



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 56

5th Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

MONDAY, MAY 17, 1971

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. A. J. MURPHY: (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, before we go into the business of the House, I would like to rise on a matter of privilege. I feel it is a matter of personal privilege because I have the honour to represent the official Opposition. Statements made on an analysis yesterday by the hon. Minister of Community and Social Development, when he said that, through obstruction, the House could not bring in very important legislation. Now I do not think that this is absolutely right because during the past week or ten days the Leader of the House has not introduced one piece of legislation. It is a complete distortion of the actual facts. We are ready at any time, Sir, to consider whatever the Leader of the House brings in. I think this was a statement that was not in effect true.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Premier): If I may say a word to the point of privilege which I think perhaps the Leader of the Opposition did not intend to be a point of personal privilege. I would say that everything that has come before the House virtually has been brought by the Leader of the House. It is all Government business that has been brought before the House. The leader of the House may bring forward many, many individual bits of legislation or he may bring the estimates. The estimates are legislation. Everytime we pass this, it is passing legislation, so it is Government business. I do not think it can be said that the Leader of the House has not brought forward Government business. He has brought all kinds of it here up to our chins, up to our eyebrows, every day, has he not? I mean you do not draw a distinction between bills and estimates. Estimates have to be gathered up in one final bill in the end, Appropriation Bill, which the House is asked to pass. If it does, the Governor signs it and it is passed. Leading up to that there are thousands of details and when these are brought before the Committee

Mr. Smallwood.

of Supply and finally before the House that is legislation. It is legislation for the House.

MR. MURPHY: Why would the Leader of the House say that we will have legislation in the morning, estimates in the afternoon?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is all legislation. That is only a convenient - it is just like the difference between Prime Minister and Premier. They both mean exactly the same. Supply is legislation.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on that point of privilege, my point is that a misleading statement was made. The House has already dealt with a considerable amount of legislation. There has been no delay in dealing with it. The only reason that we have not dealt with legislation during the last two weeks is because the Government have not called legislation. They are now calling the estimates.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is legislation.

MR. CROSBIE: There has been no obstruction.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is legislation.

MR. CROSBIE: Well not as the public understands it. There has been no important legislation tabled in this House now, that is being obstructed in anyway except (by any one) except for the fact that the Government have not called it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may rise for just one point. It is with reference to a report in Saturday's edition of the "Daily News" where there is a statement attributed to me on page (1). It is completely incorrect, because I gather it had caused a lot of public controversy. I would like to correct it. The paper quotes me, Sir, as saying that the site for the new hospital at Carbonear had not yet been - as a matter of fact it says, "has now yet been chosen." I do not know what that means grammatically or if it means anything grammatically. But the clear inference

Mr. Roberts.

from this that has been drawn by many people, Your Honour, is that the site for the hospital has not yet been chosen. I have no recollection of saying that. Indeed my recollection from the notes I have and I listened to the tapes kept by the Hansard Office. It says quite clearly the site for the hospital has been chosen. Indeed, we have spent nearly \$100,000 in connection with that site. We looked at four separate sites. We chose one which is the site, I believe, near an old garage on Saddle Hill in Carbonear. I only rise on it, Your Honour, because apparently a number of people have read the newspaper (It gets wide circulation) and have concluded from it that the site had not been chosen. The site has been chosen, Sir. Perhaps the newspaper concerned can make a correction. There was some back talk in the Chamber when we were on that, Mr. Speaker. The plans are partially drawn.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. member for St. John's West said that I had turned the sod and I said that I had not. He corrected himself and said, my wife. I said, "right." That is not saying that we have not chosen. That is saying that we have chosen.

PRESENTING PETITIONS.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Petitions, did I hear Your Honour say, petitions?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am paying attention to various things that are happening. I have the honour to present a petition from residents in the Eastern part of the great Codroy, Great Codroy and the settlement of O'Regan's in the district of St. George's. I do this with great pleasure because it is from the district of St. George's, which was represented by my dear colleague and friend, the late William J. Keough, and because it comes, in part, from the settlement of O'Regan's which is the native home of one of the grandest ladies that ever lived on Newfoundland's soil. I refer to Mrs. Genieve Dolan, with whom I conducted correspondence for many years and met her for the first time in my life three or four years ago. Mrs. Genieve Dolan is a genius if ever there was one in the field of writing. She wrote me for many years, when I conducted my programme as barrel man. So anything from O'Regan's gets my instant

MR. SMALLWOOD.

attention. The petitioners, Your Honour, request to have included in the road paving programme for the Codroy Valley this year that portion of road leading in an easterly direction from Grand River Bridge through the eastern part of Great Codroy and through the settlement of O'Regan's, a distance of 4.3 miles. Now their reasons for this request are: That the medical doctor's clinic is located on this road; that they have some sixty licenced vehicles on that road; that seventy students are transported daily over the entire distance of that road; that they have one of the heaviest tourist pay loads from hunting and fishing in the whole of the Province and which they say could be even greater if there was an all-weather road and that finally the majority of residents are self-supporting by farming and wood producing as well as catering to tourists. I must say that it strikes a very soft spot in my heart to hear that they live or many of them live by farming. I think that my hon. colleague, the Minister of Highways, should have a very good answer, if he does not do this. He should have a very good explanation. To be quite honest, Mr. Speaker, I cannot imagine how he could have a good explanation for not paving this short stretch of road. Of course, if he did not have the money, that might be accepted in some quarters as a fairly reasonable explanation.

These petitioners pray for the paving of that section of road. I must say that they have my hearty support. I beg leave to lay the petition on the table of the House so that it may be referred to the department to which it relates. I expect the Leader of the Opposition to give it his ardent support.

MR. MURPHY: I definitely do, Mr. Speaker and with reference to this, the Premier fails to understand why the prayer of the petition should not be answered, I feel the same way about many hundreds of petitions that have

Mr. Murphy.

been presented in this House. Lack of money maybe a good reason for a lot of them but being able to afford it is another matter. I think we can afford it, if we save our money. But, Mr. Speaker, we do sincerely support the prayer of this petition, as the Premier so ably pointed out, It is a very important piece of road and the people in the area are earning a living from farming. There are a school bus and a doctor's clinic in that particular area. So I am sure that this very important piece of road should receive the very special attention of the Minister of Highways.

On motion petition received.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

MR. SMALLWOOD. Mr. Speaker, if Your Honour will excuse me, I think that I have an answer here. I did have. I guess I left it on my desk. Yes, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker I have not got one.

HON. H. STARKES (MINISTER OF HIGHWAYS): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 426, on the Order Paper of April 13, asked by the hon. member for Burin. I wish to table that answer. And the Question No. 540, I would like to table the answer. It is asked by the hon. member for Burin, on the Order Paper of May 3.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, before we get into Orders of the Day, I have a question for the Minister of Community and Social Development. In due of the fact that the season for the beginning of construction project is now upon us and many municipalities are anxious to know what funds might be available from DREE for municipal projects, can the minister indicate to the House the progress of the DREE Programme? When can we expect his signature of it in Ottawa? What is involved for municipalities across Newfoundland?

HON. W. N. ROWE (MINISTER OF COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT) Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, on the matter, I cannot give any information at all until such an agreement is signed. On the first part of the question, as to when, all I

Mr. Rowe (W.N.)

can say is that the agreement will be signed once it is finally agreed to by this Government and gets finally through the Treasury Board in Ottawa and is signed and agreed to by the Government in Ottawa and signed by Mr. Marchand. I hope that will be very shortly. I have no absolute assurance as to when it can be done. I hope that it will be very shortly.

MR. COLLINS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The programme, according to the minister, was supposed to have been signed in January, then February, then March and then April and then May. Is there a delay in the Province or is the delay in Ottawa? Has Ottawa got the confidence in this Government? Are they refusing to sign the agreement?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, just before Orders of the Day, on this matter of information. With reference to a question I asked with reference to the salmon fishery regulations, I received an answer from the hon. Minister of Fisheries. What date was the hon. Minister of Fisheries wired? Could the hon. minister tell me? Was it February 14?

MR. WINSOR: February 14.

MR. MURPHY: February 14 and regulations March 12.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Premier was in Gander over the weekend. I wonder would he give us a report on his trip out there? I understand that the Goldfarb Report was not all that encouraging for him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman will know the results later.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I understand that a Provincial Government helicopter was used to go into Gander. Was the Premier in on political business or was it Government business?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was business of the Government of this Province.

