. HICKMAN: And the tunnel to Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: But, Mr. Speaker, as I see it our only hope to cure these ills is in the acceptance by Ottawa of the principles behind the briefs, which I had the honour to present in the last couple of weeks. One of these, as your Honour knows, was on behalf of the Ministers of Public Welfare in the Atlantic Provinces and called for a revision of the Federal contributions from the Canada Assistance Plan proportioned to the average personal income and the labour rate participation of each province. I think my hon. friend would agree with that. This is fair ball. I think it is very unfair, Mr. Speaker, to pay fifty per cent of the cost of Social Welfare programs right across the board to all ten provinces. I think the formula should be modified to give the "have-not provinces" a little more assistance.

Now, if this, Mr. Speaker, is accepted and I am optimistic that it will be, then it could mean another \$8 million for this Province, and I think hon. members would agree, Mr. Speaker, that this would be a

4474

badly needed \$8 million to patch up the shameful budget now that we have for short and long-term recipients.

In another brief, Mr. Speaker, that I presented in Ottawa, on May 7th. to the Special Senate Committee on Poverty, I also received a most sympathetic hearing for the principle that the Canada Assistance Plan make supplementary funds available for financing work for the able-bodied and unemployed on a special series of projects that would be non-competitive with the present programs upon which so many segments of our business community depend for their existence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just mentioned these two briefs as providing some possible bright lining to that dark cloud to which the hon. member just drew our attention and which we will be hearing more about, when we discuss the estimates of my department in greater detail.

Now, Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this hon. House, when the member for Burin..

MR. HICKMAN: I thought you were going to leave me out.

MR. NEARY: When the hon. member for Burin was speaking in the budget speech, he quoted from a letter that I had written the President of the St. Lawrence Mine Workers' Union and this is always a pretty neat trick, Mr. Speaker, that lawyers, I suppose, more than anybody else, use, to quote the letter out of context.

MR. HICKMAN: I could not find the letter. You would not give it to me.

MR. NEARY: I delivered a copy of the letter to the hon. member about ten days ago as a matter of courtesy.

MR. HICKMAN: Right. It is over here somewhere. I cannot find it.

MR. NEARY: I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, that he has not somebody in his employe to keep his records straight.



MR. HICKMAN: Not enough office space.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was talking about the Government's lack of action on the Royal Commission on Radiation in St. Lawrence. I know this matter is going to be dealt with shortly in this House, so I will not go into any great detail, but I just want to assure the hon. gentleman that at the request of the President of the St. Lawrence Mine Workers' Union and the Mayor and several other interested groups in St. Lawrence, I asked to have a study made in line with the recommendation of the Royal Commission Report.

Paragraph (3) of my letter, Mr. Speaker, is as follows:

"Perhaps (and this survey incidentally was carried out by one of our more mature experienced social workers and this is a direct quote from his report to me, Mr. Speaker) as we expected, I did not discover a single case where there was any eligibility for supplementary long-term assistance. There were, however a few cases where the need for assistance with drugs, transportation, eye examinations and glasses for children of school age and assistance with repairs to homes were evident. The great majority of those who had applied and were eligible had been assisted as the need arose. A few others had not bothered to apply, even though they probably were eligible, if they had done so." The two major problems, discovered by this social workers, Mr. Speaker, were: (1) the income from Workmen's Compensation Board, although in excess of what they would receive under our regulations, is not sufficient to enable them to maintain what they consider to be a decent standard of living. Twenty of the twenty-three widows interviewed require materials to repair their homes.

Another section of that report, Mr. Speaker, says that: "further to my letter of February 13th., and your request of February 3, 1970, twenty-three widows of deceased miners of St. Lawrence were interviewed between the

period of February 18th. to March 6th. Twenty-two were interviewed at their homes and one at the office at St. Lawrence and this arrangement was at their own request."

So, Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to point out here is that this charge that the hon. gentleman made yesterday is not quite correct, and perhaps it is because the hon. member was not in possession of all the facts, but I want to assure him, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Newfoundland through this hon. House that the widows of deceased miners in St. Lawrence have all been advised of their rights as far as assistance from this department is concerned.

MR. HICKMAN: This is not what the Royal Commission says.

MR. NEARY: The Royal Commission, Mr. Speaker - this report that I am talking about was done on March 31st., 1970..

MR. HICKMAN: I know.

MR. NEARY: The Royal Commission Report is dated when? Completed?

MR. HICKMAN: It was delivered in September or October of last year.

MR. NEARY: Well this report that I am talking about was done on March 31st., 1970.

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

MR. NEARY: Yes sure.

MR. HICKMAN: Is the figures contained in the Royal Commission Report in comparison with the Welfare payments and Workmen's Compensation, are these figures accurate? A widow and thirteen children, the maximum received by way of Workmen's Compensation, \$312.50 per month and the maximum receivable by a widow with thirteen children on Welfare \$415. Is that a correct figure? Workmen's Compensation - \$312.50 and \$415 Welfare. When you get down to a widow and one or two children, it works in reverse.

MR. NEARY: Let me answer the hon. member by saying this, Mr. Speaker

that I am not familiar with the rates paid by Workmen's Compensation..

MR. HICKMAN: But is that the correct rates?

MR. MEARY: But I would say, not knowing the circumstances, because each case has to be judged on its own merits, but not knowing the circumstances of a particular case, I would say that the figure he gave for long-term social assistance is pretty close. But let me point out to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, and this is apparently what he does not understand, that if a large family, as he just mentioned, are getting Workmen's Compensation and the assistance that they would be entitled to from the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation was greater, than we would pay the difference. We would supplement their income.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member if he understands that.

MR. HICKMAN: Understands? Of course, would you like me to answer. Let me answer it, because that is dealt with very fully, by the commission and no one has suggested that they cannot apply for the difference, but let me quote to you what the commission found: "your commissioner feels that it is unjust, humiliating and degrading for widows of deceased workmen who died, as a result of an occupational disease contracted in an industry covered by the Workmen's Compensation Act to be obliged to seek social assistance in addition to compensation and I say, "amen" to that. That is the issue.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, look does the hon. member think that he is the only member in this House who is most sympathetic with the plight of the widows of deceased miners in St. Lawrence? As a member who was born and raised in a mining community, Mr. Speaker, I think that I have some feeling for the widows of the deceased miners too, and I think this Government has some feeling.

MR. HICKMAN: Is that why you recommended self-help program for the widows?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has again completely misunderstood what it was I said, that even if the Workmen's Compensation rates were increased, and I think they should be, then there is no reason why, if they are running a sewing class at the vocational school on the Burin Peninsula that the widows or their daughters could not attend these sewing classes which would help them stretch their compensation dollar or their social assistance dollar. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. member is there anything wrong about that? Is there anything wrong with it?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, there is a lot wrong with it.

MR. NEARY: I merely indicated to the union, Mr. Speaker, that there were ways to encourage people who were either getting Workmen's Compensation or Social Assistance or even people who are employed and earning low incomes, to stretch their dollar. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. member is there anything wrong with that principle?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, would you like for me to tell you what is wrong with it?

MR. NEARY: What is wrong with it? I would like to know.

MR. HICKMAN: You have a widow in St. Lawrence, with ten or twelve children, you suggest that she is going to go down to Salt Pond and take sewing classes. Do not be so silly. And this is why the Department of Welfare will not show any sympathy for the people of St. Lawrence, and I know it, and every hon. member of this House knows it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is getting off now on another tangent.

MR. HICKMAN: I am not getting off on any tangent, you raised it, and you will try and defend the Government's inactivities, and lack of sympathy, lack of understanding.

MR. NEARY: There is not a person in this Province that would not like to be getting more money, Mr. Speaker, not an individual on the face of this earth. But, if the money is not there, the money is just not there for recipients of social assistance, then the only alternative is to try to devise ways to stretch the dollar, stretch the social assistance dollar. Now if that principle is not sound, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is.

MR. HICKMAN: That is not sound, this is not the recommendation, what about the special fund that we implemented?

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to carry on, I think that matter has been sufficiently cleared up.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, ho, ho, you have not heard the last of it, do not think the hon. minister is going to walk away from it.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this hon. House, we hear the member for St. John's East Extern, and unfortunately he is not in his seat at the moment, express a vote of non-confidence in the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. After two decades of Confederation and the tremendous benefits that flow from it, especially in the field of education.

MR. CROSBIE: Who thought that one up? Brother Greene was it?

MR. NEARY: And we have schooling, and we have a university, and a College of Trades and Technology, No it was Mr. Kierans, who thought that one up.

MR. CROSBIE: No, Brother Greene, I think.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Kierans was the one who thought that one up.

MR. CROSBIE: Brother Greene.

MR. NEARY: And we have a Fisheries College, Mr. Speaker, and we have twelve vocational schools and we have a huge network of elementary and secondary schools, and yet, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. John's East Extern stated in this House yesterday, that he does not trust people to spend their own money. And that we have made a great mistake by replacing short term assistance with cash, instead of what proved in the past to be a pretty harrowing and embarrassing experience for many who are temporarily forced on unemployment. Mr. Speaker, I could scarcely believe my ears when I heard

MR. NEARY: the hon. gentleman.

Now if you follow his line of reasoning to its natural conclusion, then Mr. Speaker, might we ask why the Government of Canada issues the Family Allowances in cash? Why that same Government pays Old Age Pensions and the Canada Pension Plan Assistance in cash? And why not, Sir, according to the hon. member for St. John's East Extern in his narrow thinking, why not the Unemployment Insurance Commission pay their benefits by that little piece of white paper, rather than by cheque.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, if we follow through on the hon. member's argument, why should not my colleague, the Minister of Education, stop paying the Mothers Allowance by cash, and force the mothers of this Province into sort of an economic second class citizenship? Why not, Mr. Speaker, according to the hon. member for St. John's East Extern? After all, Sir, those categories that I have just mentioned, some of them are inclined to this department, and the hon. member claims that they are incapable of spending there money. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that argument is complete unadulterated nonsense and typical of the Tory philosophy that we have been getting for the past twenty-one years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with one other matter that was raised in this hon. House on Friday, I think, it was, by the hon. member for St. John's West.

MR. CROSBIE: Thursday.

MR. NEARY: Thursday. In the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, he devoted much of his discussion in the way of criticizing the Government for the way it was handling and still continues to handle the current negotiations between the Government and its employees.

MR. CROSBIE: That right, it was shocking.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member will think it shocking when I am finished with him, and when I point out the dishonesty in some of the statements that were



MR. NEARY: made.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. minister knows better than that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, at this time, I do not want to take issue with him on his interpretation of the total cost of these demands of the employees, I think this is a matter that can be straightened out probably by the hon. the Premier, who obviously has a better head than I have for figures and a better memory -

MR. CROSBIE: You are too modest.

MR. NEARY: And a better memory, Mr. Speaker, of the historical quotations, than the hon. member for St. John's West.

What I wish to draw to the attention of the hon. members of this House, Mr. Speaker, and I do it just to set the record straight, are a few matters of fact which undoubtedly led to some statements of opinion made by the hon. member completely out of his ignorance of the fact. The Member for St. John's West, Mr. Speaker, and this is a matter now of public record singled out May 8th. as the focal point of negotiations between the Government and its employees. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will give the hon. member a chance to correct me, if I am misquoting.

MR. CROSBIE: Thursday morning, May 7th.

MR. NEARY: Thursday morning, May 7th. Mr. Speaker, he can pick his choice.

MR. CROSBIE: The morning after the Premier's T.V. appearance on C.J.O.N. when he would not want my poison squirted on C.B.C. So it was the morning after that.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member can have May 7th. or he can have May 8th, he can pick his choice, because I am going to prove that beyond any doubt that he was incorrect in both cases.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, the hon. member for St. John's West merely referred to that date, because it was the date on which our colleague the Minister of Health -

MR. CROSBIE: Twisted the Premier's arm.

MR. NEARY: just returned incidentally from a fortnight away from the Province,

MR. HICKMAN: Not at all he was meeting at Hogan's Pond with the hon. the member from St. John's West.

MR. NEARY: and he sat across the bargaining table from the representatives,

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The hon. the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker, who I contend and I agree with the hon. member for St. John's West on this, he did a magnificent job, but he was sitting across the table from the representatives of those who earned their livelihood in the hospitals in the Province. The real crisis, Mr. Speaker, the real risk of a break in communication in the willingness of employer to continue the talk until they had arrived at a solution within the ability of one to pay, and the other to submit it to its membership was a good six or seven days earlier. If my hon. friend from St. John's West wants to pick May 7th. then it is six days earlier, if he wants to pick May 8th. then it is seven days earlier. And Mr. Speaker, just to verify my statement, Mr. Speaker, let me show him a clipping, a copy of a clipping from the May 4th. Edition of the Evening Telegram. May 4th., Mr. Speaker, remember the real crisis was a week before the hon. mentioned it in this House, Mr. Speaker, when this Government was faced with an ultimatum from the Newfoundland Constabulary of a strike with a noon-day deadline of Friday May 1st. Mr. Speaker that day now has been referred to by another gentleman outside this House, as May Day, which as the hon. members of this House know, is identified throughout the world as the traditional "Day of the Worker." So, Mr. Speaker, faced with this deadline the Government delegated to a special committee of Cabinet the task of proceeding to a meeting to commence at 8 A.M. on the morning of Friday, May 1st.

MR. CROSBIE: With whom?

MR. NEARY: That was only four short hours, Mr. Speaker, before the deadline of the Newfoundland Constabulary or the Newfoundland Constabulary strikers' deadline, and the Firemen and the Penitentiary Workers, Sir, and several other groups of employees had pledged themselves to join in the walkout, if Your Honour, will remember.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, faced with this ultimatum of a strike, which incidentally could have done nobody any good, either the employees of the Government or the Government itself or the Opposition, I do not think, Mr. Speaker, it would have benefited anybody. And it was a strike, Mr. Speaker, that nobody really wanted.

So, Sir, with this thought in mind, the hon. the Premier in his wisdom, whether he was right or wrong, decided with the approval of his colleagues to implement collective bargaining rather than wait for legislation to be brought into this House. And, Mr. Speaker, a special committee of Cabinet was set up and announced in this House, as a matter of public record, comprising of the hon. Minister of Labour as Chairman, the hon. minister without Portfolio as a member, the senior member for Harbour Main, and myself as members.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will get around to answering the hon. members question. I will answer the hon. member's question. His blood pressure is going up, the hon. member's blood pressure is going up all the time, Mr. Speaker, because he can see the dishonesty, and dishonest politics will never get anyone, anywhere in Newfoundland, let me assure him of that.