MR. COLLINS: That is not what I heard, Mr. Speaker.

On motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CROSBIE: Before we proceed to the estimates, could the Minister of Justice indicate what our business is going to be this week? Is it going to be estimates all week. or what is the order of business?

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! I think we finished Fisheries.

MR. CURTIS: Labour? All right, go ahead.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Labrador West is not back yet so would the hon. Minister of Justice wait to call Labrador Affairs. I believe his plane gets in 5 p.m. He would like to speak on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item (16) - Labour, Page 69. On 16-01-01.

HON. S. A. NEARY (Acting Minister of Labour) Two years ago, Mr. Chairman, this House provided for the setting up of a Provincial Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations but the Act was never proclaimed. The change over, Mr. Chairman, to me is more than just a change in name alone. It involves new Provincial responsibilities in helping to get jobs, in a highly competitive employment market, for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. We know, Mr. Chairman that on a national basis, Canada Manpower is trying to find jobs for all Canadians and, where necessary, to provide them with skills. But we also know, Sir, that a national department often impedes its own efforts by the tangle of red tape which it develops in an effort to make sure that no one group or agent has an advantage over the other. Therefore, sir, to provide a firm foundation for the new department, before we make the change over, we have pretty well, over the past year or so, set up the Industrial Relations Branch, by building on the traditional role of the Department of Labour, with some shuffling in staff. Before we set up a heavy investment, however, in personnel, it would seem sensible, Mr. Chairman, to test a number of proposed functions of the new department, which will fully use the Occupational Training Act for our people. We want to test market researching, the training needs and the employment potential of both young and old people coming out of our school and our University and the older groups of our jobless, especially the seasonal jobless, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Neary.

Our late and wonderful colleague, Mr. Chairman, the hon. W. J. Keough, rather than rush into this new branch with its huge sweeping responsibilities and set up an expensive staff who might not be all suited to the real functions of the branch, he was in the process at the time of his death of carrying out exploratory programmes, to be certain of goals and objectives. Before asking Treasury Board for funds, to invest in the right kind of staff to help reach these goals and objectives that he had set for himself. So, I thought that I should provide this to the committee by way of explanation before we get into the estimates, Mr. Chairman. I will be happy to answer any questions that I can on the Department of Labour. If I cannot answer the questions, I have officials, sitting in the Common Room, who will be quite willing to give me the information. I hope the committee will bear with me, because I am only keeping the seat warm in this department, and I will try to provide all the information that I can.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, in this first vote of the Department of Labour, there are some points that I would like to bring up, which the minister might deal with. First, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister gets a chance, will he give us some explanation of the recent dispute at Newfoundland Farm Products Limited, which is a Crown corporation? We heard an announcement, several weeks before the House of Assembly opened, that the Government were introducing a concept of equal pay for men and women. I believe it was stated that in Government service, after April 1, 1971, equal pay for men and women would be instituted. Now I have seen no sign of that concept in the estimates, to date, Mr. Chairman nor have I heard any estimate of what it is going to cost the Government to apply that principle to all Government employees. The statement was made that equal pay for men and women in the Newfoundland Government service would commence on April 1, 1971. Then when we look at one of the Crown corporations, Newfoundland Farm Products Limited, we were told or at least it is reported in the press, in this case, the "Evening Telegram", May 14, 1971, in a situation there, where the workers

Mr. Crosbie

there are unorganized. They have no union. They walked off the job last Friday. They were not - well it was a strike because of collective action of the employees. If they leave their work, it is a strike. They were told, in this "Evening Telegram" article of May 14, that one of the female workers said that she had been working for the co-operative for seven years and, two weeks ago, was changed from one job to another and had an hourly pay loss from \$1.30 to \$1.10 - from \$1.30 an hour to \$1.10. Now I believe the minimum wage for men in this Province, at the present time, is \$1.25 an hour. The minimum wage for women, I believe, is \$1.00 an hour. The lady in question, if she is getting \$1.10 an hour, is getting \$.10 above what the law requires for women, but \$.15 an hour less than what the law requires for men. It certainly is not the concept of equal pay for men and women doing the same type or nature of work. Certainly, it is not - a Government Crown Corporation is not showing any kind of an example in paying at least the minimum wage which is set for men. It is not even paying that minimum wage to women, employees of the Farm Products Corporation. So, Mr. Chairman, I think we are due an explanation as to just what the Government are doing? Are the Government carrying out the Premier's announcement of about six or seven weeks ago that, as from April 1, 1971, there would be equal pay for men and women in Government service or not? There is no evidence of that as yet. I think that the minister should inform us as to just what is planned in that direction. When is it going to go into effect?

MR. NEARY: Equal pay for men and women in the same establishment?

MR. CROSBIE: Equal pay for men and women doing the same type of work or nature of work.

MR. NEARY: In the same establishment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the same establishment.

MR. CROSBIE When you say equal pay for men and women doing the same nature of work, when you say equal pay for men and women that is what I mean. That is the shorthand form of saying that.

I remember seeing some figures when I was in the Department of Health, Mr. Chairman, that to institute that policy in the Department of Health, which is the biggest employer of the Government, I believe there are 2,200 employees in Health, it would cost the Government, I think, it was between \$750,000 and \$1 million a year. There are 2,269 employees in the Department of Health. There is no sign of that large an increase in the estimates of the Department of Health for salaries. Obviously this Crown corporation, Newfoundland Farm Products Limited, does not appear to be paying men and women the same pay for the same kind of work. In fact women down there are being paid as low as \$1.10 an hour.

Now the law at present, Mr. Chairman, only requires women to be paid \$1.10 and men \$1.25. But surely, if the Government have announced a new policy, it does not need to wait for the law to be implemented. It should set an example by immediately instituting this concept and by paying all of its employees at least \$1.25 an hour which is the minimum wage for men. At this Farm Products Corporation, most of the employees are earning between \$1.10 and \$2.00 an hour. This is certainly not big pay. They have been trying to get a raise they say for two or three months. But every time they ask management, they are told that it is before the board. Now what board it is supposed to be before, I do not know. The minister in the House here last Friday say that what the holdup was that the jobs down there had not been classified by the public administration division of Government. But I say so what! Surely, you cannot expect employees of that Crown corporation to wait month after month after month to have their jobs classified. The classification can come later. It should be treated as an emergency and done now.

Another employee, Mr. Chairman, said that he had been attending a

Mr. Crosbie

Canada Manpower Centre School and was receiving \$63 a week and that is why he attended school. Now he says that he is receiving less than that when he has got a full-time job with Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation. Well what kind of an example is this for the Government to set the employees of this Province? Here is a man, when attending school, gets a student's allowance and is able to make more money a week than when he is working full time down at Pepperrell, in a Crown corporation. Then the minister said that if these men joined the union, that is the hon. Minister of Labour - the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources was quoted as saying that if they are members of an organized group such as an union, then they could be dealt with, but it would be very hard to deal with them, if they did not form a union. Why, Mr. Chairman? Surely these eighty-two people who quit work had some kind of spokesman for them. It would be easier if they had a union. But apparently conditions are so bad at the Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation at Pleasantville, that these people, unorganized, which is very unusual, all determined to quit their work. So obviously their working conditions and pay in that branch of the Government service are most unsatisfactory. I would like to hear from the minister on that and as to what is being done. We know that, in today's paper, these workers have been rehired except for two who left of their own volition. Otherwise they would have been rehired. I think the minister should now deal with that and the minister should inform the House that the minimum wage, at least, \$1.25 an hour, is going to be paid every one who works at that plant down there or who works in Government service at all. Now as I recall, Mr. Chairman, when the Premier made his announcement, there about two weeks before the House was open, he said that this would be instituted in Government service from April 1, 1971. I believe he said that in about six months time or some period of time (I do not have a clipping here. I could not find

Mr. Crosbie

my clipping on it) that the concept of equal pay for men and women would be legislative throughout the Province or would come into effect throughout the Province, but employers were given a period of six months to get ready for this.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as anyone knows who has any experience in this matter, everything is going to depend on how that decision is implemented, because just

MR. CROSBIE: what is the same kind and nature of work for both men and women is the all important factor. It will be very easy to get around this concept, if an employer can say that the woman is doing work of a different kind than the man is doing. It is not only the law that is important, it is the administration of that law and the way the law is checked on. The bald statement that this is going to apply in the civil service can mean exactly nothing, if it is not implemented with vigor and enthusiasm, because the Government is going to decide whether the woman is doing the same kind, nature and quality of work as the man. This statement, which sounded wonderful, can mean very little. I would like to hear from the minister just what the plans are. How long is it before equal pay for men and women doing the same kind and quality of work is going to be implemented? When it is implemented, how is it going to be enforced by the Government? What is being done by the Government to enforce it now in Government employment itself? It was supposed to start April 1, 1971, and this is now seven weeks later. Obviously, this either means something or it means nothing.

There is an editorial in the "Evening Telegram" of March 5, which pointed out - it was headed, "What Is Equal Work?" Just to quote that, it said; "too vague, too indefinite is how the Premier's statement on minimum wages can be described. Even he did not seem to know what he was talking about, and was not sure how or where the equal pay, equal work principle would apply." That is exactly the impression I got from watching the Premier on those newscasts. "It appears to be a hurried decision, not given the proper forethought, but rushed into the news to make a political gain at the moment.

It is unfortunate that such an important right has to be proclaimed in the interest of politics, rather than the women." Then they go on to ask, "what is equal work? If certain jobs are regarded as purely female jobs, do they come under the same minimum wages as men? Does the law apply in an all female establishment, and so on?" There are too many questions unanswered. I agree with that one hundred percent, and that is why I would like to hear the minister discuss this now, this afternoon, when we get on it.

I believe the Premier, in his announcement, said it would cost the Government as a whole, \$750 thousand to pay female Government employees wages equal to those of men. If that is the case, I would like to know who are the women in Government service who are doing the same kind of work as men, but who are not receiving the same kind of pay? I believe the minister should be able to tell us that. How is this \$750 thousand distributed? What were these women doing who were doing the same kind of work as men - the same type and quality of work, but who are not getting the same pay? What department were they found in? What kind of work was this? How is the \$750 thousand made up? Has the Government now, already rectified it?

I have some other points too, but perhaps it is better to let the minister deal with this, if he is going to deal with it before getting on to some of these other matters. Perhaps it is just worth mentioning one other point in these general remarks, and that is the Government's position on the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act, 1970.

The House knows, Mr. Chairman, that that piece of legislation which was rushed through the House last June, Bill (85), is completely inadequate. When it was passed through the House last year I pointed that out. I think other speakers did also. This was a piece of legislation that has no guts at all, no

teeth. Everything in it that was of any importance to the employees of the Government was left to the Government to decide, by Order in Council and by regulations. In the last few days, we have all heard statements by the Newfoundland Federation of Labour, Mr. Critchley, Canadian Labour Congress, The Newfoundland Government Employees Association now called NAPE, (Newfoundland Association of Public Employees) all of them critical of this piece of legislation, which should be taken by the nape and done away with by the Government.

MR. NEARY: It does not come under the Provincial Department of Labour.

MR. CROSBIE: No, but it is a labour matter, you see, and labour we are now discussing. The Government's labour relations and they are in a pitiful state. Does the Government intend to proceed with its own regulations, under that Act, or are we going to have introduced at this session or at the next session, perhaps when the Cohen Commission reports, proper legislation giving the employees of the Government real collective bargaining rights? I think that is a very important question at the moment.

The Government has been requested, by the labour bodies in this Province, not to proclaim Bill (85) but to wait for the Cohen Commission to report. That seems to me to be very sensible, as long as Mr. Cohen reports this year sometime. Heaven knows he has been long enough at it now and still has not reported. That is something by the way the minister might tell us. Has he been in touch with Mr. Cohen? Has ~~Mr.~~ Cohen flown? Are we ever going to get Mr. Cohen's report? Because he took over from Mr. Justice Rand, I believe, at the beginning of 1969, certainly two years ago. Has the Government decided not to proclaim this Act, and to wait for the Cohen Commission to report, or to bring in more suitable legislation or not?

In view of the statements that have been made about this by Mr. Noseworthy, the President of the Newfoundland Government Employees Association, (I had a clipping here somewhere. I am not sure where I put it now) but, he described the legislation last Friday, in particularly appropriate terms. I will have to look for the clipping, but I am sure that the minister noticed it. It has been most inadequate and most unsatisfactory. I think the time has come, Mr. Chairman, we are now on labour, for the Government to clarify their position on this legislation, which is opposed by Government employees and by the labour movement.

MR. MURPHY: This is in connection with the same matter, Mr. Chairman, that is why I would like to mention the number of calls I have received from nurses aides, who do the same work as the male nurses and the orderlies. According to their stories, they are being paid very much less than the male employees, notwithstanding the Human Rights Legislation and equal pay for equal work.

I was wondering, since it is ⁱⁿ conjunction with the same matter, if when the minister replies he might bring us up to date on just how the Government have faced up to the problems existing, in view of their great announcements of great human rights and this type of thing? When the minister is replying - this is just the one matter I wanted to bring in at this time.

MR. EARLE: There are a couple of point I want to bring up under Labour, in a general sort of way. I did ask a question in the House some days ago about the cooperation of industry, the trades and technical schools, and labour generally. I recall that some years ago there was supposed to be a joint committee set up to operate in conjunction with all these various groups, and to try to tie together their interests in the field of labour.

It appears, that what is happening to the trainees of the various technical schools and the vocational schools, somewhere along the line, after they get out, there is a bit of a fall-down between what they have learned in school and what they intend to put into practice when they get into the field. I think this is very pertinent to the department of Labour, because I have had many instances of young men who approached me and said; "we have taken a heavy equipment course or we have taken some set course. We think that we have learned something in this course, but when we get out there are no jobs for us, because the employer say to us, 'first of all you have to have experience.'" Now they ask a simple question. "How can I get experience on a bulldozer unless I can operate a bulldozer?"

You can well understand that a construction company with very expensive construction equipment, is not going to put some trainee on, to using a very expensive bulldozer, without some knowledge of his ability. There is a gap there somewhere along the line, where these fellows, coming out of the trade schools and the technical schools, can be fed into industry and trained. I imagine that this comes, in a sense, under the apprenticeship idea, but there are many segments of industry where there does not seem to be any appropriate apprenticeship setup. I think in the trades, such as plumbing and electrical and this sort of thing, the apprenticeship course is working very well indeed.

I am particularly interested in the field of construction and heavy equipment, because at the time I was responsible for setting up the heavy equipment training school at Stephenville, which I think has been quite successful, also at that time we set up the adult training there, so that men could qualify to take courses there, to bring up their general educational standards, so that they had enough of what we used

to call "book larnin'" to get into more advanced courses.

Many men have gone in there and the school has done an excellent job of putting through a lot of them, but there has been a great lot of disenchantment on the part of men having sweated through this, sometimes after they have been left school for many years, to come out of it and then find that somewhere along the line there is a gap where they just cannot get this start with industry.

The idea that I had in mind at the time and I think that it was a good one, was that this committee of industry and labour should work closely in conjunction with the training department of the trade schools and vocational schools. There seemed to be some trouble at that time, as I recall it, to get the correct representatives from the labour movement and from the industry and so on, to cover the whole thing. This bogged down, in the fact that nobody seemed to be able to get all these different groups together. In my mind, this is a very appropriate field for the Department of Labour. They should get in boots and all into this, because it is essential to the man who is looking for a job. They should be most active in trying to have such a working committee appointed.

If need be, Government I think should give them responsibility for it. This brings up another question. There was a falldown in labour relations, apparently, the other day at the Farm Marketing Board, because a job classification had not been completed. I find this completely beyond understanding, because it was over two years since I had anything to do with classification organization, The Public Services Administration. They were working very, very quickly indeed, as I recall it. They did a tremendous number of job classifications. I had a book from them, about four inches thick, of job classifications which they had completed two years ago, at the time I left the Government. Why would a little operation like the Farm Marketing

Board not be done in a matter of days? It seems a very feeble excuse that a job classification on a comparatively small operation like that, could not be completed very quickly indeed. It does not ring true to me. It does not seem to be a proper excuse. If it is, the thing has been far too long delayed and there should be some pressure from the minister's department to have this classification of jobs cleaned up and dealt with.