MR. CROSBIE: Let the hon. minister answer, did he meet with CUPE?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this committee, this is what I am coming to Mr. Speaker, this committee met with representatives of the Newfoundland Government Employees Association, a committee representing the constabulary, and two representatives, Mr. Speaker, not one as the hon. member asked, but two representatives of the Canadian Union of Public Employees -

MR. CROSBIE: Who were they?

MR. NEARY: In what I consider to be a historic first.

MR. HICKMAN: Who were they?

MR. NEARY: And Mr. Speaker, I might say the employees publication, the N.G.E.A. Bulletin in its May Edition outlined what took place at that meeting, and what a historic event it was. The employees bulletin, Mr. Speaker, and yet the hon. member tells us we did not agree to collective

MR. NEARY: bargaining until May 7th. or May 8th.

MR. CROSBIE: Did nothing.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the Evening Telegram of May 4th. headline on the third page, "Strikes nipped in the buds". The same paper, Mr. Speaker, on the same day, May 4th. on the front page, "N.G.E.A. members holding votes ,Police Force and Guards accept Government offer".

MR. CROSBIE: You never negotiated with CUPE until May 7th.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there were two representatives of CUPE at that historic meeting.

MR. HICKMAN: Who were they?

MR. NEARY: One was Mr. Crosbie, I do not remember the other hon. gentleman's name.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Dobbin.

MR. NEARY: No, it was not Dobbin, I do not remember the other gentleman's name, Mr. Speaker, but I do know Mr. Crosbie because I had met him before, the other gentleman was from Halifax.

MR. HICKMAN: McNamara?

MR. NEARY: No not McNamara.

MR. SMALLWOOD: McIntrye.

MR. NEARY: No it was not McIntrye.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Two anyway.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. CROSBIE: Cousin, my cousin, yes.

MR. NEARY: No, I do not think that Mr. Crosbie that we met, that came to that meeting, Mr. Speaker, was any relation to the hon. member, because if he was he would not have walked into this House and made these statements that he did, that the Government did not recognize the crisis until May 7th. or May 8th. He knows the difference, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member knows that it was not.

MR. CROSBIE: The Minister of Health deserted again.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker..

MR. CROSBIE: That is the hon. minister..

MR. NEARY: That meant, Mr. Speaker, that between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 11:00 a.m. on May Day, 1970, around the one table, the representatives of Government and its employees hammered out a proposal based on ground rules which were established without dissent by any of the three groups of employee representatives.

This proposal, Mr. Speaker, was a proposal. It was a proposal, Sir. It was not as the hon. member intimated in his remarks - a formula to be imposed on anyone.

MR. CROSBIE: That happened May 6th.

MR. NEARY: It still, Sir, had to be ratified by Government. It happened on May 1st., 1970.

MR. CROSBIE: The Premier got the ultimatum, May 6th., after retreating about two or three miles.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the formula that was worked out in those four hours on May 1st..

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who was present at that meeting?

MR. NEARY: I think I better repeat who was present at the meeting, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the hon. members of the House, especially, the hon. member for St. John's West.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May 1st, 1970.

MR. NEARY: May 1st., 1970.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May Day.

MR. NEARY: May Day, 1970, 8:00 a.m., representatives of the Newfoundland Government Employees' Association, a committee representing the Newfoundland Constabulary and two representatives of the Canadian Union of Public Employees..

MR. CROSBIE: When did you get down to negotiations?

MR. CROSBIE: May 8th.

MR. NEARY: On May 1st., 1970.

MR. SMALLWOOD: At 8:00 a.m.

MR. NEARY: One week prior to the date that the hon..

MR. CROSBIE: There was no negotiation took place.

MR. NEARY: There were negotiations, Mr. Speaker. It was the first attempt that I know of in this Province of collective bargaining between the Government and employees in the public service, and I think, Mr, Speaker..

MR. CROSBIE: It is a bit late, after the budget was brought down, was it not?

MR. NEARY: I think, Mr. Speaker, great credit is due the hon. Premier for taking the initiative..

MR. CROSBIE: Great credit?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was a bit later but it was seven days earlier than the eighth.

MR. NEARY: It was seven days earlier..

MR. CROSBIE: Great credit for pressuring the Premier into permitting the meeting. Welfare deserves that thanks also.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker,..

MR. SMALLWOOD: Tell me how I would be pressured.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not permitted to divulge Cabinet secrets..

MR. CROSBIE: We have to guess..

MR. NEARY: I have an oath of secrecy, Mr. Speaker, that I will carry to the grave..

MR. CROSBIE: That is for sure..

MR. NEARY: I hope that if I am in or outside the Cabinet, Sir, at least, I can..

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman is not a perjurer.

MR. NEARY: I consider myself, Sir, to be an honourable man.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not a perjurer?

MR. NEARY: And if the Premier decided that tomorrow he did not want me in his Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, the secrets of Cabinet - my lips would be sealed. I would carry the secrets of Cabinet to the grave.

MR. CROSBIE: Let us give him a hand.

MR. NEARY: The hon. minister knows what he said, and he has a fairly good



memory and the whole world knows what I said. I know, Mr. Speaker that this is getting a little bit away from the subject..

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. minister does not want to hear that.

MR. NEARY: The hon. Premier has asked me a question that I am afraid I am going to have to answer in a sort of roundabout way, because it is not permissible for me to divulge Cabinet secrets.

MR. CROSBIE: If you break your oath in this case, you will be forgiven.

MR. NEARY: But, Sir, I want to say this..

MR. CROSBIE: The great giver of..

MR. NEARY: I want to say this that I have been associated with the labour movement of this Province for fourteen years, and I want to say this and I say it without prejudice - Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to get into the Cabinet. I am there already, but I want to say this that I have to heap great praise on the Leader of this administration for taking the initiative - for taking the initiative, Mr. Speaker, for taking the initiative in collective bargaining before legislation was introduced in this House.

MR. CROSBIE: When Government forced the hon. Premier's hand, he finally gave in.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. member for St. John's West would like to be able to drive a wedge, but the hon. Minister of Health on May 1st. was out of the Province on Government business and when he returned he did a magnificent job, Mr. Speaker. I am not trying to take anything away from him, but the arm twisting that the hon. member for St. John's West is talking about is, I am afraid and if my colleague were in his seat today, he would verify what I have said. I think my hon. colleague will agree that there was not very much arm twisting.

MR. HICKMAN: Does the hon. minister agree with his statement that the anti-labour legislation..

MR. NEARY: The formula was worked out, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think it was

imposed on anyone, but it still had to be ratified by the Government.

MR. CROSBIE: That is why he went on CJON to ratify that, was it?

There was only \$6 million available then, remember.

MR. NEARY: After our meeting from 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. Mr. Speaker, we proceeded to the Cabinet Chamber.

MR. CROSBIE: \$4.3 available,

MR. NEARY: And we put the formula that had been agreed on by the various employee representatives..

MR. CROSBIE: They have not agreed since.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, may be agreed is not the right word but there was certainly agreement that the Newfoundland Constabulary, the custodial workers at the Mental hospital, the wardens at the penitentiary and the firemen be given preferential treatment because of the hazardous occupation in which they were..

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who agreed to that.

MR. NEARY: This was agreed, Mr. Speaker, by all the employee representatives who were present at that meeting, which was held incidentally down on the Fifth floor in the board room of the Department of Labour.

Now, Mr. Speaker, once the Government then agreed, of course, then the proposal had to be submitted to each of the three employee groups concerned and the largest of these by far was the Newfoundland Government Employees' Association and they insisted, Sir, on conducting a Province-wide ballot so that everyone of their members would have a chance to exercise his democratic and membership right to accept or reject this proposal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this was the turning point. This was the turning point, Mr. Speaker..

MR. CROSBIE: They do not know what they have been offered yet. It was in the paper yesterday.

MR. NEARY: This, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker was the historic occasion, when

Government, when those on this side of the House agreed to by-lateral discussion of important matters for its employees..

MR. CROSBIE:    Pretty late in the day.    Pretty late in the day.

MR. NEARY:    Please note, Mr. Speaker, much to the disappointment of my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House, please note this: that there was no strike. The great victory had been won, Mr. Speaker, There had been no breakdown in communications.

MR. CROSBIE:    Breakdown in Government. That is all.

MR. NEARY:    Employer and employees were able to..

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

MR. NEARY:    Mr. Speaker..

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

MR. NEARY:    Take the floor.

MR. CROSBIE:    Thank you. Did the hon. minister notice or is he familiar with a communication from the President of the NGEA, Mr. Noseworthy, who wants to know who this suggested raise covers, what the status is of the joint council, what the status is to collective bargaining for Government employees, is he familiar with all that? This is May 14th. It is not May 1st. It was May 14th. The President of the NGEA is asking all these questions.

MR. NEARY:    Mr. Speaker, I think I, unless the hon. member is extremely dense, I think I indicated in my opening remarks that negotiations and discussions were still going on and since, Mr. Speaker, these initial meetings, these attempts at collective bargaining were held. The Executive of the NGEA have changed..

MR. CROSBIE:    Sure have.

MR. NEARY:    And so obviously, Sir, they have to get certain questions answered to their own satisfaction before the circulate the ballot. This is fair ball, Mr. Speaker.

Now, as I say, Mr. Speaker, the proposed formula was worked out. There are still some details to be worked out with the membership or the new executive of the NGEA, but I have no doubt that this will straighten itself out in a matter of time, but the important thing, Mr. Speaker, is that there is now no breakdown in communications.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the members of this hon. House who has had many years experience in the labour movement. I "Hail" May 1st., 1970, as a major milestone in recognition of the rights of our Government paid workers both as employees and as human beings.

What went on, Sir, on that day is, I am quite certain, the foundation upon which we can build a whole new era in "employer - employee" relations in this Province.

MR. CROSBIE:    What happened between the 1st. May and 7th. May?

MR. NEARY:    And, Mr. Speaker, a relationship that will redound not only to the advantage of Government and employees but to that of the public as well in terms of better service to them.

MR. CROSBIE:    Twenty-one years too late. What about May 1st and May 7th. The minister is not finished yet is he? What a revelation that was.

MR. WORNELL:    May I adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:    It is moved and seconded that this debate be adjourned. Those in favour "aye."    Contrary "nay."

Is it the intention of the member to adjourn the debate or go on after 6:00 p.m.    What is the hon. member's intention?

MR. WORNELL:    After 6:00 p.m. your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER:    I now call it 6:00 p.m. and this House stands recessed until 8:00 p.m.



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR**

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

---

**Volume 1**

**Number 73**

**4th. Session**

**34th. General Assembly**

---

# **VERBATIM REPORT**

**TUESDAY, MAY 19, 1970**

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

The House resumed at 8.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. WORNELL: Mr. Speaker, I have a few words to say in defence of the budget, Sir. I do not intend to prolong the proceedings of this Hon. House any longer than I feel necessary and in justice to my constituents. Much has been said Mr. Speaker, about the lack of facilities in the districts represented by the hon. members of the Opposition. And I think it would be grossly unfair if I did not say something about the deficiencies and lack of public amenities in my own district. However, Sir, when I make any reference to the needs of my district I do not do so with any carping criticism. I try to take a reasonable view. I know that money cannot be dug up in a gravel pit and I know that even if this Government were favoured with billions to spend on public services contracts would still have to be let and contractors would still have to be found to perform such work.

Now, Sir, I am not an economist. I am not a financier. I am not an industrialist but I do think that there are some good things in this budget speech, and incidentally I wish to congratulate the minister of Finance who prepared this budget, and put it in such a convenient format. I also wish to congratulate the Hon. the Premier of course for any part that he had to play in it, in its preparation or in the delivery of it.

Now, the hon. member for St. John's West was most critical of almost every page. And he made very much ado about the promises which the Premier has made in the past. He did not give the Premier the benefit of having good intentions, hoping that Ottawa would come through with sufficient funds to perform all the good work which he had in mind for Newfoundland. I think the phrase that the hon. member used was, "the Premier is a prisoner of promises."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am an amateur politician. I am almost a novice, I have had four<sup>years</sup>/experience. And I have found Sir, that it is very very difficult for any politician to exist without making promises. Because, Sir, the constituents demand promises. They demand to know when certain



things will be done. I have three letters here today. I have a telegram. I had two phone calls, wondering when the road, or both roads, we have been promised a spur road from Hermitage and the continuation of the road from Harbour Breton. Both of these places are after me to try and get me to state definitely when work will start. How can a politician keep from not committing himself once ~~and~~<sup>in</sup> a while. Well, I try to give them the truth. I try to say, "well boy look, it will be done just as soon as the contracts are let, are awarded, and the contractors can get their equipment in there." But that does not satisfy the constituents Sir, all the time and I can understand that because in a good many cases these constituents who are making the enquiries have been pressured by their friends, they are perhaps the spokesman in these communities. and they are putting the pressure on the poor politicians. And the poor politician is putting the pressure on the poor minister - I say poor there, meaning the hounded minister -

Sir, I have heard a lot of criticism on industrial development. A lot of criticism. I have heard recently statements made by some people who presume to know the answers to all our economic ills. I would like to have just twenty-five per cent of the knowledge of some of these individuals.

MR. SMALLWOOD: One per cent would be a help.

MR. WORNELL: Thank you, I thank the Hon. Premier Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: (inaudible)

MR. SMALLWOOD: One per cent of what they think they know.

MR. WORNELL: I do not think that question was intelligible. If it had been I would have answered it. But I will continue Sir, to say this that I have heard people shouting about what should be done, shooting off their mouths perhaps I have shot off my mouth sometimes, and perhaps that is the reason that I get the backs of the hon. ministers <sup>up</sup>. They say the heck with you Wornell you can go and - you know - fly a kite. But, at the same time Sir, <sup>seem to</sup> if I had some of the answers that some people think that they have, then my problems in my district would be over. It is not too easy Sir, to have an industry in every cove and hamlet, outport, in this Province, whether it be

in Labrador and I wish the hon. the member for Labrador West were here now because I was going to discuss some of the points that he raised about Labrador. It is impossible Mr. Speaker, to have viable industries small or large, in every cove and hamlet in Newfoundland and Labrador. Even if we had, say, a hundred thousand dollars put aside, a fund prepared, a fund already raised or arranged, for the distribution of a hundred thousand dollars to each hamlet, where would you get the competent men to start these small industries? And if you had the competent men to start small industries how long would they last? I just pose this question, Mr. Speaker, because as far as I can see if there were any easy answers, surely heavens, in twenty years the best brains of the Province would have come ~~with~~<sup>up</sup> with some of them, if there were any easy solutions. The Hon. Premier is taking the gaff, and taking the criticism for all our economic ills, to my mind that is not absolutely cricket, somebody must have advised the Hon. the premier. I think that the Cabinet members must have had some ideas, if they did not they were deadwood.

The Deputy Ministers of the various departments are actually the mandarins running this country, to a certain extent. The Government administers it but the deputy ministers certainly do most of the administrative work and surely they must take and bear some of the responsibility for any bad advice, if it were given or for any mistakes which had been made in the past. It is not cricket to me, Mr. Speaker, to lay the blame on the shoulders of one man.

Sometimes Mr. Speaker, the critics take a lot of glory because they get a lot of good press, good publicity and they are fortunate in certain ways because they do not have to bear the responsibility. As I said one time before here in this Hon. House; The easiest way to wipe the smile of scorn or cynicism off a man's face is to give him responsibility. Give him authority. Sure! Then he will find out how difficult it is to put his schemes into practise.

Now Mr. Speaker, we have heard what I would consider to be plethora of argument and debate on the Bonne Bay National Park. Now I drove from Deer Lake to Lomond by snowmobile 1945. That was my first visit to Bonne Bay, first time ever I saw Gros Morne. First time ever I saw Gros Morne was on a beautiful March morning. It is definitely a breathtaking scene. That is Bonne Bay taken as a whole. I know, kill the devil, I think I know the Table Mountain up there opposite Woody Point. So I visited Bonne Bay in the Winter and I visited it in the Spring and Summer and Fall. Several occasions. I know its beauty. And I know that Bonne Bay National Park is in the cards and will eventually materialize, will be realized. But Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. gentleman on the other side, I must make a distinction here because I do not think it is the hon. members of the Opposition, the official Opposition, I think it is the renegade Liberals who have had a field day exercising their forensic abilities and great debating exercises. It is a subject that they could get their teeth into. They were not a bit sincere about the Bonne Bay National Park. My hon. friend the member for Bonne, yes, my hon. friend the member for St. Barbe South is sincere, because his constituents live there. But I am sure that the other gentlemen certainly made hay out of this subject. And it was a great subject and as a matter of fact I could have probably waxed just as eloquent if I were on the opposite side. But the Greeks had a word for it Mr. Speaker, and the hon. gentleman over on the other side have had thousands of words for the Bonne Bay National Park. All of them spurious. All of them specious. They have tried to make the White Paper a Black Paper, But it is still a White Paper and it is well composed, well written, and well put together. I congratulate the hon. Minister for Natural Resources for having compiled it. And I think that eventually the hon. members will see the benefit of it.

Because I already know, from listening to Trans-Canada check up, across Canada check-up on Sunday night that the hon. John Chretien's

department have brought in some sort of a regulation probably a Bill or an Act to allow for payment of fifty per cent of the expropriation fees. That in itself justifies the delay thus far.

Now the hon. gentleman on the other side were all in favour of rushing the Bonne Bay National Park to its completion. They want it rushed now, get the work started, get the work started what are you waiting for? But on other matters they say, go slowly, go slowly, they are not a bit consistent you see. By delaying the Bonne Bay National Park this Government has already saved money because I understand that fifteen or sixteen hundred people's lives are affected by the development of this park and when you have to expropriate the lands and properties of the households, say, three hundred households, that runs into a lot of money, Mr. Speaker.

So, the hon. gentleman made a good job, I will give them "A" for their effort. They made a darn good debating effort and no doubt they did justice to the subject. Now I was surprised that they did not use any of Dr. Pruitt's arguments. Dr. Pruitt I understand had made a survey there and he was most hopeful about the Bonne Bay National Park getting started as soon as possible. And no doubt Dr. Pruitt was a man well qualified to discuss and assess the ecological and biological effects and importance of such a National Park. But I maintain Mr. Speaker, that there are others who are just as important and who will benefit more perhaps by the delay and if this park does not become a reality within the next year or two then I think I shall join the gentlemen on the opposite side and say well the Government is really dragging its feet.

AN HON. MEMBER: You will be here.

MR. WORNELL: I may not be, I may not be. Now the point was raised by the hon. member for Humber East I think, in speaking about this White Paper that if this is such a good thing why do not all members demand the same scheme, same plan, for their districts. Well, as a matter of fact I think that was a little bit too silly for words. There can only be two National Parks in the territory that we have here in this Province. But when it comes

to the allocation of the DREE funds for the development of other areas, then that is a horse of another colour. And I feel that the DREE scheme, DREE programme will improve the economic and social existence of every park, every district in this country. But we have to give it time, Mr. Speaker. We cannot expect these things to happen overnight. People are too impatient. Sir, if a man wants to build a

MR. WORNELL: If a man wants to build a bungalow, a five or six or seven room bungalow, it takes six months to get it done, to do it properly and have all the work done, to get it landscaped, to get it fenced, it takes six months. How in the dickens, do the hon. gentlemen on the other side expect miracles to be wrought? And it takes so much machinery and we only have so many contractors here in Newfoundland, work is proceeding in other provinces, it might be argued that contractors could come from other provinces. Do you think that there is no work going on in other provinces, that the contractors could come down here and we could have work going ahead in every part of this Province? Every square mile? Foolish. Absolutely crazy.

Now, as I said in the beginning, I probably would not have anything to say in this debate except that we were more or less challenged into it. I heard so much from other hon. members talking about the district that I felt that it was incumbent upon me at least to talk about my district. And I am sure Sir, that I represent some of the best Newfoundlanders that can be found, and they are patient and long-suffering, and I am very pleased Sir, that it is in the cards for road work to be continue from Harbour Breton to the Bay D'Espoir Highway this summer, and also it is hoped to get a start made on the Spur road from Hermitage to the Harbour Breton road.

Now, much has been said about education. Mr. Speaker, surely heavens no one can criticize this Government for not being concerned with education in this Province. Who instituted the Warren Commission? Who instituted the great Educational Conference two years ago? What happened there? People from all parts of this Island had their eyes opened as to the difficulty of finding finances. I was sat on one of these committees, there were ten men there and it even included the President of Price Newfoundland who retired the other day. He could not come up with the answers, and he is a man that should know. What can you do, you can only take so much blood from, well you cannot take any blood from a turnip, but you can only take so much taxation, tax off a man's dollar. It is impossible to get money for everything. Now the other day we heard the criticism about the access school, my good heavens you cannot satisfy them. We are going to get the money from DREE for access



MR. WORNELL: schools, and somebody brought up the question of, who is going to run it?

MR. CROSBIE: In Bay D'Espoir.

MR. WORNELL: We want plenty in Bay D'Espoir, the hon. gentleman does not know any more about Bay D'Espoir than I know. But, the hon. member for Bonavista South might think he does, but he would not think he does.

MR. CROSBIE: There is no DREE plan for Bay D'Espoir.

MR. WORNELL: No, as far as I am concerned there is no DREE plan so far for Bay D'Espoir, and do not think that I am not worried about it. As a matter of fact, there it is right there.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. WORNELL: Do you think I am on my feet for nothing tonight?

MR. CROSBIE: No, Sir.

MR. WORNELL: And as far as I am concerned I have not been lax in letting my voice being heard in four or five districts.

Now, I feel Sir that we are up against problems in education, in industry and in road work and everything else. You do not realize, Mr. Speaker, that I should not speak to you that way, I am sort of wound up by the hon. gentleman heckling there. But do the hon. gentlemen realize that we have more coast lines in Newfoundland, more indentations, than all of the American coast, the U.S. coast? No we have more than the great American nation. Now just imagine how much it is costing to service all these thousands of communities. It is amazing, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. gentlemen are not honest, when they criticize the Government for not having an industry in every small settlement, it is crazy, it is absolutely crazy.

Somebody said the other day, or they talk about resettlement, we are not going to burn our boats, we are going to burn the barge. Well, let me have something to say about resettlement, when I went into my district first resettlement was about, well reaching a certain peak, a certain level, and the people used to ask me, "what about it, Mr. Wornell, 4499 do we have to get out of these places, do we have to get out of our homes?"

MR. WORNELL: And I said, "no, as far as I am concerned I do not think that any government would be foolish enough to drive anyone from his home." I just said, "I do not think any government would be foolish enough to drive people from their homes." Is that clear to the hon. gentleman? That is what I said. So when I came back I checked into the matter, and I found no one is forced to leave his home.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WORNELL: Oh! no, I beg your pardon, no one is forced to leave his home.

MR. CROSBIE: In an indirect way.

MR. WORNELL: Ha! Mr. Speaker, that is another falacy. If I wanted to live on the Funks, Farley Mowat lived up in Burin for four years, nobody told him to leave Burin. Look, if I wanted to live on the Funks, no government could drive me out of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WORNELL: Crazy, crazy. The people are not forced to leave, I will tell you what is forcing them to leave their children are forcing them to leave, lack of facilities are forcing them to leave. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman does not know anything about outport life. It is obvious that he does not.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke with Farley Mowat one time, he was criticizing resettlement, and I said, "Farley, do you realize that mankind has been resettling ever since the days of Adam and Eve?" My father, left Greenspond Island in 1929, and he did not have any government assistance, he just had vision enough to know that there was not an opportunity there for his five sons, and he left it. And do you know what he had done three years before that? He spent two years away from home working in New York. Two years away from home, we did not see our father for two years. That was the condition that my father did not want perpetuated with his children, and Mr. Speaker that happened forty years ago. And who says now that resettlement is a bugbear? Who says that resettlement is rammed down peoples throats? Crazy. They make up their own minds, and they make their beds, and sometimes they do not like the beds that they have made. But, that

MR. WORNELL: is not my fault, and not your fault.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nobody decides to go on welfare.

MR. WORNELL: Well, as far as welfare is concerned, God Help us, nobody wants welfare, I do not want it, you do not want it! But if mistakes have been made, if people have settled without giving due consideration to their future, after all we all have brains, we all have heads, we are supposed to use them.

MR. WELLS: The Government do not have them.

MR. WORNELL: Do you mean to say, does the hon. gentleman mean to say that he would take my advice without muddling over the situation, say, "I wonder is the hon. gentleman right?"

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WORNELL: Oh! crazy, crazy,, in this day in age, crazy.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. WORNELL: I saw something about Lamaline the other day, yes. And I know Lamaline, Mr. Speaker, I know Lamaline. Lamaline is about thirty miles from the big metropolis of Fortune and Grand Bank, and they have been dealing with Fortune and Grand Bank, they know something about the economic I was going to say pentacle, perhaps that would be a wrong word, the economic influence of these centres of commerce down their on the boot of the Burin Peninsula. Lamaline to my mind may have a farming potential, I do not know, I am not an agriculturist and I am not presuming to know anything about the hon. gentleman's district. But it is a nice level piece of ground, I like that area there, Lamaline, no doubt about it, and if they are induced to leave by say the urgings of their children or by the economic exiguous of that area, more power to them, more power to them. People are going into Grand Bank and Fortune from other areas and they are finding jobs in fish plants, so why would not the people of Lamaline avail of that same economic opportunity.

4501

MR. WORNELL: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not off the subject of resettlement yet, because my district has three or four places which may or may not resettle within the next year or two. But, do you realize that the communities which have resettled in my district were not expected to resettle. They were the ones that seemed to be complacent, they seemed to be satisfied, no talk at all about leaving. I cite quite clearly in January, Mr. Speaker, I had a letter from an resident of Pushthrough, "no one going to leave here." I did not care whether they left or not. When I went up in March, I was surprized when I landed on the wharf, I was surprized when I spoke to the Chairman of the Road Board. to find out if he wanted any extra work done that year. He says; "why we will not want any money this year, we are all leaving here." Now that came like a bolt from the blue Mr. Speaker, within three months they had decided to leave, because they made up their mind on their own, and perhaps their children. Now I will give you a little afterthought to that, on the way down the coast on the boat, I was talking to two teenage boys, under twenty anyway, and I said, "where are you going boys?" "Milltown, Sir". "Milltown, do you live at Milltown?" "No, no we live in Pushthrough, but we are going to live in Milltown". "Oh! I said, you are resettling?" "Yes". "What do you think of it boys are you happy about it?" "Indeed, we are Sir, indeed, we are Sir". So It is the children. But I would say this, that the parents and the older people must find it heartbreaking to leave their old homesteads. I know that. I visited my old homestead the place that I left when I was twelve years old, I visited it last year.

MR. CURTIS: Greenspond?

MR. WORNELL: Greenspond, yes. I even walked to that House and I went up in the various rooms, and I saw my bedroom, you see, and it is still there after forty years. People still living in it, you see. But Greenspond is a place which has dwindled from 1200 to 700 people. And it was only three miles from a highroad in Valleyfield. They have a cottage hospital right there, so they are not too badly off. They always had good schools and

MR. WORNELL: good teachers, they were close to a doctor, they were close to magistrates, and they were close to a policeman, in my day growing up. So at that time it was just as good any other part of the Island outside of St. John's. But in this modern day of age after the children come to University, after they go to work say in Corner Brook, Grand Falls, St. John's ; Clarendville, after they see the bright lights of any of these towns, you will never get them to go back in the outport again, not in isolated outports, you will get them to go back in outports which are close to St. John's, yes or close to towns, or say within driving distance of the town.

Now, I just mentioned education and someone was talking -

MR. T. HICKEY: Will the hon. member permit a question?

MR. WORNELL: Yes, of course.

MR. HICKEY: Before he leaves the resettlement program, I wonder if he is familiar with the situation in Placentia in connection with the people who were moved to that area, that area being considered as growth centre by this Government? Is he familiar with it? What those people are doing -

MR. WORNELL: Now Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman has fielded a curved ball there, why should I be familiar with Placentia, except having visited it? I will say ..

MR. HICKEY: Well, we are talking about the whole Province.

MR. WORNELL: Now I have read something about it , but within the past two months, I was speaking to a sister( that is a film) who had come from Merasheen and her parents had moved into Placentia. I gathered from her, she showed me some snapshots of her homestead and her family, I gathered from her that her parents were not too happy, but yet she was very reasonable and philosophic about it, ' ..

MR. HICKEY: Yes, but she is not looking for a job, as you know.

MR. WORNELL: True, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman does not take me for a fool, I hope. I just said she was a sister, and I hope she will always have a job, because this world needs plenty of dedicated sisters. Mr. Speaker, you will find the isolated case, of course, does the hon. gentleman on the Opposition think they are the only ones with hearts, are they the only ones



MR. WORNELL: concerned about the poor?

MR. HICKEY: All we say is more planning, all we say is more planning, that is all. We do not condemn it.