Just one final question Mr. Chairman: My friend, the hon. member from St. John's West, mentioned the Cohen report. This gentleman I understand is a pretty expensive individual and his report has been drawn out a long, long time indeed. The labour organizations themselves are saying that the Government should not take action until that report is received and studied. When is that report going to be received and studied? What at this stage has the cost of it been? This has been one of these ongoing things that seem to be interminable. I know it is a big job, but in a Province such as Newfoundland it cannot be all that big. Most certainly, I think some push should be put behind this effort to see that it is cleaned up, so that people, labour unions in particular, know where they stand. This is a sort of report that can go on indefinitely, never presented, looked at and then put one side and looked at again, so that nothing will happen.

This is a most essential and vital piece of information for the labour movement of the Province as well as for employers. I should think that, the thing having been underway now I believe for close to two years, it is time to get on with it. I wonder if the minister could tell us something about this?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to reassure the House that the Government intends to stand by its decision to

provide equal pay for equal work in the same establishment. We are committed to that, and we intend to stick by it. It is one of the greatest reforms that has ever been brought in to this House.

As far as the Newfoundland Farm Products dispute is concerned, Mr. Chairman, my colleague, the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, explained, through the House, how this dispute arose and what was being done about it. Only a few moments ago, I signed a document, as a member of the Treasury Board, that will give the new union, which was formed at Newfoundland Farm Products, voluntary recognition and laying down of a procedure for defining the bargaining unit. I think at this particular point in time, Mr. Chairman, it would be improper for me to comment any further on that. The situation is well in hand.

They have, as a result of their action the other day, formed themselves into a union. The matter is now being checked out by an official of the Department of Labour to assist Treasury Board in defining - or assisting the department in defining the bargaining unit, the same as we did with the Newfoundland Power Commission. We gave the I.B.E.W. voluntary recognition. In the case of the Power Commission, and I understand that my colleague, the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, and the Treasury Board have agreed to give the new union of Newfoundland Farm Products, voluntary recognition. It is only just a matter now of defining the bargaining unit.

How the equal pay for equal work in the same establishment will work, in business and industry, Mr. Chairman, is problematical. I have no idea how it will work, but I will say this; business and industry have been given sufficient time to work out job descriptions and bring their records up to date. As far as I am concerned, personally, I think this is the only way that it will work. Now, for the first time some small

business people will have to keep adequate records and have to have proper job descriptions. It is impossible, with the thousands of classifications that we have in the civil service, for me to come into this House, without at least one year's notice, to provide members with the information that they asked for, concerning what employees, what departments will benefit by the \$750 thousand that has been allocated to implement the equal pay for equal work programme.

I would think, myself, Mr. Chairman, that probably the Department of Health and maybe my own Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation will be the two departments that will be more heavily involved than the other departments of Government. I think, as my colleague, the Minister of Finance points out, that probably these two departments will pretty well take up the whole amount.

As far as the Cohen Commission Report is concerned, Mr. Chairman, I have not spoken to Mr. Cohen since I became the Minister of Labour, (acting), but I was speaking to his assistant, Mr. Bell. I am assured that the report of the Royal Commission on labour will be in the hands of the Government, not later than September.

The hon. member for Fortune Bay raised a very interesting point. As I indicated in my opening remarks, the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations is not yet set up, but I think probably the points that he made would be considered by the New Minister in the Department when they get it set up. It is always frustrating, Mr. Chairman, for students to be trained in things that are obsolete before they get their training, or training students when you know that there are no jobs for that kind of training. I think he probably had a good point there, and one that would be worth taking a look at in the future.

MR. CROSSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the minister's answers are really

most unsatisfactory. Most unsatisfactory. I mean, it sounds wonderful for the Premier to get on T.V. and radio and declare, as he did six weeks ago, that there is going to be equal pay for men and women doing the same kind or type of work in the civil service, from April 1 and generally, six months from April 1,

When we ask in the House; how is this great principal, which is advocated here year after year by the official Opposition, and voted down by the Government by the way, certainly during the years since 1966, when I have been here, when we ask how that principal is going to be implemented, how is the Government going to go about doing it itself, in the civil service? After all, the Government had the Public Service Associates of Chicago here to reclassify the civil service. They have a Public Administration Board to do the same, but when we ask how this figure of \$750 thousand, to achieve this in the Government employment, is arrived at, and what categories of female Government employees have been doing the same work as men but getting less pay, when we ask that question, the minister says that it would take a year's notice for him to get the information.

Surely the Government did not go ahead and make that announcement, Mr. Chairman, without having this information at their finger tips. I know that I had this looked up in 1968, in the Department of Health, as to what it would cost in the Department of Health. As my memory serves me, officials there estimated \$750 thousand a year for the Department of Health alone, to pay men and women the same pay for the same work.

Is the minister saying that, when the Premier made his announcement, this was just talking through his hat? That the \$750 thousand figure he gave to do this in the civil service

was just pulled out of thin air? Because, if the minister needs a year's notice to get this kind of information, presumably the Premier needs a year's notice to get it, or is this just poppycock? I mean, the principle sounds fine, but there are going to be a lot of dissappointed females in Newfoundland. Mr. Chairman, both in the Government service and outside it this year, if it is not laid down pretty stringently what people are doing the same kind and nature of work, women as men.

How is the woman to know, who, say, works in a fish plant, whether she is doing or can be held by the Government or the administrators of this legislation to be doing the same work as a man who works in the same plant? Who is going to advise her of her rights? If there is a union, of course, presumably the union will do it. If there is no union, or even if the union is involved, somebody in the Department of Labour has to give their opinion on it, so what kind of machinery is being set up to see that this is carried out to really mean something? Not only that, but what kind of work has the Government itself done to see how it is to be brought into effect in the civil service?

From what the minister says, Mr. Chairman, you can only gather from what he says that the announcement that the Premier made was hasty, ill-considered and not thought out, unless the Premier or somebody on the opposite side of the House can tell us how this is going to be implemented. Do not forget, that it was supposed to have started in the civil service on April 1, 1971. This is seven weeks later, so the minister has not answered that point at all. The minister frankly says, now imagine this, the Government introduces a new policy equal pay for men and women, and the minister says, when he is asked this afternoon in the House, and that was announced eight or nine weeks ago, eight weeks anyway, he has no idea how this will work in private industry. This concept of equal pay for

men and women.

The minister says that everybody who employs people is going to have to classify their jobs and reclassify them. That is all very well to say, but we all know, Mr. Chairman, that the only firms in this country large enough to have staff to classify their jobs and reclassify them are, Bowaters, Price and perhaps Lundrigans and few more big employers in the Province. The ordinary man, employing five, ten, twenty, twenty-five people, does not have anybody working for him who is going to do job classifications or who is trained to do job classifications. What kind of utter tripe is that? I mean, it is ridiculous! The policy has been announced and now the Government says, in the person of the minister, that he has no idea how this will work in private industry.

If the minister has no idea how it will work in private industry, why was it announced?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: I-d-e-a, I call it "idear"

AN HON. MEMBER: "Idear" is wrong.

MR. CROSBIE: The point is not how that word is pronounced Mr. Chairman, it is how the Government is going to implement this policy. This is just election window dressing, unless the minister can come up and tell us how this is going to be done. What are his plans for doing it?

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: How is the Government going to enforce this? Where are they going to get the staff?

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Order them to do it.

MR. CROSBIE: The Government has to have people who are capable of going into somebody's business and saying, "now you have twenty-five men here. I am going to classify their job, and these women here are doing the same work as these men

here." It is going to take a big staff for the Government to do that. I mean, the minister had better start getting staff, experienced staff to do it. Apparently, the Government, after a year, has not had time to get down to the Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation and classify them. That was the reason given in the House last Friday as to why they are being paid the abysmally low wages they are getting, a dollar and ten cents to two dollars an hour.

The Government that proclaimed equal pay for men and women, eight weeks ago, got women working at Pleasantville for one dollar and ten cents an hour. It is bluff. It sounds like bluff, unless the Government shows us something otherwise.

I am glad to hear that the union has been formed at Pleasantville. I hope that we will soon hear that some new working conditions have been negotiated there. We know that with the Acting Minister of Labour, acting as he is in election year, he will doubtless be pretty quick to see that something is done about that. But really, to hear the Government is

paying \$1.10 an hour up to \$2.00 an hour and the rest of it.