MR. WORNELL: Mr. Speaker, I leave that Sir for you to judge. That is all they say more planning, they do not criticise it, they do not vilify it,

MR. HICKEY: We do not condemn it.

MR. WORNELL: more planning please.

MR. HICKEY: We are not condemning it.

MR. WORNELL: They are very sweet reasons.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I talked long enough., In consequence I can never hope to sway the hon. gentleman's reason, They have devised ways of reasoning, Mr. Speaker, that I certainly do not hope to overcome.

Now somebody was talking about special groups, I think the hon. member for Fortune, he said, "you are going to have pressure groups all over the Island, education, where are we going to get the money?" Pressure. Mr. Speaker, we will have so many pressure groups one of these days, that our society is going to be ruined. It is inconceivable, Sir, that we can have pressure groups in every one of our one thousand settlements and expect to have competent Government. I throw out this challenge to any man who aspires to Leadership. I would not want to be the leader of this Province and talk about pressure groups as the hon. gentleman over there did. It would be much better for us Sir, to start a campaign and stop this: participatory democracy. The man who coined that word should - I will not go to far, he should reconsider at least, because as far as I am concerned, Sir, it is time for every Government of the world to start thinking about Government for the people, not Government by the people. It is impossible. You will only have chaos, when you have Government by the people, chaos. So that is my answer to pressure groups, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I hope the few words that I have said will make a little sense. I can only say this, Mr. Speaker, now with regard to the statement by the



MR. WORNELL: hon. the Minister for Community and Social Development, I was disappointed no mention of anything there under the DREE program for that great metropolis that is to be Bay D'Espoir. But, Mr. Speaker, I have made representation to the minister and to the Minister of Municipal Affairs on many occasions, and I want it to go on record here Sir, that I have not been remiss in my duty in speaking up for my district. There are other things required in the district, and I do not think Sir, I should go into it now, all I wish to say is that I have a list of the projects right here, which I prepared and gave the hon. Premier a copy recently. It includes every place of the district.

Last year, I presented a brief offering some suggestions for the alleviation of unemployment in Bay D'Espoir. I think that got attention Mr. Speaker, but it is just one of these insurmountable problems. Impossible of solutions. Quite recently March 20th. I presented a brief to the special committee appointed to advise the Minister of Transport on the south coast transportation problems. This brief, Sir, requested that one of

MR. WORNELL: Sir, requested one of the ferries, one of the Gulf ferries be scheduled to go into St. Albans, make St. Albana a port of call, twice a week perhaps. Once a week, we will be reasonable with that, we will be satisfied with small mercies. I showed in this brief, Sir, that the town of St. Albans in Bay D'Espoir was closer to about one-quarter of the population, the people of ten districts closer to these people than was either Port aux Basques or Argentia. And, Sir, I hope that that brief will receive all the consideration it deserves, but I am afraid that the powers that be will consider all the time involved, there are four to six hours involved, and I am afraid that they are going to be parsimonious, they are going to think of the cost, they are not going to think of the human factor at all, the 125,000 people that will deserve it. And they are going just to think of the few extra hours and the few thousand dollars extra, I must say that if the few thousand dollars involved makes a deficit in the operations of the C.N. it has got to come out of the tax payers' pockets, the only thing I can do there, with tongue in cheek, is to hope that it does not come out of the Newfoundlanders taxpayers' pockets. But, anyway Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make these two points, there are others that no doubt I could make, it is a disjointed speech, and I thank the hon. gentleman for their attention. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The motion is that I do now leave the Chair. Those in favour "aye" contrary "nay" carried. In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

MR. CROSBIE: Let the House divide.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Those in favour of the motion, please stand. The hon. the Premier, the hon. the President of the Council, the hon. Minister of Labour, the hon. Mr. Lewis, the hon. the Minister of Highways, Mr. Noel, Mr. Smallwood, the hon. the Minister of Labrador Affairs, Mr. Hodder, the hon. the Minister of Education,

MR. SPEAKER: the hon. the Minister of Public Works, 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, Mr. Saunders, Mr. Wornell.

Those against the motion, please stand: Mr. Hickey, Mr. Collins, Mr. Earle, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Wells, Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Myrden,

I declare the motion carried. Chairman of Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Shall the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again?

Mr. Speaker the Committee of Ways and Means has considered the matters to them referred, and direct me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole reports they have considered the matters to them referred, directed him to report progress and ask leave to sit again. Moved and seconded that the report of this Committee be concurred in. Those in favour "aye" contrary "nay" carried. When shall this Committee have leave to sit again, on tomorrow? Those in favour "aye" contrary "nay" carried.

Third reading of a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Department of Supply Act, 1966-67".

MR. CURTIS: I move Mr. Speaker that this Bill be recommitted now.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that this Bill be ~~new~~ recommitted. Those in favour "aye" contrary "nay" carried. Chairman of Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Bill No. 28.

MR. CURTIS: I will move, Mr. Chairman, that Section IX be reconsidered. And I have been asked to move an Amendment to the present Clause IX which is on page 7 of the Bill. This is a clause which provides for purchasing from hospitals. And the Amendment I am moving provides for the wiping out altogether of Clause (c). Well then adding after hospital in (a) "any hospital whether privately owned or not upon the request of the proper hospital authorities and". Have the hon. members got that?

4507

MR. HICKMAN: And wording for it, Mr. Chairman, "any hospital whether privately owned or not whose board has so requested".

MR. CURTIS: That is the Amendment we are making. The new reading will be "whether privately owned or not upon the request of the proper hospital authorities and".

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is that Clause IX - 3 (a) the Amendment to read, "any hospital whether privately owned or not, upon the request of the proper hospital authority and".

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, that seems to me to create confusion rather than obviate it, I do not know what the reason for the Amendment is at this stage, but there can in some instances be some doubt as to what is meant by proper hospital authority. Now the Board, upon the request of the Board of the hospital makes it clear, but when it comes to an issue a particular hospital, what is the proper hospital authority? The Department of Health, the administrator of the hospital, a Board of Governors, is it the Government hospital or what is the proper hospital authority? Would the minister mind telling us what the Government intends that to mean? What is intended by it? It is too ambiguous, it is too uncertain.

MR. CURTIS: Would the hon. member suggest an amendment?

We all have the same object in view. It meant the hospital, the Board of Management, I presume.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Some of the hospitals do not have boards, and therefore,

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is the Department of Health.

MR. WELLS: In a hospital that does not have a board, may be we can suggest another — that this proper hospital authority. It may take a longer wording, where a board exist and if not the Department of Health, some such thing as that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I might say that the draftsman, knowing the view of the House and having seeing the Amendment that was passed, and knowing that some hospitals had no boards, suggested this amendment to the Clerk.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, the hospital in Labrador City is operated by the Salvation Army. It is owned by the Government, but operated by the Salvation Army and the proper authority over that hospital is the Salvation Army. The hospital at Baie Verte is owned by the Government, but it is operated by the United Church of Canada, the United Church of Canada, not the Newfoundland Conference of the United Church, but the United Church of Canada, they bring doctors in and they run that hospital. I do not know if they have a board, but the United Church of Canada is certainly the proper authority for that hospital. The St. Clare's Hospital is run, I would imagine, I do not know, but I would imagine by the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation or some authority set up by the church. The Grace Hospital, I think, has a board, I think the hon. member, my Parliamentary Assistant, who is not in the Chamber at the moment, is a member of that board. And various hospitals have various kinds of authority. And I suppose the thought, is some one term that would cover all of them.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, after <sup>having</sup> seen a couple of other Bills, I am not too impressed by the fact that the lawyers in the Department of Justice have recommended it.

MR. HICKMAN: Do not be so unkind now.

MR. WELLS: I do not mean to be unkind to them, but that in itself is not to be all and end all is what I am suggesting. What I was thinking, Mr. Chairman, when you get to the points where somebody requested and there is confusion, who is the proper hospital authority and what is intended by this? Take a hospital where there is no board, and there is an administrator, is not the administrator a proper hospital authority in that case? I do not know, I am suggesting to the House, Sir, to the Committee, Mr. Chairman, that it does leave room for doubt rather than to leave anything ambiguous in a statute, a matter of a few more words to cover the board where a board does exist and otherwise the Department of Health, well that is fine.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I believe that it would be all right if it said, "upon the request of the proper governing authority of a hospital". They all have a governing authority, in a case of the Government hospital of course, the governing authority is the Department of Health. In the case of St. Clare's it is their board. In the case of the Grace -

MR. CURTIS: What change does the hon. member suggest?

MR. CROSBIE: It will just read, "upon the request of the proper governing authority of the hospital".

MR. CURTIS: That is all right.

MR. CROSBIE: It will make it clearer than that, "if the governing authority of the hospital".

MR. CURTIS: " upon the request of the proper governing authority, and add of the hospital".

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Amendment will be -

MR. CURTIS: And, the word and.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause (a) "any hospital whether privately owned or not, upon the request of the proper governing authority of the hospital and". Those in favour of the Amendment, please say "aye", contrary "nay" carried. Shall the Amendment carry? Carried.

Shall the Committee rise and report having passed Bill No. 28 with some amendments? Carried.

Motion, that the Committee rise, report having passed Bill (No.28) with some amendments. Moved and seconded that the report of this Committee be concurred in. When shall this Bill be read a third time? Now, by leave. Moved and seconded that this Bill be now read a third time. "A Bill," "An Act Further To Amend The Department of Supply Act, 1966-67". This Bill is now being read a third time, and it is ordered that the Bill do pass and its title be as on the Order Paper.



May 19th., 1970    Tape no 927    Page 1

Motion, second reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Printing And Stationery Act." (Bill no. 25).

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I made some mention of this earlier in reference to the Department of Supply Act, in fact, this should be read. I did make mention of it, when we brought up the earlier Bill. It is merely a change of name, changing the department of Government involved from the Department of Supply to the Department of Supply and Services and in order to bring this under this Act. More than that I think is unnecessary to say at this time, unless there are questions from hon. members. I would move second reading, Sir.

MR. CROSBIE: I wonder would the hon. minister tell what printing is done - what actually is done under this Act. Is there a division in his department that operates under this Act - a printing division?

MR. NOLAN: The..

MR. CROSBIE: If I sit down, I cannot - I only have a couple of - that was one question and another is that: would the hon. minister tell us what the cost of the - give us some idea what the cost of the printing of the alleged White Paper on the Bonne Bay Park? Could that be done in his department and what the cost of that would have been, the cost of printing, how many copies were printed, what it cost to print and what the mailing costs were? Could he give us any information on that? I presume that this was all done under the Public Printing and Stationery Act and also if he could just explain a bit about how this section works. I know it is a printing section, but how much work do they do and how many people are employed, just a general idea?

MR. WELLS: There are a couple of matters I do wish to bring up on this, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me, Sir, that printing is a pretty big part of the Government business, printing, stationery. The hon. minister has a pretty hefty division of his department to manage. I would like him to give the House, if he so disposes, some information as to what printing is done

under this Act? Is this the governing Act that regulates the Queen's Printer, which as hon. members know, is a private corporation in this Province that is the Government has contractual work done and in the arranging for printing work that has to be done, are tenders called from other printers or is there just a standing contract for or standing appointment for Creative Printers to be the Queen's Printer? Would he give us some information on that as well?

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, before the minister closes the debate, there is a point I mentioned on another matter the other day in the division of the cost of printing within Government services. I wonder when the minister replies, if he could advise us how that is broken down? Are the departments who request and demand printing charged, including overtime, if any, or is it just on the cost of the materials used. I think this should be clarified, because it would indicate whether the departments are preparing their true costs or not in the preparation of these documents. I asked that question the other day and a supplementary question which now occurs to me - how is time allocated?

In my experience in Government, there were times when rush orders came through and there was some confusion. Certain departments needed work done very quickly. How were the priorities arrived at in this very important division? Who lays down the laws<sup>as</sup> to who comes first?

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I may have missed a question or two along the way and if so, I would certainly appreciate any prompting from one of my hon. friends opposite. It is difficult for me to give you all the answers that you have asked simply off the top of my head, but I am not at all attempting in any way to be evasive on any of the questions asked, and if I cannot provide them now, I will be more than happy to, as soon as I can get the necessary information.

In reference to the question posed by my hon. friend the member for Fortune Bay, I believe, what was the practice in the past was that departments,

divisions, agencies, perhaps, would go to the printing and photography division and submit their requests for certain printing, for example, the Department of Education, I would think, turns out anywhere in the vicinity of eighty-one or eighty-four publications of one kind or another a year. This is an approximate figure, I will grant you. But what I have attempted to do, Mr. Speaker, is to set up a system now whereby no matter who it is, in Government, would like to have something done by the printing and photography division, they are required to sign the necessary requisitions and forms we have drafted and are now in use. They sign for any work that is being done in this division. This is a departure as I am sure my hon friend will appreciate from the system used formerly and in this way, I will be in a position with the officials in the department to charge back, if you like, work being requested and done for the departments concerned. It is always a matter of difficulty to determine priorities, because I am sure, when my hon. friend opposite was the Minister of Finance, if he wanted something done coming budget time, I am sure there is nothing I could say here, now or then that would convince him that someone else had some work that was more urgent than his at that time, but I believe what has happened and is continuing to happen is that, through negotiations with the people concerned, we can come up with some kind of a priority list. It is not as good or nothing like as good as I would like to have it, but this is something that we are taking a look at. Just recently, as a matter of fact, we had someone in from the printing office in Halifax, the Queen's Printer in Halifax, the man responsible, Mr. Towers who takes care of all the printing for the Federal Government in the Halifax division and he is taking a look at our setup and has recommended some changes and so on, and I hope that we will be able to bring some of them into effect.

MR. CROSBIE: Under Section 20 of this Act, the principal Act, there was supposed to be a statement made before the Legislature each year, apparently,

in connection with stationery, which I do not recall was done this year.  
What is the position on that?

MR. NOLAN: I am familiar with the observation of the hon. member. I do not know what has been the practise in the past. I do know, as you say, that there has been no statement as such placed before the Legislature. I have made some inquiries about it and I would, if necessary, and obviously it is, that any explanation that is required, I would be in a position, before the session closes, to certainly table any report that is required.

Now the hon. member for St. John's West did ask another question, which I - perhaps I did not answer, and I am not trying to avoid it. Yes, in connection with the Queen's Printer, one of the hon. members mentioned that a firm is designated as a Queen's Printer. I think this is erroneous, because "a gentleman"...

MR. SMALLWOOD: One man.

MR. NOLAN: One man, yes, this is what I just said, and not a firm. It is a man. I believe it was the late Mr. Walter Thistle for many, many years.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Mr. David Thistle.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. David Thistle that you all know and remember and now it is Mr. Davis, as I recall, who is the Queen's Printer. He, of course, is responsible for the printing of i.e., the Newfoundland Gazette, Bills such as you have before you in this House and so on and the Order Papers and this is where that..

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

MR. NOLAN: By all means.

MR. WELLS: If Mr. Davis, if formerly appointed as Queen's Printer, the actual printing is done by Creative Printers Ltd., and this is, I presume, either to comply with tradition or something else. The actual printing is in fact done by Creative Printers Ltd, is it not?

MR. NOLAN: Yes, but that is not what the hon. member said or some other

members suggested. He suggested that a firm, I believe, was in fact the Queen's Printer.

MR. WELLS: Well he is doing all the printing for the Queen in right of Newfoundland.

MR. NOLAN: He is not <sup>doing</sup> all of it. No! No!

MR. WELLS: A great bulk of it.

MR. NOLAN: No! he is doing certain printing, but there is much more that is required that in fact is not being done, i.e., all that we do in "P and P" - in Printing and Photography, is done here. What we have done, in fact, is there are certain reports that we could argue back and forth about, if you like, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps should be done may be by the Queen's Printer. What I have attempted to do is to try and bring it into the "P and P" division in order to reduce costs wherever it is possible to do so. I am not sure if what I said is as clear as the hon. member would like it to be, but I would be more than happy to elaborate, if I can.

MR. WELLS: The question that I asked, Are tenders called for the printing that is normally done by Creative Printers. They print a great deal of material for or on behalf of the Government through the Queen's Printer or otherwise. They do a lot of printing on behalf of the Government as anybody can see in many of the documents, perhaps, even the Orders of the Day, the Bills that come before the House - are tenders called for this work or are they appointed by the Queen's Printer or by the Government or by what means is it done?

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I do know that we call tenders on certain printing. I again - I am not trying to be evasive. It is just that I do not want to be flip, with an answer that is incorrect, and be accused of misleading the House. I do know that the work that I referred to such as, what we have before us, has been done by the Queen's Printer and in this

case, it would have been done, perhaps, I have no doubt, by Creative Printers. If that is the question that the hon. gentleman is asking, yes, whether I can say as a certain fact that a tender was called for this piece of paper, I cannot do that at the moment, honestly, and give you a fair answer.

MR. WELLS: Can the minister have it ready, when his estimates come up?

MR. NOLAN: Oh! most assuredly, Mr. Speaker.

On motion a Bill, "An Act To Amend the Public Printing and Stationery Act", 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 Companies Act." (Bill no. 33).

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Act. As a matter of fact, I often wonder why my department recommended that it be brought in. Section 22(a) of the Companies Act as enacted by the Act no 10 of 1966 provides: "that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council 'may' - it does not say 'shall' - the Lieutenant-Governor may prescribe the form of and information to be contained in any prospectus issued by or on behalf of any company or intended company. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council 'may' make regulations prescribing the form."

As a matter, the feeling is that they should not prescribe the form and the suggestion is - the motion is, in this Bill, that we take out the word, "form" and just say, "may prescribe and information to be contained" rather than "the form in which it takes, which I think throws an unnecessary burden upon the registrar and that is the sole object of the Bill, and I move second reading.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I certainly have no objection to this amendment, but in connection with the Companies Act, Mr. Speaker, in many provinces now they are revising their companies legislation, particularly, of course, the Federal Act has been revised many times and the Ontario Act, particularly,



with reference to the position of minority shareholders and the very little protection that our present Companies Act offers minority shareholders in Newfoundland, that is shareholders who do not control the company, and have very little protection under our legislation and the Acts of other provinces, particularly, Ontario, their Act is being amended to give them more protection from majority shareholders who control companies and it would not be a matter that would require a Royal Commission, Mr. Speaker. It is not of that much importance, but I would suggest to the minister that it might be a very good idea to appoint some lawyer here in Newfoundland who is well versed in company law to do a report for the minister on what changes might now be brought to our Act and not just consolidation but in line with what has been happening in other provinces. Changes which might be made in connection with public companies: There are very, very few here in Newfoundland and particularly with reference to protecting the rights of minority shareholders and the rights also of creditors and the information that they should be given.

I certainly feel, Mr. Speaker, that it is time now for us to take some steps in that direction and the minister might consider that.

MR. WELLS:      Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with the amendment as my hon. and learned friend from St. John's West has indicated, except that I am concerned about the fact that, perhaps, it does not go far enough.

The hon. President of the Council, Minister of Justice, indicated what is left would be "may prescribe the information to be contained in any prospectus." Of course, frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the word 'may' should be changed to 'shall' prescribe, because, as most hon. members know, prospectus is filed - a company files a prospectus generally as the basis for floating a bond issue. What it proposes to do with

a sale of preferred stock, something of this nature, and the members of the general public rely on this prospectus, when they assess, whether or not they should invest in that particular venture.

Now I do not know whether or not the Lieutenant-Governor in Council has, in fact, enacted regulations, because the permissive authority is there for them to do so. They are permitted to do so, but not compelled to do so. But this is sufficiently important, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps we have not run into it seriously in this Province yet, but the day is going to come, when we, in this Province, will be more like they are in the province of Ontario where the filing of a prospectus for the raising of funds by means of a bond issue or the sale of preferred stock will be a common, every day occurrence, and for the protection, particularly, of the small investor who is not well-informed and goes to an agent and is prepared to buy some common stock or invest in certain bonds. That small investor needs some kind of protection. I know of one or two instances where certain preferred stock was sold in a corporation in this Province, under conditions that I do not think any person, if they really had full information, would have invested in in the first instance.

Now, if there had been regulations requiring full and total disclosure in the prospectus before such shares were issued, then it may well have been a different thing, and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think that the word 'may' should probably be substituted for the word 'shall' because..

AN HON. MEMBER:    It should be the other way around.

MR. WELLS:    The word 'shall' should be substituted for the existing word 'may' because one of our primary functions here, as well as to administer the ordinary affairs of Government, is to ensure that the average citizen of this Province gets the maximum protection where he has not the ability generally to protect himself, I think we have a function to fulfill here and we are not doing it well while that word 'may' is there and while no regulations exist.

Perhaps the hon. Minister of Justice might now even be inclined to suggest the insertion of the word 'shall.' I would do it with his recommendation, although I agree that it would be a bit unusual to do it at this stage, but some consideration should most certainly be given to that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EARLE:    When the hon. minister answers, for the information of the House, I wonder if he could inform us, if it is absolutely essential that a company starting business issue a prospectus? Is it mandatory, if the company is going public, if all of its capital is not subscribed by private individuals, but they are looking to the public for money - is there a compulsion within the Companies Act that they must issue a prospectus?

MR. CURTIS:    Replying, Mr. Speaker, to the last question first, I understand that it is necessary before any company issues any shares for sale that it clear the registrar of companies and so far the registrar has been very careful in trying to protect the public along the lines that have been suggested here.

Now the reason, I believe, that this changed is asked is so that the Government can make regulations without having to fix the form. In other words, I do not think, there would be any hesitation on the part of the Governor-in-Council in making these regulations providing they do not have to fix the form, so I think that that is a matter which can stand for the present, although, I will discuss the matter with my officials and if they feel that 'shall' might replace 'may', we can discuss it in committee. I really think, at the moment, the word 'may' is all right and that the only reason that this section has not been invoked is because of the use of the word 'form' and the object of this legislation is to take that word out.

Now with regard to what my hon. friends has said about companies, he

has approached that has been worrying the Department of Justice both since I became Attorney-General back in 1949 and prior. When I came into office, we found stacks and stacks of draft Companies' Acts prepared by the judges, and I believe the Law Society turned them down.

Then we have had other drafts made, and they have been submitted, I believe, to the Law Society, and we could get no replies from them. The trouble is, Mr. Speaker, as you, yourself, know, the Companies Act is so long and so full of information that it is almost impossible to get anyone who will take the time to go through it and give it the consideration that it deserves. We have been watching very closely what has been happening in the rest of Canada, and we have been watching, particularly, the uniformity of legislation committee. They have had a committee working on the Companies Act for years and that company is not yet in a position to report. Just as soon as we can get a guide and I do think that the Companies Act ought to be an uniform Act. We ought to have <sup>practically</sup> the same Act in every province, so that the people in the various provinces will know just where they stand in relation to companies and, therefore, I suggest that we just wait and see what the uniformity of legislation committee can come up with. I know we have had delegates going year after year, after year to meetings in Ottawa and in Toronto at all of which meetings the Companies Act was considered.

It is not the kind of legislation which I would like to leave in the hands of a commission, as my hon. friend has said, and I think we can safely wait and be guided by the uniformity of legislation, which as my hon. friends know, is a committee appointed by the Law Society. Indeed, I am pretty sure. I speak from memory. I am pretty sure that there is a special committee dealing with the Companies Act and just as soon as they report, if I am still in office, I will be happy to bring in that Bill.

On motion a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Companies Act", 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 Summary Jurisdiction Act." (Bill no. 29).

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of this Bill. Those who are lawyers in the House, will recognize that this is a Bill which deals with enquiries to be conducted by magistrates, when death occurs as a result of violence, misadventure, negligence, misconduct or malpractice; by unfair means during pregnancy and suddenly and unexpectedly from disease or sickness not treated by a medical practitioner, in prison; or having apparently committed suicide.

Now in the past, originally, all these deaths were the subject of magisterial enquiry, but we found, Mr. Speaker, that in many

MR. CURTIS: In many cases it seemed unnecessary to have a medical magisterial enquiry, particularly when subsequent to the death there is a medical certificate saying that death took place in normal circumstances, or, where the director of public prosecutions is of the opinion that an enquiry into such a death is not necessary.

There is an appeal and in all cases the Attorney General may at his discretion at any time order a magisterial enquiry into any case. If the magistrate is called upon to conduct an enquiry he can call witnesses having all the powers of a commissioner under the Public Enquiries Act.

There is a new feature here, that the enquiry if the magistrate so desires and orders, can be conducted in private. The result of every magisterial enquiry must be submitted to the Attorney General stating in particular the opinion of the magistrate as to the cause of death.

There is a new element here, and that is a proviso whereby a magistrate conducting an enquiry need not bring before him witnesses who are outside his jurisdiction, but may request another magistrate to take the evidence of any such person. That will facilitate the magistrates and expedite enquiries. I think that will prove a very valuable addition to the law.

Lastly the Act deals with statutes which provide offences but does not prescribe a penalty. I do not know expressly any such Acts, but I understand it is quite likely that there are offences, created by statute, for which no punishment is fixed. Therefore, it is proposed to put in an omnibus clause saying that in any such case, the fine shall not exceed \$500., and the term of imprisonment shall not exceed six months. It is just a general clause showing that in any case where, through misadventure or through accident, no punishment has been outlined, the magistrate has jurisdiction to this extent.

I think this Bill will commend itself to the House and I move second reading.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of matters in the first part of the Bill that we can deal with when we come to committee stage, but on principle the last, the second last clause, clause (4) of the Bill proposes a new section 123A



of the Act that the hon. minister just mentioned before he sat down. It is a catch-all provision, a bathtub provision or whatever else you want to call it that provides a general penalty for a breach of any provincial statute where no other specific penalty exists.

I would suggest, and perhaps between now and committee stage the hon. minister can consider this, that the penalties provided there are much too severe for that kind of a provision. The penalty provided is upon conviction to a fine not exceeding \$500., which means the magistrate in his discretion could go up to \$500., or in default to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months. Now, if there were second or third offences, and I doubt if you can in this Bill, maybe that could be justified for a third offence or a second offence, but not in a first offence, because, this is the kind of section where a person, even though it requires willfulness, willfully doing anything that is a breach of a statute. You do not have to be willfully breaching a statute, all that has to be proven is that you willfully do something, so if you do it with the will to do it, then you fall within the provisions of this proposed section. If by willfully doing anything that such provision forbids, or by willfully omitting to do anything that such provision requires to be done. Now if the penalty is going to be that severe, the willfulness should be directed toward the offending a particular Act, which the persons knows.

For example, I may not know, and may have no means of knowing although everybody is presumed to know the law, that it is an offence to walk down the steps of the Confederation Building after twelve o'clock at night. There is no doubt about my willfulness in walking down the steps. I say quite clearly "I intend to walk down the steps, but I certainly have no intention of breaching the law." The willfulness is directed at the wrong thing. If the penalty is going to be this severe, at least the willfulness should be directed towards the willfully offending a provincial statute, not willfully doing the act, doing the physical act which constitutes the offence. I hope I am making the difference clear.

In any event, with this kind of a catch-all provision, I feel very strongly Mr. Speaker, that the penalty proposed is much too severe. It

should probably be a fine not exceeding \$100. and imprisonment not exceeding thirty days. Anything that is serious enough to warrant this kind of punishment is usually and almost without exception, <sup>or</sup> will be provided for specifically, as a specific offence.

In hundreds perhaps, of instances there are specific offences spelled out with punishments provided, where the punishment is a fifty dollar fine or ten days in jail, or something of this nature. This kind of a catch-all phrase, that can trap a person accidentally, who has no real intention to break the law and allow a magistrate to impose that kind of penalty is much too severe. I agree that you need catch-all phrases, but I think the willfulness should be directed towards willfully offending the provisions of any statute. Just doing the act should not be enough. As it now stands in this wording, all that is required is that you do the physical act, whether there is any intention to breach the statute or not. That is enough to bring on a conviction and that would result in this rather severe penalty. I would ask the minister before committee stage to consider these two things. The direction of the willfulness and the extent of the penalty.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the magisterial enquiry into a death is <sup>a</sup>very useful device. It replaces the coroner. In other Provinces they have the system of the coroner conducting these investigations. In this Province the magistrate in the area conducts an enquiry into the death where a person dies from violence or misadventure, or by unfair means whatever that means, Mr. Speaker. It is a very useful thing. Just several comments. In section (2) of the Bill, it says " whenever any person dies as a result of violence, misadventure, or negligence." What I want to know Mr. Speaker, is how you know if it is negligence before the magisterial enquiry has been held? I would have thought that that would have been, that that should be possible negligence or some wording like that, because you cannot tell it is negligence until there has been an enquiry.

Misconduct; how can you tell before hand if the death was caused by misconduct or malpractice? That assumes that somebody has been guilty of an offence. I am not sure what a person dying by unfair means is. Any death

is unfair for the person who is dying. What is a death by unfair means? If I am run into by a car, as far as I am concerned that is unfair if I expire. No matter by what ever process I go, it will be kicking and struggling not to go unless things are pretty sad for me, all of which will be pretty unfair. I wonder, unless that is some legal term of art brought up by unfair means means.