MR.SMALLWOOD: I am beginning to suspect that the hon. gentleman does not like the Government. Sounds like it.

MR.CROSBIE: Not a question of liking it or disliking it. The time is long past for the Government to disappear, disappear from the scene. The Premier is looking so bright and cheerful there we do not want to irritate him today. Just read his newspapers while we get on with the business of the Province.

MR.SMALLWOOD: I am listening, I never miss a word of the wisdom, that is about one word in about every three minutes.

MR.CROSBIE: That is when the Premier listens to himself. If he listens to others he will hear a few more. The Minister did not deal with the NGEA. Their President said last week that a better process of collective bargaining will soon be forthcoming, that the 8000 members association will be given the right to strike as well as other union rights. Is the President anticipating a change of Government? Or has this Government said they are going to give the Government employees the right to strike and that a better process of collective bargaining will soon be forthcoming? I suspect that what Mr. Noseworthy meant when he said that, is that he foresees a change in Government so that a Government will get into office that is more sympathetic to the aims of government employees, more sympathetic to the labour movement. Or has this Government told the NGEA that it is going to give them the right to strike? It certainly will be a change of pace for the Premier, if he does. I remember him saying in this House, many times, you cannot strike against the Queen, you cannot strike against the Crown. We have heard all that.

Now perhaps the Acting Minister can go down in history by announcing today that the Government, the Crown is going to permit government employees the right to strike, that they are going to give them decent collective bargaining legislation. Or is that being saved for a moment closer to the election? Mr. Noseworthy is quoted as saying the Government, he said, has the chance to completely scrap the Act, that is

the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act, and bring in new legislation that (quotes) "will define a fair and decent process for collective bargaining." He described the Act as an insult to the labour organization and retrograde in every respect. That is the viewpoint of the government employees who have to deal with the Government under this Act., "An insult and retrograde in every respect." The NGEA is currently bargaining for the bulk of the public service, but the results of the negotiations will not be known for some time. There appears to be a fair kitty set aside in the budget for adjustments to the new pay plan.

"As I read the Budget," Mr. Noseworthy said, "it would appear that nearly \$10 million may be available." I hope he is right. I hope he is right. So I would like to have the Minister or the Premier really clear up that point. All we can do is plead with him, our usual gentle way here, to set our minds at rest on this point, the strikes by Government employees.

There is another aspect of Government labour relations, Mr. Chairman, that should be dealt with. That is, what is the position of hospital workers? I believe, I am not sure on this now, my memory might be faulty but there was legislation passed here. No, I think it was said that the new Public Service Collective Bargaining Act would apply to hospital workers. I believe that the legislation that was passed in 1966-67 is still in effect. However, I am not sure on that, the Minister can correct me, if I am wrong. What is the Government planning to do with reference to the legislation, if it is still in effect, as I think it is, but my memory might be wrong, that forbids strikes in hospitals? That was passed 1966-67, is that going to be revoked so that they will have the same collective bargaining rights as other Government employees or public service employees or what is the position on it?

The statement was made last year, in this House, Mr. Chairman, that there was to be an automatic five per cent increase for those workers, on April 1, 1971. That is being denied since. Perhaps the minister will clarify that.

MR. NEARY: That is not in my department.

MR. CROSBIE: We can wait for the Department of Finance. It would be in order under the Department of Finance. There is one question I am going to ask the Minister, when we get down to minimum wages, which he might think on now and that is this. I had a complaint the other day, Mr. Chairman, I have not had time to look into it, by an employee of a construction company. He said that under the Minimum Wage Act you have to pay time and a half after forty-eight hours work. This is the regulations passed last year. He said what his employer was doing was he was paying them, he was working them sixty hours a week, paying them time and a half, based on the minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour, not on his normal wage, which say was \$1.75 an hour. In other words the employer told them that, according to the law, when he worked the overtime, the employer only had to pay him time, one and a-half times \$1.25 which was the minimum wage, not one and a-half times \$1.75, which was his normal wage. So I told him I did not have time, the House is meeting morning, noon and night, to look the point up for him. But I assured him that this is certainly not the intention of the legislation - perhaps I am wrong the minister might deal with that.

(1) Is that the intention of what was done last year, that the time and a-half would only be paid on the minimum wage? I feel sure that cannot be the case, that it must mean time and a-half the ordinary wages.

(2) Has the Minister had such complaints, has he any legal opinion as to whether or if this particular employer was in defiance of the law in doing this. I assured the chap that called me that this could not be right. But I did not have time to look into the law, perhaps the Minister has had this kind of complaint investigated. If it turns out that, because of the wording of the regulations or the Act, an employer only has to pay time and one and a-half times the minimum wage when he works, a man overtime who is being paid more than the minimum wage, this is all wrong. It should be time and a-half times his normal pay. So, if the Minister could get us some information on that. I assume his department had the same kind of complaint.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the hon. member that if he wants me to deal with that complaint that he have it documented and pass it over to me, I will be very happy to have an investigating officer of the Provincial Department of Labour look into it. It is very difficult for me to answer a hypothetical question. I do not have the facts in front of me Mr. Chairman. As the Chairman knows a good lawyer does not answer a hypothetical question .

MR. CORSBIE: No, but has the Minister had similar complaints -

MR. NEARY: Yes, we have, we have had similar complaints. I would be very happy to look into this, it must be properly documented.

MR. CROSBIE: What position does the department take, it is one and a-half times the minimum rate or what does the department advise?

MR. NEARY: Well, all we do, Mr. Chairman, is set minimum standards. We can only enforce the legislation. I would have to know more about it before I could give you a yes or no answer. But as far as Bill 85 is concerned, Mr. Chairman, let me say this, that the Newfoundland Federation of Labour are coming next week to present their annual brief to the Government. Then they are meeting with the Minister of Finance, who is also the President of the Treasury Board, and myself as acting minister of Labour. We are quite prepared to listen to what the Newfoundland Federation of Labour or any other organization has to say about Bill 85, Mr. Chairman. To my knowledge there has never been a piece of legislation passed by any free parliament in the world that has not been amended. I do not know if my hon. friend knows of any piece of legislation that was ever passed anywhere in the world that has not been amended. We are quite prepared to listen and, if they have justification, we are quite prepared to bring amendments into this House. There is no problem, Mr. Chairman, I do not know what all the fuss is about. We have established two-way communications with the Newfoundland Federation of Labour, the NGEA, we have good relationships. So I do not know what all the fuss is about.

Mr. Chairman, they are coming to see us, they will present their brief, we will listen to them. If they have justification for having amendments brought in, of course we will bring them in.

MR. CROSBIE: That is the minister's answer to all these points-

MR. HICKMAN: Before the estimate, before the item is carried, Mr. Chairman, I would like for the minister to outline to the Committee what programmes his department have implemented to retrain Newfoundlanders for the changes in jobs and job classifications that obviously are now upon us.

I was reading in Friday's paper a statement, attributed to the hon. minister, with respect to the unemployment situation in Newfoundland. The minister is quoted as saying that the significance of the new employment figures would depend largely on the definition of seasonally unemployed. I believe that, apart altogether from the tragically high unemployment rate that we have in Newfoundland at this time, we have a second group who are in not quite the same predicament but close to it and these are the under-employed. They are in very sizable numbers. The fact is, despite all the optimistic predictions that go back at least to November of last year, that things would get better in this Province, employmentwise. Things have been getting progressively worse.