The next section will never be applicable to me Mr. Speaker. I do not think it will be during pregnancy, but the "D" suddenly and unexpectedly might, if the campaign gets wild enough. Quite seriously, I do not know if the wording there might be changed now. In the same section Mr. Speaker, I wonder, under sub-section (2), of the new section (166), the director of public prosecutions can direct a magistrate, or notify him that an enquiry into a death is not necessary. I think it should be made clear that even if the director of public prosecutions does notify the magistrate, he can still go ahead with an enquiry. The magistrate can if he wishes. I wonder if the minister might consider adding that section in committee, the same as is down in the next section. But he may in his discretion hold an enquiry just to make it clear, that, although the director of public prosecutions might tell him in his opinion he does not think he needs to hold an enquiry, if the magistrate wants to he can go ahead.

MR. CURTIS: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, it seems to be impliable. In the next sub-section they go ahead to say that a magistrate need not, but he may in his discretion hold an enquiry in sub-section (3). I think it would be better if that was written in there.

The other thing is Mr. Speaker, under sub-section (6). An enquiry conducted under this section may, in the discretion of the magistrate or justice conducting it, be held in private. Any persons other than those required to be present by law, may be excluded from the place where the enquiry is held. Witnesses may be kept separate and apart from each other, or otherwise prevented from communicating with each other until they have been examined. I am not sure what the procedure is now Mr. Speaker, not having practiced for three or

four years, but

MR. CURTIS: That is pretty much the same

MR. CROSBIE: That is pretty much the same. If a person wants his lawyer present at one of these enquiries, it is permissible today is it not?

AN HON. MEMBER: Any lawyer can go in

MR. CROSBIE: Well I wonder, you see, reading the section whether that is so. "Any persons other than those required to be present by law." You see that does not apply to lawyers.

MR. WELLS: Required or entitled

MR. CROSBIE: I think it should be required or permitted to be present by law. The lawyer is not required to be present by law. He may appear, so I wonder if the minister would consider that. Should those words be added? If a person is being examined, they should be entitled to have their lawyer there. So if the word or "permitted."

MR. CURTIS: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Well you might check anyway, if you do not mind Mr. Minister, just to see. The other thing is, under sub-section (7), the magistrate is to send a report to the Attorney General. I think it is the case now, that the dependents of a deceased person or a widow or a husband can obtain a copy of the report now. Are there cases where they are not given a copy of the report, or is it an invariable rule that the next of kin of a deceased person, where there has been a magisterial enquiry, are they always given a report if they request one?

MR. CURTIS: Only if they ask for one

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, but if they ask as far as the minister knows it is always the practice to give them a copy of it is it?

MR. CURTIS: If they request it.

MR. CROSBIE: If they request it. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of the amendment, and I think that our system of magisterial enquiries into deaths caused through misadventure or violence is a very good one. It is an efficient one, and well the last section (4), has been covered by the hon. member for Humber East, he was very strong on the willful business and I certainly think he

is right of course, having listened with great care and attention. With those comments Mr. Speaker, the minister might consider, I think it is a good piece of legislation, and a very good system.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, just in reply to my hon. friends, I think the first speaker went a little bit to-wing in talking about the \$500. fine and the six months imprisonment. That might represent an actual fine of two dollars and half of the imprisonment. The whole object of the section could be as well covered if it just said " shall be punished by fine and imprisonment," but we have to put some maximum in, or some magistrates would go haywire and perhaps soak my hon. friend his full sessional pay the next time he gets caught.

MR. WELLS: I still think that maximum is too high, is it not?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, I think it too high, it is a matter Mr. Speaker which I will have to consider between now and when it goes into committee. I would not have the House to think for a minute that because it says \$500., or because it says six months, that would represent the average punishment. It would be more likely ten dollars or two days, or perhaps twenty-five dollars or ten days. It is awfully hard to know just what the maximum should be because, you have to know the nature of the offence. It would be a mistake to have it too low because then, the section might just defeat itself. It would be almost as well to have no punishment at all as to have punishment that does not suit the crime, as they say in " make the punishment fit the crime." However, that is a matter we can consider, and I want to thank my hon. friends for their suggestions.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

On motion, second reading of a Bill, " An Act To Repeal The Trade Union Emergency Provisions Act, 1959." (No. 30).

HON. W.J.KEOUGH (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, this is one of the pieces of legislation forecast in the Speech from the Throne. The intent of this amendment is to repeal what I suppose I may call the I.W.A. legislation of 1959. There should be no need to go over the unhappy events that led up to the enactment of that legislation which was passed by the unanimous vote of



this House. These events are well known to most Newfoundlanders, and I feel certain to all members of the House.

Suffice it to say, that we came as close to anarchy as possible without actually having it. It has gotten finally to be a matter of who is going to govern Newfoundland, the I.W.A., or the Government. Now all that is over with, an unhappy episode in our history. The legislation that was necessary at that time, has served its purpose and may safely be repealed.

When this Bill was being drafted, the draftsman gave it as his opinion that merely to repeal the Act could very well be interpreted as reviving the revoked certification. Since there is no intention to reinstate the certification of the two locals of the I.W.A. legislation, of 1959 decertified, the House will note that.....



note that an appropriate saving clause is incorporated in the proposed amendment. I move the second reading.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see this legislation brought before the House and I am sure all members in the House are. And it is not much point going back to the history of 1959 and the events that year were very sad ones in the history of this Province and to rehash and argue over whether the action taken was right or wrong would not serve any useful purpose now. But certainly it is time that the legislation that outlawed the International Woodworkers of America Local 254 & 255 should now be taken off the Statute Books as a step in the right direction. So we are certainly going to support the legislation and I would only hope that it would never be necessary again Mr. Speaker, for any legislation in this Province to be inactive or used to revoke the certification of any union that is certified by, in accordance with the Labour Relations Act. I think that particularly a day now in the 1970's, that that kind of action would never be successful again is more likely to incite strife than to do away with it. I do not want to debate the merits or whether it had to be done in 1959 or not. I think in the future that collective bargaining is necessary whether the Government is involved or not involved and this is, the Government has agreed to that it is in the budget speech. There is going to be legislation coming before this House to deal with relations between government's employees so I would expect Mr. Speaker, that we will never again see legislation revoking or providing it for the revocation, decertification and there is other legislation passed by this House in 1967 that is going to be dealt with too in connection with hospital workers.

So, I think the best thing to say in connection with this Bill that the history of 1959 is something we read about in history. It was an interesting view taken of it by the author of a book a year or two ago "Biography of the Premier." A history of recent times, so that should be best left to history so we welcome the amendment and hope that this kind

of legislation would never come before the House again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the decision to ask the House to repeal this legislation is a decision of the Government, not of the Minister of Labour. The Minister of Labour concurred in it heartily, enthusiastically, warmly and without reservation. But like all ministers of the Crown in this Province all he did was concur in it and concur heartily in it. It is not the and legislation of any one minister it is the joint/unanimous desire of the Government as a Government to repeal this legislation. To ask the House to repeal it. And we do ask the House to repeal it and we do it unreservedly and we think we are doing the right thing.

We think it is now as right to ask the House to repeal it as it was right to ask the House to pass it in the first place. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the records show, that is to say the records of the House. What happened in the House in connection with this piece of legislation? When it was introduced into the House it received the unanimous support of the House. And not unanimous alone but ardent support, ardent support given unanimously, by every member of the House. And further Sir, the most ardent supporter of it was the Leader of the Opposition of that day, the present Senator Hollett. Who said, that just as in 1914 he had taken his gun in defence of King and Country against the Hun, so he would now just as gladly take his gun against what he now regarded as the foe, Newfoundland's greatest foe. He was the most vehement hon. member of the House, in this matter.

Sir, every clergymen virtually of all shades in Newfoundland, the heads of all the churches without exception and most of the clergy under those heads, every newspaper without exception. All, with few exceptions, all of the leading citizens of this Province favoured the action the House took at the request of the Government. The Government of course took the initiative and made the proposals to the House, as it was the government's duty to do. But those proposals were received ardently with complete unanimity. I would say that rarely in the history of this people was there such public unanimity,

such approval of anything as there was then of the attitude of the Government and the attitude of the House, toward that organization.

The amazing thing about it Mr. Speaker, as I look back is this: That that organization had followed the law scrupulously at every step. They had obeyed the law. They had carried it out, completely without deviation. They were most careful to carry out the law in every detail, every inch of the way. And when they went on strike, on New Year's Day, they were completely within their rights. What they did was completely lawful, and no man could dare raise his voice, against their decision and their conduct. It was a perfect compliance with the law of the land. Never was there a union that was more law-abiding than they were up to the day that the strike began, which I think was on the first day of January, up to that day.

But on that day, the day that the strike began, they announced that the 900 or whatever it was 900, or 800 or 1100 men, members of the Union, who were in the camps, were to remain there, on strike, but they were to remain there. They were to make use of the company's camps, company's property, company's stoves, eat the company's food, make use of the company's trucks, station wagons or whatever property there was belonging to the companies, up in the bush, they were to use these as though they owned them. Which of course was highly unlawful. Then in addition to that they took possession of the company's roads, private roads, owned privately by private companies, the woods roads, the roads that led from the Queen's Highway up to the camps. They took possession of those roads, usually at the point where the road left the highway. And they threw picket lines, in force, unlawfully, across them and would allow no one even the company to use them. They occupied those vantage points right along throughout the whole period of the strike.

Then in addition to that, taking control over private roads, they took control over the Queen's Highway and stopped trucks and sent them

back, stripped the trucks, threw everything off, truckloads of pulpwood, and turned the drivers back. It was at that point that the Minister of Justice, my present colleague, the present Minister of Justice, wrote and had printed and circulated stern warning; that merely because you are on strike you had no right, you gained no right that you did not have before, to stop other citizens from using the Queen's Highway. Merely being on strike did not give you the right to block the Queen's Highway and stop other citizens in the peaceful pursuit of their ordinary every day activities and the exercise of their basic rights. You had no right, merely by virtue of the fact that you were on strike, to interfere with the rights of others. This was printed and circulated widely and laughed at just as widely.

So from the moment it began to the moment it ended, in death, it was violent, it was unlawful. If they had won they would have become the government of this Province. And by that I do not mean that they would have occupied the Chamber and appointed ministers of the Crown. They would have been the Government of Newfoundland. They would have been more powerful than the Government. There is room in any country or part of the country for one government only. They would have been that government. It was a struggle to the death that ended in death, death of a fine man. Yet Sir, while everything I just said is true, this too is true, that the men themselves were ordinary Newfoundlanders, decent Newfoundlanders, decent, ordinarily good, decent law-abiding Newfoundlanders. And in that strike they I think, absolutely genuinely and absolutely sincerely, these men considered themselves to be engaged in a great cause. As much as any men ever thought themselves to be engaged in a great purpose and a great cause, a noble cause, they thought they were. They sincerely believed they had the right to break the law, ignore the law, flout it, sneer at it, despise it. Because the greatness of their cause, the greatness of the human rights they stood for, superseded all silly little things like

laws and governments and companies, and priests and parsons and clergymen, and churches.

They had a cause greater than all that. They firmly believed it. They believed it with, I think, utter simplicity and absolute sincerity. And so you had two things happening simultaneously. You had clever hard-faced, relentless men of superb training and magnificent ability, leading. Never in Newfoundland was a cause led, a cause of that kind, led by men of such superb experience and ability, with such magnificent training as many of those leaders had received. And they did a perfectly magnificent job of organization. There was never anything like it in Newfoundland. No political party has ever organized as they organized. No political party has ever thrown up men with the dedication and devotion that they had and the ability to organize and to lead that they showed. It was incomparable in Newfoundland. That you had on the one hand and on the other God-fearing, many of them quite religious Newfoundlanders, and many of them, I must say, of a type of religion that always has appealed to me, of an evangelical type of religion. I am built that way. We are all built differently. I am built in the way that the evangelical type of religion appeals to me. It is not the only kind that appeals to me. But it appeals to me in a special way and many of those in the IWA were that same kind of people.

There they were, decent men, family men, some of them, most of them, were young men, most of them were young men with their eyes shining with the glory of it, literally, quite literally. I will never forget a meeting I held in Deer Lake when there were so many in the hall that I had to climb in through a window to get on to the stage. There was no human way to get in. and get up to the platform unless they had lifted me and passed me over their heads up to the platform that way. So I got in through a window and got up on that stage and I faced that audience. Ninety per cent of them <sup>were</sup> young men and their eyes shone with the glory there that night.

There was one man who stood there and just <sup>with</sup> a wave of his finger, up, down, he controlled them as a great orchestra leader would control an orchestra. And he was a very prominent officer of that union.

It had all the fire of the confederate movement and more. And most of them were confederates. Most of them were men who had fought with me in the confederate cause and voted for confederation with the same kind of spirit they had in that strike. Messianic fervour a veritable divine afflatus - an evangelical enthusiasm that some of us have seen in certain types of meetings in Newfoundland, more especially in years gone by than in the present time.

It was nothing less than a social upheaval. And in many ways it is a pity it did not win. It is fortunate that it lost, fortunate for Newfoundland. It had to lose. But it was a tragedy that it had to lose. It was a tragedy. Well, the repeal of the Bill which my hon. colleague has asked the House to do, to give, is right, it is time to repeal it, but it was right to pass it when it was passed. It has served its purpose, it might have been repealed three or four or five years ago, I think, with almost as much safety as today. The men in thousands abandoned that union and joined another. But that other was a makeshift



MR. SMALLWOOD: But that other was a make-shift, it was led by the hon. member for Trinity North, who spoke here on Opening Day, who has been in hospital most of the time since then. It was led by him, but it was a make-shift. There could not be a vacuum, there had to be an organization. The present Mayor of St. John's accompanied the hon. member for Trinity North, and accompanied him and stayed with him in the organizing the formation of that substitute union.

AN HON. MEMBER: "Take up your axe and follow Max".

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, "take up your axe and follow Max". And what was the rest of it, how does the rest of it go? The rest of it is not to be quoted in polite company. By secret Ballot the members decided to affiliate with one of the great powerful international unions of North American, the carpenters, with a million members, who were anxious to have them, they decided by secret ballot to join them and they have been with them ever since. And my understanding is that the carpenters have done very well for them. They are powerful, they are tough, but they are honourable, like the steel workers, I understand that the steel workers are <sup>a</sup> wonderfully tough union, tough bargainers, but they keep their word. They are honourable and when they give their word, you can depend on it, and that the carpenters are much the same. And that they represent the interest of the loggers in dealing with the paper companies, that they represent them efficiently, that they get good results. And, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it may be the case, it just may be the case that their task in representing the loggers has been made a bit easier for them by that strike. Perhaps the companies realize that it is far better for them to have a tough union like the carpenters represent the loggers, tough but honourable, and an organization whose word is its bond, than to run the risk of the men becoming disillusioned with the carpenters and perhaps lusting after the other. May be, may be that has been what one of the results, although there has been a complete revolution, there were 20,000 men in Newfoundland who made part of their living in the pulp wood logging industry. Twenty thousand men, twenty thousand. By the time the I.W.A.

MR. SMALLWOOD: got the upper hand of the membership, the number of loggers in Newfoundland was down to perhaps 12,000 men. Today it is half of 12,000, it is 6,000. Fourteen thousand jobs have disappeared in the logging industry. The men who are in the logging industry now are relatively speaking full-time woods workers, full-time relatively speaking. They work nine months, ten months a year, may be eleven months a year, some nine, some ten, some eleven, may be some even the best part of twelve months a year. It is relatively speaking a full time job now. The pay now is a far different story from what it used to be, it is a relatively, relatively speaking, a high-paid job. So today you got 6,000 relatively high-paid men producing half as much more pulp wood as 20,000 produced, and getting more money in the aggregate than the 20,000 got, and I would say that the companies are better able to pay more money to get as half as much more wood produced as they paid to get the former amount with the former number of men. The probability is exactly that.

I hope I have not said anything that arouses any passion or hatred in the breast of any hon. member. It is ten or eleven years ago now, Passions ran pretty fierce at that time, pretty fierce indeed. There has never been anything like it since in Newfoundland. The story of the Anglican priest who was beloved and who turned up on a Sunday morning in a place that he had to visit to hold service not, well, yes there were two persons who went to church that Sunday morning, two, two young girls. He was boycotted completely by the entire settlement except for two young girls. There is the case of the school teacher who left and travelled a hundred miles to get to the Trans-Canada or what would have been the Trans-Canada Highway, if there had been a Trans-Canada Highway, he travelled a hundred miles to get to the point and then he travelled another two hundred miles or one hundred and fifty miles, a school principal to do picket duty, he was not a logger at all, but it was a great cause in his heart, in his mind he thought, he was almost like one of the early christians fighting heroes. I do not know who the hero was, may be I was. But, he was a man of great ideals.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

When he send word to the priest, a Roman Catholic priest in this instance, he send word to the priest; "Off on picket duty will be back in a week or two," just abandoned the school to go out and do picket duty.

Since then I have been among young men who were pickets in that strike and held meetings. I was in Bay of Islands, I held meetings last year among men and when I got elected in Humber West I held meetings and there I met scores of men who had been on the picket line, and I had some hot meetings. I believe they voted for me and certainly I will be proud always, as long as I live. I will be proud of this fact. Soon after that strike was over there was a general election and the candidates of the party that I led won Humber East and won Humber West and won the whole West Coast, and won Green Bay and won the whole I.W.A. stronghold, my hon. friend the Minister of Education went down into White Bay South where he was all but mobbed in places, and yet those places have all but mobbed him, voted overwhelming for him. I was very proud of that, that in the great I.W.A. stronghold we were given a mandate by the people, and yet let it never be forgotten the words that I am uttering will appear in Hansard and one day they will be read. Let it never be forgotten that there was an up-welling of idealism and ardent enthusiasm among several thousands young men especially who were as convinced that they were fighting for a noble cause as ever the crusaders were to rescue the Holy Land from the hands of the Infidel, just as believing as that. And I always considered it to be one of the greatest tragedies that ever happened, they were so misled. If that union had not broken the Law and challenged the Government, if the Government had not been completely obliged to accept that challenge and to defeat them, if that had not been produced, that situation, they probably would have won their strike, and then they would have deserved to be the powerful body that they would have become. As I said at the time, truly they would be the tutor of the Trade Union Movement. Truly they would be Newfoundland's Trade Union University. Truly they would be the one labour organization up to whom

MR. SMALLWOOD: every union would look with respect, to whom every union would go for advice, for guidance, for inspiration, they would have been a wonderfully powerful body and they would have deserved to be, if they had been able to do it lawfully. But once they threw the gauntlet down to the Government, there could be one Government, and we were it, we had to win and we did. But now I think we do right to repeal this legislation.

MR. S.A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak on this Bill, but I could not let the opportunity pass after hearing the hon. the Premier recount the events the events that led up to the introduction of this Bill. I think it is ancient history, that I was one of the citizens of Newfoundland at that time who was pro I.W.A. Funny how things develop in life, Mr. Speaker, that I should be a member of the Government, when the Bill is being repealed. But I have a confession to make to the hon. the Premier, I do not think I have ever told him this before, he mentioned the election that followed the controversy. I think the election was fought on Term 29, and there was a protest party emerged as a direct result of the Labour strike in the Province at that time, and it was called the N.D.P. Mr. Speaker, and I have to confess that I, that N.D.P. party ...

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not N.D.P.

MR. NEARY: Yes, it was, the N.D.P. party, Mr. Speaker, was my godchild.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Was Jim Higgins in that?

MR. NEARY: No, N.D.P. was called the "Newfoundland Democratic Party". Now the reason it was called the "Newfoundland Democratic Party", Mr. Speaker was this, the hon. Premier will recall that the C.C.F, and the Canadian Labour Congress were holding discussions to merge and to form a new labour party in Canada ...

MR. SMALLWOOD:

MR. NEARY: the equivalent of the Labour party in Great Britain. And we were aware of this and we had the inside information on what the name of the new party would be once agreement was reached between the C.C.F and

MR. NEARY: the Canadian Labour Congress, we knew that they were going to call it, the New Democratic Party. So that the initial, if we called our party the Newfoundland Democratic Party, the initials would be the same, and then the organization of Newfoundland would just fit in with the new labour party that was about to emerge in Canada. And I can tell you quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. the Premier will probably appreciate this, that that party was created or was my godchild created in a little coffee shop over on Campbell Avenue, and anybody that likes to research the morgue of the Evening Telegram will find the story right on the front page in big black bold print, where I had made the statement that labour was going to form a protest party in Newfoundland, and that is how the Newfoundland Democratic Party began.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Perhaps the hon. gentleman would allow me to ask him, if he remembers when he came with the Federation of Labour in a delegation to call on me in my office; on that whole I.W.A. dispute?

MR. NEARY: Indeed I do, Mr. Speaker, and we went and we asked the Government to intervene in the dispute, there is no question about that. Although I have no regrets about the position that I took at that time there is something about that meeting that I did not like, not as far as the Government was concerned, but as far as the representatives of the Trade Union Movement who were present at that meeting, and some of them are still active in labour in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, and I would not want to mention their names, but they decided following the meeting that they would keep the meeting quite, and I always felt that that was a mistake. But, however, as I say I have no regrets for the part that I played in it, and I am extremely pleased to see that the act is going to be repealed.

But, Mr. Speaker, it taught me a great lesson in politics, you know they say that you have to learn in this life from the schools hard knocks, but the Premier was talking about the hon. Minister of Education who went



MR. NEARY: down and fought the election in Green Bay, well I was an N.D.P. candidate, Newfoundland Democratic Party candidate on Bell Island and as the hon. members of the House may recall when Bell Island was in its "hay day" we were ninety-five percent organized labour, and I had a committee on Bell Island at that time, Mr. Speaker, that would be the envy of any candidate that ever ran in an election on Bell Island. The Steel Workers gave me the Union Hall free of charge, they made up banners and billboards and we had a committee, well the Union Hall was longer than this Chamber, there is an hon. gentleman sitting outside the door of this Chamber who will recall the whole affair because he was very active in the United Steel Workers of American Local 4121 on Bell Island, standing right outside the door, Mr. Speaker, he will recall it, because he was one of my ardent supporters.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that why he is here now?

MR. NEARY: You know I might say Mr. Speaker, I started to say maybe I am being a little nostalgic, Mr. Speaker, but I fear to say that life sometimes is funny you know, but the gentleman that I just referred to sitting outside the door was very active in the Labour Movement on Bell Island and extremely intensely interested in politics. I would not be<sup>a</sup>bit surprised that the gentleman led a wildcat strike or two, if he did not lead them, I did. But here he winds up here sitting outside the door tonight listening to me recounting this election. But anyway, we had to put tables the full length of that Union Hall, I had such a committee, not only of Trade Union people Mr. Speaker, but there were some small business men there, there were all kinds of volunteers, there were a few school teachers there, and there was no way in this world, in my mind, that I could lose that election. No way.

Now the candidates at the time were Mr. Richard Greene, who had since been admitted to the Bar, and Colonel O'Driscoll who was carrying the Liberal banner, and being a native born Bell Islander, organized labour on my side, schools teachers and small businesses, I thought I had it made, Mr. Speaker, and we used to hold meetings, committee meetings and tables the full



MR. NEARY: length of that hall with people seated on either side, they were enthusiastic, they were campaigning, but anyway, Mr. Speaker, when the polls closed at

MR. NEARY:    When the polls closed at 8:00 p.m. on polling day, we had arranged to go down to the union hall with a radio, because there was no television. Was there television? No, I do not think there was a television.

AN. HON. MEMBER:    Yes, there was.

MR. NEARY:    There was. Well anyway we decided to go down with a radio down to the union hall to hear the count and all the committee was to meet there early in the evening.

MR. SMALLWOOD:    Went down to cheer.

MR. NEARY:    I mean it was a foregone conclusion. We even had the refreshments there, Mr. Speaker, to celebrate the occasion, and when I went to the union hall.

MR. SMALLWOOD:    Did the union workers do that?

MR. NEARY:    When I went to the union hall - they did as a matter of fact - when I went to the union hall that evening, one man turned up. The polls had closed and we were sitting in the office he and I and I said, "what happened, where are all the, where is the committee." Well, we could not understand it. So we turned on the radio and because Bell Island is a confined community the first count that came in that night was from Bell Island and within half an hour, Mr. Speaker, I discovered why the committee had not turned up at the union hall. I still do not know what happened, but anyway it taught me a great lesson in politics.

MR. SMALLWOOD:    What happened?

MR. NEARY:    What did happen, Mr. Speaker, was rather tragic. I think I probably got almost 400 votes in that election, but what I did, I defeated the Liberal candidate and that was the last thing in the world I wanted to do, Mr. Speaker. If I could not make it myself, I would have preferred to see the Liberal get elected. I certainly did not want a Tory to get elected, but the votes that I took, I believe, I took them away from the Liberal candidate and he was defeated and a Tory got elected. I will never forgive myself

for that. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the Bill, some day, I think, I might sit down and write a book about that whole controversy, the I.W.A. situation in Newfoundland. But before I take my seat, Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. Premier will agree with me. He was high in his praise of the organizers of the I.W.A. Now I knew the organizers of the I.W.A. As a matter of fact, I was in Grand Falls the evening that the result of the strike ballot was announced, and I was a great personal friend of H. Landon Ladd, and I want to say this about Mr. Ladd. I think the hon. Premier will agree with me. Outside of the hon. Premier himself, I have never met a more able man. He was a great debater. He was a thorough gentleman. He was the one, Mr. Speaker, to clean the communists out of the I.W.A. in British Columbia, as the Premier will probably recall, and he was a fine man. I am inclined to agree with the hon. the Premier, that it was rather tragic that the thing worked out the way that it did.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a word of support to this Bill, and to say that in our opinion, Sir, we welcome the change of attitude by the Government towards labour. We feel, however, that it is long overdue. Unlike the last two speakers, I am not going to recall too many instances that took place so many years ago, but I do recall the strike and followed it. I was amazed to find my friend, my hon. friend from Bell Island, say that the last thing in the world he wanted to see get elected in that election was a Tory, because I think he left out the fact that he, too, was a Tory at one time..

MR. NEARY: Never a Tory.

MR. HICKEY: Never a Tory? He should correct an awful lot of people - there are a lot of people under that misunderstanding according to that. However, Mr. Speaker, as I have said it is certainly a wonderful sign to see Government change its mind and change its attitude towards labour. I recall that it was

somewhere around the same time that the axe was raised over the head of the Teamsters' Union or thereabouts. I may not be correct on my timing but if it was not the same time, it was close to it, and it certainly is good to see that things have changed.

Now, I suppose, I may be suspicious by nature and in commenting on the Teamsters' Union, I obviously raised a question as to whether or not the hatchet has been buried between Government and the Teamsters?  
As I recall it, they were<sup>as</sup> forceful against the Teamsters, as they were against the I.W.A. If one is to look over the financial arrangement of the linerboard mill, which we hope to see go into operation very soon, we will find that the Teamsters' Union have loaned Mr. Doyle the amount of something like \$5 million.

Now, may be I am bad-minded. I hope I am not. I was of the opinion that, somewhere along the line, there must have been some negotiations, may be a bargain made to improve the relations with labour in the Province and in return the union would support this worthwhile project. May be it is bad-mindedness out of me. I felt that it is worthy of mentioning, questioning, as I have said, irrespective of what it is, the repealing of this legislation does not come too soon. As I indicated, Sir, it is long overdue. I have much pleasure, at least, in supporting the Bill.

MR. MYRDEN: Mr. Speaker, before we carry on, I, too, would like to have a few words on this Bill. I am glad to see it repealed. Sir, at the time, I lived, I suppose, in one of the most active I.W.A. areas in Newfoundland, and it was a great tragedy, actually, because, we, having to live within the area knew exactly what these men were going through. For many months, actually, they lived on their strike pay of \$10 per month. Many of them with families, big families and, of course, I think it was one of the greatest tragedies that ever hit the St. Barbe coast. For many years, many years right up to this present time, I guess, may be it is a little bit different now, but

almost to a man, every man within the area there who had taken part in this strike was blacklisted by these paper companies. They could never get a chance and in many cases and have, in many cases, never been able to get a job back in the paper companies since. I remember also, too, that there was not only one death but there were four deaths. One night a big truck load of men coming back from a union meeting over in Deer Lake accidentally went through one of the ramps at Norris Point. There were three men drowned that night. It was a great tragedy in the whole area. I, myself, would never like to see it go through again. I agree with the Premier, because I think it had to be done at the time. Many of us were in agreement. We thought it was harsh, but I would say one thing that as far as I am concerned, I think that union has given the men working in the woods now much better conditions than they would ever get. I think he would agree with that, because right now today it is just like a palace compared too what it used to be.