In November 1970 Newfoundland had the highest unemployment rate in the Nation. At that time the estimates of the Department of Manpower was that there were 14,000 people out of work. That was in November. We can expect, we should regretfully have to anticipate an increase in the number of unemployed during January and February. But the tapering off should then start, because seasonal unemployment in the service industries, in the construction industry, are not like they used to be even five years ago. You find construction companies busily engaged on their projects right through the winter. But yet what do we find on Friday, May 14, 1971. The unemployment figure in Newfoundland is still rising. That there was an increase in April of 2,000 over the month before. Now I believe, despite all the good pieces of legislation that we have seen

passed by this legislature over the years, the fact that the Minister is responsible for the implementation, the enforcement of this legislation, over and above all that, its first and primary task must be to articulate Government's and it is the minister's position to articulate Government's position insofar as unemployment is concerned. There is not much doubt that the Atlantic Provinces has been pretty cruelly dealt with, that for the first time in the history of Canada the Federal Government, with malice aforethought, deliberately, in its anxiety to curb inflation, created unemployment. Now, maybe Ontario or British Columbia or some of the wealthier provinces can afford this but again we have been called upon, Mr. Chairman, to pay the price and pay the penalty of an overall national policy, which appears to have been disastrous with all of Canada. But most assuredly it has been most disastrous for the Province of Newfoundland. If the hon. minister has the big heart that he says he has, then surely goodness he is not going to sit by and he is not going to continue to sit silently by and watch a Government in Ottawa, that is more concerned about balancing its budget and fighting inflation, deliberately, maliciously, carefully planned, to create unemployment in Canada and knowing (or they should have known) that the Province would feel the effects, more so than any other Province in Canada, would be the Province of Newfoundland.

Let me direct the hon. minister's attention to the fact that apart altogether from the seasonal unemployment, a lot of this unemployment appears to be more than seasonal, that the recent report which was submitted by the Atlantic Development Council on the strategy for the economic development of the Atlantic Region, As the hon. minister is aware, favourable reaction to this report was expressed by the Hon. John Marchand, who said that the report, is quoted as saying that the report will have a profound effect on Atlantic Development policies. His department would take each recommendation, discussion and action plan. He went on to say that this is not a report we want to shelve. In that report, on page 13, it says; "resource based activities will continue to be important to the overall

economic base of the region, and opportunities for new and expanded activities, based on processing of the regions natural resources, should be actively and systematically explored and promoted!" This is the key to it. In the extractive phase of primary activities, however, a significant decline in the size of the labour force employed can be expected over the next decade and changes in the structural organization of operation. The release of manpower from the primary sector must be dependent, the Council emphasizes, upon the opening up of adequate job opportunities in other sectors of the economy.

This Committee will recall that that same organization stated that 170,000 new jobs will have to be created in the Atlantic Provinces during the next ten years, at a cost of \$25 billion. That is only half of the problem, Mr. Chairman. The creation of 170,000 new jobs at the very most will take care, if it will, of those entering the labour force during that period. What is equally important is the rather discouraging statement of the Council, but it is a realistic one, we know that, we know it from watching the operations in the lumbering industry, from watching the operations in the fish plants, in almost any industry we have in the Province, that with more mechanization, with the improvement of methods and procedures that each year the number of man hours is being reduced, and constant loss of employment to the Province.

Over and above the creation of the 170,000 new jobs that we are going to have to find and find very dramatically, I submit, Mr. Chairman, we can only find this with careful economic planning and a very intensive programme of re-training, initiated by the Department of Labour of this Province. Also the hon. minister will recall there is a recommendation that there be established a regional, Atlantic Regional Labour Education Centre, because, as it points out, of the tremendous role that labour will have to be called upon to play in the development and creation of jobs in this area. We cannot wait, Mr. Chairman, for this to suddenly come upon us and say we had no idea. If we had only known about it in 1971, we would have taken some steps

to meet it.

The fact is, that this Atlantic Development Council with the expert knowledge at its disposal, has stated categorically that these facts will occur and the Minister of Economic Expansion in Ottawa has indicated that he is prepared to accept their findings and their recommendations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I also point out that the Atlantic Development Council states (quote) "it will be necessary that there be harmonious labour management relations and ways must be found minimizing industrial discordant friction. Unless the co-operation of both are received, the best conceived programmes will founder.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is why the report of the Cohen Commission may be of great relevance to the future of this Province. We have tried, during the past two or three years, to have labour contracts for the life of a job, if the project is sufficiently large. We have it in Churchill Falls. It is not peculiar to Newfoundland, I believe they had it on the Montreal subway, certainly on EXPO. It is now in Stephenville and now in Come by Chance. I would like to hear from the hon. minister as to how these contracts are working, because there has been a suggestion from workers, from time to time, it breaks out in print from time to time, that when a union gets a contract for the total project, and that contract for Churchill Falls may be for four or five years, there is not the same continuous attention paid to membership grievances and enforcement of the contract as you would find where a union has a, , knows it has to negotiate its contract or re-negotiate it every year or every second year. I do not know if this is a good policy. The experiment has been tried at Churchill Falls. It has been, relatively speaking, strike-free, probably strike-free.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do not be so long winded as the member for St. John's West.

MR. HICKMAN: I am not trying. I am not trying. What I would like to hear from the hon. minister is now based on two years of experience and may be a bit longer and some complaints from the workers at Churchill Falls.

Does he believe that for this type of project that it is in the best interest of the union members and the best interest of the workers to have this long term life of the project labour contract rather than to have labour unions come in and negotiate each year?

But again, Mr. Chairman, I do not see how we can debate the estimates of the Department of Labour in May of this year in the full realization that Newfoundland's unemployment situation is not improving that it worsened during the last month, without hearing a policy statement from the Minister of Labour. Rightly or wrongly, I suggest to this Committee that it is the Minister for the Department whose estimates we are considering, who has the responsibility, and no one else, to articulate government policy. What are his views on it? What action has he initiated, as Minister responsible for Labour, and what action of protest has been taken by the Government of this Province with respect to the disastrous national policies that are having more disastrous effects in Newfoundland than any other part of this country? I think we have to know. I think we have to know whether the Minister of Labour believes that the greatest enemy to the security of Canadians today is inflation, as opposed to unemployment. I think most Canadians, most Newfoundlanders certainly, if you give them a choice, they will take inflation rather than unemployment. Again, Mr. Chairman this policy - how can they -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Inflation means that we stop selling to the world, our goods become too expensive, that is what inflation means.

MR. HICKMAN: No, Mr. Chairman. Inflation means a great deal more than being competitive in the world markets because of employment. Inflation is also the ability to sell to world markets. It is probably more adversely or alternatively beneficially effected by the currency, international currency exchange. The fluctuations that we have seen in Europe during the last two weeks will probably have a more far-reaching effect on the economy of the resource centre in areas of Canada than any anti-inflationary regulations that we have seen emanate from the Government of Canada during the past several months. The same thing with the United

States of America. If their dollar is weaker than ours then obviously the fishing industry, the pulp and paper industry in this Province will benefit from it.

But how does this business of deliberately planning to create unemployment inure to the benefit of this Province in particular, which is not a manufacturing province in the strict sense of the word? Newfoundland or the Atlantic Provinces cannot be accused of contributing to the inflationary spiral that is going on in Canada. For sure it cannot be. But, yet when a policy is laid down it has to be national. This is silly. does not have to be, Canadians, lived from 1867 until about, until the creation of the Atlantic Development Board, about fourteen years ago, lived under this terrible umbrella, that a strong Federal Government must have a national policy, without variation. But the Atlantic Development Board varied that. It has been continued on and expanded year after year, but the strength of the nation did not suffer, because the Government of Canada is prepared to make certain concessions to the Atlantic Provinces and certain other parts and certain other distressed areas in Canada. So that this - I suggest it was promoted, for generations in Canada, to avoid having to make these extra expenditures and additional expenditures and to show these preferences for the Atlantic Provinces. This did not destroy Confederation, if anything it strengthened it.

Here we have now an unemployment situation in Newfoundland that is not directly attributable in its entirety to economic factors. You can stay here for weeks and argue what caused the last great depression in the thirties. This may, probably was worldwide economic factors. But this is not the cause nor the cause of the factor, for the situation we find ourselves in today. We find ourselves in a status of high unemployment in Newfoundland because of legislative action taken

MR. HICKMAN:

by means of Order-in-Council and by means of policy decisions of the Government of Canada they were made to apply to Canada as a whole. They knew or should have known that the effects on the unemployment situation in Newfoundland would be disastrous. I think the onus is on the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Labour only to satisfy this Committee that the Government of this Province were very alert to the tragedy of this policy, that the Government of this Province months ago saw what would happen, and give us concrete information as to what steps were taken, in September and October of last year and maybe even before, to indicate to the Government of Canada that its present anti-inflationary policy was not sitting very well with the people of Newfoundland and that the results would be what we now regretably find them to be in May of 1971. It is no good to get up and shout and say, "Hooray! hurrah! hooray! We have won the fight against inflation," when the fight against inflation has been won at the expense of Newfoundland workers, and it has, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of points with reference to this first primary general vote to the Department of Labour. First is this; Members of the official opposition and the members of the party of which I am a member were very heartened to hear the announcement, by the hon. the Premier, to the effect that there would be equal pay for equal work, regardless of sex. After all this is a policy that and a position that has been announced by us time and time again, year after year after year. It cannot go without notice that the former Leader of the Opposition, the former member for St. John's East, brought in 1966 and 1967 and again in 1968 time and time and time again this question, brought in resolutions to the effect that this should be brought about and these resolutions, of course, were voted down by the majority on the other side.