Going into that other election, I think the hon. member from St. Barbe North will recall that one. It was a very ticklish affair down our way. As we went further north, the men in the northern end of it, I believe, at that time the district ran right from Wiltondale and Bonne Bay right into Big Brook. It was a long, long district, but it never had gotten down that far, the I.W.A. organizers, and I remember quite distinctly that, as he usually is when he runs an election, he will never give himself too much credit for what he has done down there. He was very scared in this one. I do not know if that was the time that my father-in-law, at the time, use to say, well, he did not know this fellow Chalker, but he remembered that he used to deliver hams to him, when he was on St. Clare's Avenue. I remember, I believe, at the same time that he did get him a boat called the "Western Star." It was skippered by a man who we found out later was very, very strong Tory, and as he went into each settlement, (Mr. Chalker was campaigning) he used to say - he would come out and he was quite pleased with this. The fellow from the boat use to go right behind him and cancel practically all of his votes, but at the time, he did come out with sixty-eight per cent, I believe, so he was

quite pleased. Yes, Sir, I am glad actually to see this Bill repealed, because I think it is time. It was a good one, and I think many of the people will be happy to see it. There is still strong feeling, as the Premier knows. He has met it in Cox's Cove and out around the bay. I do not think it is a strong I.W.A. feeling but they still feel very, very strong towards a strong union. I do not think, actually, that the one they have now is that strong, but I am hoping it will build. But like he says instead of it being 20,000 men, it is down to 4,000 to 5,000 now. I would like to say that I am glad to see that the minister has brought this Bill in. Thank you.

On Motion a Bill, "An Act To Repeal The Trade Union (Emergency Provisions) Act, 1959", 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 Minimum Wage Act." (Bill no 46).

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, this Bill encompasses a sort of tripartite amendment. In other words the Bill is designed to amend the Minimum Wage Act in three respects. In the first instance, it is proposed to amend the Minimum Wage Act to give the Minister of Labour discretionary authority to set rates for certain handicapped persons and to set minimum rates less than the regular minimum rates or even to exempt certain handicapped persons altogether from the regular minimum wage rates.

This amendment arose out of a recommendation of the Minimum Wage Board and the thinking behind the amendment is that unless provision is made whereby handicapped employees may be paid less than the minimum rates, they may very well find themselves in a situation where they cannot obtain work and thereby the opportunity to earn.

The second proposed amendment is this: at present minimum wage investigating officers do not have authority to interview employees on an



employer's premises. It is proposed to amend the Act to provide that an investigating officer may enter, at all reasonable times, upon the premises of an employer to whom an order made under the Act applies, to interview an employee to obtain relevant information and the third proposed amendment is this: at the moment prosecutions cannot be instituted for offenses occurring more than a year prior to the time a charge is laid.

Now it has been found that in some instances a year has not been a sufficiently long period of time for possible breaches of the Act to be reported, to be investigated and for charges to be laid. The result is that sometimes workers do not receive sums owing to them because of short payments in minimum wages due. It is hereby proposed that the Act be amended to provide that prosecution may henceforth be commenced within three years from the date on which an offense is alleged to have been committed. I move the second reading.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I do not have any quarrel with the amendments that the hon. minister is proposing in this legislation, but in connection with minimum wages generally, the minister made an announcement, I think, it was yesterday, new minimum wages levels for the Province in accordance with the provisions of this Minimum Wage Act, and I understood him to say and his statement says that; in future the minimum overtime rates of time and a-half, which now have to be paid if you work in excess of forty-eight hours a week, that this provision will in future apply to those who are employed in fish processing. I believe that is correct.

Now today, I believe or yesterday I heard on the radio another Government figure, the hon. the Premier and unless my ears were hearing wrong, on this radio broadcast which is well known, and the Premier speaks more there than he does in the House of Assembly - VOXM. The hon the Premier said that this was not going to apply, that the overtime provisions would not

apply to workers in fish processing or in the fish processing industry for sometime to come yet.

Now, if I heard correctly, there is a difference between what the hon. the Premier has been saying recently on the public airways than what the minister said in his statement yesterday. I think that it would be appreciated by all, if the minister could clarify this position, when he speaks to close this debate. Is it correct that from July 1st, which I think is the date that the minister has now given, the provisions of the Minimum Wage Act, the law that after forty-eight hours work a week, they must be paid time and a-half, that from July 1st on that provision is going to apply to workers employed in fish processing?

MR. SMALLWOOD: He may have heard me say fish plants and I daresay I said it, but I did not mean to say it. I was thinking and thought I was talking about farming. Overtime is not to be for time and a-half on farms and is to be paid in fish plants. May be in conversation I said fish plants meaning farming.

MR. CROSBIE: Well that explains it, Mr. Speaker. What the Premier did say was fish plants, but the Premier meant to refer to farming, so that clarifies that point and the time and a half then will apply to workers in the fish processing industry from July 1st and that is certainly a very necessary and a very welcome step forward and I think I heard the hon. the Premier say that the Government have studied the position of fish plants in the Province and that, in the Government's opinion, the fish processing industry could well afford now to have the minimum wage apply and this overtime rate of time and a-half after forty-eight hours could now apply to the fish processing industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the minister will be able to say as to what seems to me anyway, certainly, in principle and that is that the minimum wage should be the same for men and women who are doing the same type of work, carrying out the same kind of work - that the minimum wage

should be the same for both.

Now the Government have not adopted this policy. They have not. The minimum wage has been raised for both men and women, but men are now to be \$1.25 an hour and ladies are now to be \$1.00 an hour - a \$.25 difference. What do the Government base this on? Is it based on some economic reasons that this would cause trouble for certain industries in Newfoundland or certain businesses in Newfoundland or why is the discrimination still continuing? I think that the case for equal pay for men and women, doing a similar type and kind of work, is unanswerable and then I cannot see justification

MR. CROSBIE: I cannot see any justification for doing it unless there are some business or industries in Newfoundland that might be hard hit, or that the Government feels cannot stand it at the moment. If that is not the case, I think the minimum wage should be the same for both, and certainly the many women's groups in the Province feel the same way.

I have seen the human rights legislation referred to that the House has passed, which has not been proclaimed and this may be one of the main reasons why that legislation is not proclaimed because the Minimum Wage Act does discriminate in this Province against women. Not just in this Province, there are others too, but it does discriminate against women in this Province. Mr. Speaker, if the hon. minister could give us some, explain the Government's position with respect to that point when he replies I would appreciate it. I am sure that there are many women in Newfoundland who would appreciate it also. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, I agree with these changes in the legislation, and I do not know, I notice that the minimum wages in other Provinces, according to the Globe and Mail, the minimum wage in Quebec is one dollar and thirty-five cents, and Quebec has announced that the rate is going to go up in five cent stages to one dollar and fifty cents an hour in November of next year. The rate in Alberta is one dollar and forty cents and is going to climb to one dollar and fifty-five cents in October 1970. The minimum wage in Ontario for adults is one dollar and thirty cents in general industry, and one dollar and fifty-five cents in construction work. Newfoundland now is not, or is almost up to Ontario if this statement in the Globe and Mail is correct, for February 1970.

We are almost up to Ontario for adults, but Quebec will be going up to one dollar and fifty an hour, and Alberta to one dollar and fifty-five within the next year. I presume that our Government is going to review the situation and it is quite possible that the minimum wage will increase in Newfoundland too within the next year or two. I wonder if the minister would tell us how this matter is reviewed. Is there any kind of an economic review done to indicate when, or how much the minimum wage could go up at any particular time? Does the department have people to carry out that kind of

study? It would be helpful to know that. Otherwise Mr. Speaker, these are my only comments on this Bill. The Bill itself is all right, the amendments are all right.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, like the hon. member for St. John's West, I agree with most of what is in the Bill, but there is a matter on minimum wages that is creating a bit of a problem in the Province at the moment. In a sense, it is one of legal interpretation that applies generally to the regulations rather than to the Act itself. There is a flaw in the regulations, that has allowed the minimum wage investigators to use one standard for determining whether or not the minimum wage is paid or the proper minimum. In one instance say in where the wages are hourly, and where it is monthly he has to apply another standard which is a lesser standard. I am a bit reluctant to comment too extensively on it because, the matter is in a sense sub-judice at the moment. It is before the courts by way of appeal, and I do not want in any way to affect that.

I would ask the minister, and perhaps the best way to handle it is I asked the minister if he would agree to sit down with <sup>me</sup> privately on some occasion and I will point this out to him, and he can then bring the matter up with his colleagues. Because the matter is before the courts, I am a bit reluctant to speak extensively on it. It is a matter that, suffice it to say, that it does allow for discrimination. The minimum wage regulations are supposed to apply equally, whether the man is payed weekly, on a waekly salary, on an hourly rate, or a monthly rate or an annual salary or whatever. The regulations require all employers to keep a record of the time actually worked.

Now, if you are trying to calculate the, if an officer is attempting to determine whether or not an individual who is on a weekly salary is being paid the minimum wage, he has to take the total hours worked under forty-eight or forty-eight and under at one dollar and ten cents, or over forty-eight at one dollar sixty-five. Where he is paid on an hourly rate, the officer is taking a different measure and cannot but lead to discrimination. I did want to mention the matter now, because this is probably the proper place to do it when this Bill is up for consideration. But, rather than go into it extensively I

would ask the minister if he would agree to sit down with me privately and I can go into it and explain the details to him.

MR. N. NOEL: There is just one thing I would like to ask, and that is that these investigators who go around investigating, do they have any kind of a letter or any authorization or anything to show? I had the unfortunate case of an investigating officer going in and demanding the books and the shopkeeper got his back up and said, "well let me see your authority," and the officer had no authority to show him so he would not show him the books, so the officer left and came back with the authority and then he let him see the books. Then of course the chap got himself a summons for obstructing the officer and got himself fined.

I do feel that when these officers go in from the minimum wage board, into a small private business someplace, that they should have at least a letter to say, or something to show that they are from the Minimum Wage Board, and that they have authority to do this, because, the ordinary citizen thinks that people should have search warrants or something. Here you have a chap busy packing up apples in a box or something and somebody comes in and says, "I want to look at your books." It is a natural thing for the citizen to say, "well show me something." When the chap has nothing to show it can lead to trouble. I think these officers should have something, a letter or something to show that they are an officer doing this particular job. That is one thing.

The other thing that always struck me is, why would there not be an exemption for employees who are covered by a certified bargaining agent? Why should employers who have unions, who are union shops, why should union shops have to be bothered with the minimum wage Act at all when they have a certified bargaining agent acting for them?

MR. STRICKLAND: Mr. Speaker, just one word if I may. I am greatly concerned about this, I agree entirely that fish plant workers, employees, are entitled to all the money that they can get. But, I hate like the dickens to see this additional cost passed back to the fishermen and this is what I am afraid is going to happen.



MR. BARBOUR: Mr. Speaker, I covered this I think this afternoon in my Budget Speech, but I am certainly in support of this new wage Act, and the raise of fifteen cents per hour, but what impresses me more than anything else is the fact that fishermen, or let me say employees working in the fish plants, will receive time and a-half after they have worked forty-eight hours. To me, that is only just and fair and I think this has long been overlooked in the past and I am glad now that the Minister of Labour and the Government have decided to give this time and a-half rate.

I am a little bit disappointed just the same. I would liked to have seen females get the same rate as males, because, if you were to visit the fish plants, like I do in my district, and there are three of them, you will find that the females do practically the same work in the processing of the fish as the males do. I suppose a man is a man, even if he is in a bottle. Maybe that is the reason why he is getting a little more than the female would get. I hope the day will come when it will be equal for both male and female. I certainly support it.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, first of all the matter raised by the member for St. John's West, with regard to overtime in fish processing. It has been clarified by the Premier, he was thinking in terms of farming instead of fish processing. Farming which has up until now been exempt from all minimum wages will be made, the minimum wages will be applicable to farming, but the overtime provisions will not be.

The question raised by the same hon. member as to why the minimum wage, why there is still that discrepancy reserved between the minimum wage between men and women. All I can say in that regard is this; nothing will please the Government of Newfoundland more than to be able to equalize the minimum wage rate for both sexes. The discrimination still continues, and it is preserved in the present order because the necessary research work has not been done to determine what impact an equalized minimum wage for both sexes would have upon the economy of the Province. I do not have the necessary economic research staff in the Department of Labour to do that kind of research. As a matter of fact, I do not have enough staff to run a bullseye shop, let alone

a good department of Government. I have passed the question along to, and I have asked the economics branch or one particular member of the economics branch of the Department of Finance if he can, or if he will look into the matter and try and form some judgements, or some opinions on that matter which would give the Government some idea of what equalization of minimum wages for both sexes would have upon the economy.

He will do that and I may point out that the equalization of these rates for both sexes, if it is decided upon, will not have to wait until the House of Assembly meets next year, but can be done by Order in Council. It can be done by the Government by way of Order in Council. It is an area in which we feel we have to move quite carefully, particularly in these times of rather economic stringency in case we upset altogether too many apple carts.

With respect to the matter raised with me by the hon. member for Humber East, I think that in the next day or two<sup>if</sup> he and I were to get together with the director of minimum wages to discuss the matter he has raised, we may be able to satisfy him or we may come to a different conclusion, that might be implemented.

With regard to the point raised by the hon. member for St. John's North. The minimum wage officers who do travel the Province do carry with them an authorization from the department, indicating to employers that they have the right to investigate the minimum wages paid to employees, to require the production of books of accounts, and for the future of course we will have the additional authority to interview employees on the premises of the employer. At the moment I do not know by whom that authority is signed. It is signed by one of three persons. The director of minimum wages, the Deputy Minister of the department, or the Deputy Minister of the Department, for me.

Union shops who have unions who have collective agreements are not I should think particularly concerned about the minimum wages, because, I have no knowledge of any union negotiating a wages agreement in which the wages they have negotiated are less than the minimum wages.

The point made by the hon. member for Trinity South, as to the cost of the minimum wages being passed back to the fishermen. I find that difficult

to see how it could happen. The minimum wages of course are paid to the fish plant workers, and they will be required to receive them by law. The only way I can envision in which the cost will be passed back to the fishermen would be in reducing the price of fish.

MR. STRICKLAND: Sure, in the reduction of the price of fish. The fish pays for everything in the operation of the plant.

MR. KEOUGH: Well, it poses a problem, but I do not think that at this stage that the Government would be prepared to get into the business of controlling the price of fish for which the fish must be bought from the fishermen. However, again it is something to give some consideration to. I think that covers the points raised Mr. Speaker, and I move second reading.

On motion, Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

On motion, the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 p.m.