It was then with a feeling of gratitude, a good feeling, when we heard this news that there was to be equal pay for equal work, because this was an

MR. MARSHALL:

implementation of a position which we had taken, as I said, time and time again, and the record will bear us out on this. But it is also now, on looking over these estimates, a matter of concern, when you look them over and you see that the total estimates of the Department of Labour have been increased by a mere \$23,500. Now it is going to be impossible, you can bring it in, certainly you can bring it in, if Government has full intentions of doing it, you can bring in in Government the position of equal pay for equal work but in private industry, as such, it is going to require constant, intensive supervision in order to bring it about.

There will have to be staff provided by Government, to assure that this policy is taking place, to assure that the private company is paying to the woman who is doing work equal to the male worker, her counterpart in the company, is paying them equally. There does not appear, by reason of the fact that there are no appreciable increases in the staff of the Department of Labour, an increase in the staff to cope with this requirement. One would think also that there would be a type of a Board or a Committee set up for the purpose of hearing complaints which, when this policy is implemented, will obviously be raised by workers throughout the Province, by females, to the effect that they are not being paid equally to their male counterparts; and there is no provision, that I can see, in these estimates for the setting up of this Board. I think it is a most necessary element in order to bring the policy into effect.

Well, the Human Rights Commission, the Minister perhaps then will elucidate to us, will tell us how this Human Rights Commission is going to apply and whether in fact the Government has turned its mind, which I seriously doubt, to the Human Rights Commission taking up matters of this nature or complaints of this nature. It is certainly something that should be part of the Department of Labour and should be a special, specific board made up of experts, in the same matter as the Labour Relations Board and the

MR. MARSHALL:

other Boards that are set forth here in the Department of Labour. In the first years of implementation, as I say, of this policy, if in fact the Government is seriously intending to implement this policy, there are going to be problems and these problems can only be met by enforcement and enforcement can only be realized by increased staffs and by machinery such as boards set up for the purpose of ensuring that the policy is carried out by everybody in the country.

Then, Mr. Chairman, there is another matter that the acting Minister of Labour might well set his mind towards and this is the setting up of some type of over-all Industrial Relations Council in the Province, comprising Government, management, labour, representative for the Fisheries Colleges etc. for the purpose of assuring not only that the labour force of this Province is adequately utilized but also assuring that the labour force is adequately trained and streamed into the changing face of this Province, streamed into the industrial economy of this Province. It is necessary and it is long overdue. It is a policy that has been advocated by us for quite some period of time. We see the Government giving lip service to the policy, our policy of equal pay for equal work, we would like to see at least the Government paying lip service to this policy of an Industrial Relations Council.

But in conclusion, I would like to underline the fact that it is going to take quite a bit of administration and quite a bit of enforcement in order to realize equal pay for equal work. Now we have told you, the Government has been told for the past four years, that this was necessary to be brought about and they saw the wisdom of bringing it about and announce it. We now tell you that, in order to bring it about, you are going to have to set up the machinery in order to enforce it and I feel the Government must realize this. Unfortunately it would appear, by reason of the fact that increased employees have not been provided for the enforcement of this policy, that the announcement is a shallow one and there

MR. MARSHALL:

is no real intent on the part of the Government to bring it about.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few comments on this matter.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman's usual few comments are unusually few comments.

MR. HICKEY: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, would the Premier like to wait until I make them and then he can decide whether they are the usual or the unusual.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is what I was afraid of. I thought the hon. gentleman might sort of set me at rest beforehand.

MR. HICKEY: I will not delay the House, Mr. Chairman. We have until six, so I will be finished around five minutes to six.

Mr. Chairman, what I want to comment on is the new Legislation pertaining to equal pay for equal work. I was rather surprised to hear some of the answers given by the Minister but one has to realize that he is new to the department, that he is attempting to do two jobs. I do not like to be overcritical of anyone but possibly, Mr. Chairman, what the Government should do is they should sort out their own House and put their own House in order. Surely they have some bodies over there that they can put into the departments without saddling one Minister with two departments, two very important departments I might add. I think the Minister has more than he can do to attend to the portfolio of Social Services and Rehabilitation, as that is quite a tall order in itself. The portfolio of Labour, while very closely related to that department, at the same time is a most important one and one, Mr. Chairman, in which the Government is finding themselves in a lot of difficulties, with strikes and what have you.

So I think that possibly they might do some thinking along those lines. But, Mr. Chairman, with regards to this proclaiming of the Act pertaining to equal pay for equal work, and I am not going to go into detail, for my colleague, the member for St. John's East, just have pointing out that

MR. HICKEY:

this is foolish. If there never have been a Tory law, then certainly this is one. However, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that it would be in the form that it is in. It is as a result of numerous recommendations by this party, by the present Opposition and by the people who have sat in Opposition. Since 1966, we have continuously pressed for this kind of Legislation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No credit goes to the converts, just the true blue Tories.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, we always credit the Government, we always credit the Government when they bring in some piece of Legislation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am talking about the converts, the converts.

MR. HICKEY: There is always room for a few more.

MR. SMALLWOOD: While the light holds out to burn.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, the difficult thing to understand is that the Government waited so long to proclaim this Act and, apparently, during this period did nothing or next to nothing to set their own House in order, and I refer to the Government employees. It is understandable, from the answers given by the Minister, that if he is not in a position to determine or to say just what effect this Legislation will have on those people, well then that is a straight answer at least. But, Mr. Chairman, the unforgiveable part, in my view, is that the Government has just let this Legislation go by the boards, as it were, all at this time. They must have known some time or another they were going to proclaim it and they have done nothing to determine, right in their own service, just what the effects would be, how many people it would affect or what the cost would be.

Mr. Chairman, while my colleagues and I were delighted to see the Act proclaimed and made law, on the other hand, I think we would have even preferred to see the ground work done first, before proclaiming it, so that when it would apply to industry there would be sufficient teeth in the Act so that some people would benefit from it. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister has any indication at all today as to how many people have been

MR. HICKEY:

affected by this Act to date, I believe it became law the first of April. Has there been any great number of people affected by it? Because, Mr. Chairman, as I see it, in the present Legislation there are enough holes in it to drive a truck through. When we talk about job descriptions, as it applies to industry, I think that the first thing should have been done, industry should have been requested to come up with job descriptions, before the proclaiming of this Act. Each employer should have been requested to determine just what the job descriptions of their employees were and, when that was done, Mr. Chairman, then this Act could be proclaimed. In my view this would have certainly made a much or at least have a much different effect on a great number of our people.

There is nothing, for example, to stop an employer today from changing the job description, changing the duties of an employee. I do not know of anything in this Act which prevents it. If the petition descriptions or job descriptions were established and pinned down before the proclaiming of this Act, then they could not have been changed or normally would not be changed. Mr. Chairman, the proclaiming of the Act was associated with an hon. Minister and an hon. member of this House who has gone to his final reward and rightly so, but it is unfortunate, Sir, because I believe, if that hon. gentleman sat in this House today, I doubt very much if this Act would be on the Statute in its present form. I think that he certainly did not envisage this kind of Legislation going into effect with little or no work done within the public service and with little or no preparation as it applies to private industry. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a political move on the part of Government. It is something which appeals to a great number of our people and I hope the Government are sincere in implementing this law and enforcing it and I hope that there are amendments, in due course, to strengthen this Legislation, to prevent an employer from taking advantage of employees, like he might have as it would apply under the

MR. HICKEY:

Act. As I see it at the moment, there is nothing to prevent an employer from doing just that and, therefore, I doubt very much, Mr. Chairman, if any great number of people would be affected, if there is any great gain to be gotten from this Legislation at the moment.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the hon. member for St. John's East Extern. I am sure that the hon. Premier has thought about a permanent Minister of Labour. Once in a while that thought must flash in his mind, Mr. Chairman. I do not mind looking after two departments. I like hard work, Mr. Chairman, and it is very interesting to be able to not only do something for the unemployed but to do something for the employed. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for St. John's East Extern completely misunderstands how the equal pay for equal work in the same establishment will be implemented. It is not the Government, Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize that. It is not the Government, it is not the Department of Labour that goes out and does the job classifications, provides business and industry with records. That is a job for each individual business and industry and the hon. Premier has given business and industry right across this Province, six months notice.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We said that.

MR. NEARY: Six months notice, September 1, that the Legislation concerning equal pay for equal work in the same establishment will come into effect in this Province. Now, Mr. Chairman, that should give every business, large and small, a chance to bring in the necessary records that they need and to reclassify, if they have to, the jobs in their plants. So far, Mr. Chairman, and I think the Premier indicated when he announced the proclamation of the Act that six months would be sufficient for anybody, any employer in Newfoundland to come to the Government, to come to the department with a complaint, if they had it, if they did not think the thing would work, if they had any recommendations for amendments, changes. But, to my knowledge,

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, we have not been approached by one employer, so far, in Newfoundland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course, we might do a little approaching to them after September 1 and get a few reports.

MR. NEARY: That is right and I want to assure this House now, Mr. Chairman, members of this House, that we intend to go ahead with the enforcement of the equal pay for equal work in the same establishment, as of September 1 and that the Provincial Department of Labour will have the machinery whereby employees, either as individuals or employees' organizations, will have a way to process their grievances and complaints, if they have any. As far as unemployment is concerned, Mr. Chairman, I think that matter has been dealt with and rightly so in the Parliament of Canada. I think that is where it belongs. We are very concerned, naturally we are very concerned in Newfoundland, over the high unemployment, but it is not the highest we have ever had in this Province, Mr. Chairman. It is 16.2 per-cent at the moment. The statement that I made the other day, just for the benefit of the hon. member for Burin, was that I thought that this figure of 16.2 per-cent was deceptive because it includes workers heretofore who were just considered as seasonal workers. For instance, fishermen, loggers, construction workers have always had to make enough in a few months to do them the year around, but now they are considered as being unemployed.

The next thing, Mr. Chairman, school teachers who are not teaching in the summer time will be lumped in with the unemployed. Well, university students, another example. Construction workers are supposed to earn enough in a few months to do them all year around, but there is no question, Mr. Chairman, that automation and new technology is having an impact on the work force, and I do not know what the answer to the unemployment situation is. Some experts say that it is the guaranteed annual income, reverse income tax. I think the hon. member asked me for my own personal opinion, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY:

I think that one of the solutions is to provide people with programmes that will enable people to earn rather than accept social assistance or unemployment insurance, a job. Give them a chance to earn their share of the gross national product or the gross provincial product and to be able to get all the good things that are pouring off the assembly lines today, Mr. Chairman, by the very automation that is putting these people out of work.

I would to inform the House, Mr. Chairman, that only this morning I discussed this possibility with the Federal Minister of Health and Welfare, Mr. Monroe, and his officials from Ottawa, and he promised me that he would give me an answer to work activities projects in June, when the Ministers of Welfare meet in Ottawa.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, on this question of enforcing the Minimum Wage Act: Obviously to enforce it, the machinery has to be there and there has to be a will to enforce it but will the hon. Minister indicate -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that tolerable?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is just lovely.

MR. HICKMAN: I would have worn my sunglasses today, Mr. Chairman, if I had the slightest indication that the hon. the Premier was going to come out in that blazing red shirt.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is decent, but that tie. It is an affront to the Liberal party.

MR. HICKMAN: It is away from the Orangeman and back to the hon. Minister, to the green. You know this is all fine, to say that it is going to be enforced, but the hon. Minister must have some thoughts as to how you are going to deal with alleged breaches of the equal pay for men and woman provisions of the Human Rights Legislation. Because what happens is you prosecute an employer and he comes in and says, "You are all wrong. I make my own classification in my factory and I have classified this lady here as doing work that is something less than that which is being done by one of my male employees." Now somebody

MR. HICKMAN:

has to make a judgement decision and it will not be the courts. Someone has to make a judgement decision on the classification within a particular factory or within a particular fish plant. There again you are going to have real problems, say on the cutting line. You know who is going to make that decision? Who is there? I am sure that no-one in this House, no hon. member of this House would go into a fish plant today and classify work. It is going to take someone with experience and no one who is experienced in classification, say in the car manufacturing industry, is going to be able to go into a fish plant and classify work, anymore than they can go into the hon. Minister of Public Works or a sausage factory and classify that work and job classifications.

What I would like to know is :

MR. HICKMAN: What does the Minister plan to do? I am not suggesting that he does not have the best intentions in the world, but I can see every case taken, being thrown out of Court for lack of classification, because the onus will be on the Crown to prove that the male and female employee were doing the same work but they were not getting equal pay. How does he propose doing it?

Other provinces have met this challenge. I would like to hear it because I do not know what they have done in other provinces but, obviously, they have had equal pay for men and women legislation in some provinces, now going back to ten years.

MR. HODDER: Shall -01 carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the Department of Labour has fifty-seven employees, according to the information we are given here, and the Minimum Wage Branch has six employees, now there is not a cent in the Estimates for additional employees for the Minimum Wage Branch to carry out this new policy of the Government - equal pay for men and women.

The Minister has not offered any explanation on how it is going to be done. The regulations have not been explained. It is obvious that the announcement was a sham and it is an attempt to delude the people of Newfoundland.

There are six employees in Minimum Wages, there were six there last year, six this year, yet a whole new policy has come into effect, and it is going to require a lot of checking done around the Province. There are going to be many complaints come in in six months time, that will have to be investigated, so apparently there is not even a person being taken on to enforce this particular phase of the Government's activities.

It is farcical for the Minister of the Government to ask us to believe that this is going to be a vigorous programme and that it is going to mean something, on these conditions. The Minister has no explanation for it. The Minister has no explanation for the atrocious wages that the Minister's Government is paying at Pleasantville, in the

MR. CROSBIE: Farm Products Corporation. The Minister has had no explanation as to what the position is with Government employees bargaining, They are in a twilight world, the Government employees and their collective bargaining—that has not been clarified.

The hospital workers are forgotten now. They are forgotten until the next strike occurs. Because, mark my words, if there is no change.....

MR. JONES: I think he must be completely misinformed when he says that the hospital workers are completely forgotten and that we will hear nothing more of them until there is another strike in the offing. This is completely misleading.

As a matter of fact, last week the negotiating team from the Treasury Board was in Grand Falls, they returned on Friday afternoon for the signing of the Police and Instructors agreement, they left at six o'clock to return to Grand Falls and, to the best of my knowledge, they are in Corner Brook today. It is misleading to say that they have been forgotten.

MR. CROSBIE: It is not misleading, Mr. Chairman, we are given no information, That is exactly what is wrong with the Government's collective bargaining process. No one is given any information on whether there is any progress at all or what is happening. There is nothing misleading about it. The Minister has now given us some information that is all it means.

The point I am making is that the hospital workers' legal position, collective bargaining with them, that position is unclear. It may be the Treasury Board is out meeting with them now, I am glad to hear the Minister say so. It took a long time for him to get up to say that. But they are in the same position. The basic position that was found a year ago has not changed. The collective bargaining process has not changed. So it is good to hear the Treasury Board is dealing with them but, whether they have got a right to strike or not, has not been clarified or changed, and the Government says nothing

MR. CROSBIE: about it.

Now there are two other points that the Acting Minister, and acting is the right designation in this case because he is only acting as the Minister, and it is not even a very good performance. He is going to have to improve quite a bit. He is going to have to get the Actor's Award for this portfolio.

There are two other points, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to raise and one is that it is reported, I think in connection with Come By Chance, this is on jobs now, the Premier said Friday there were four hundred and five people employed there—very welcome news, they have been waiting three years for this employment. But it is reported that the Government directed Procon, who are the prime contractor down there, that they were not to pay more than the prevailing rate of wages for Newfoundland on that job. They were forbidden to pay the various unions or people from the various unions, who worked down there, any higher than the presently prevailing rates of pay for construction workers in Newfoundland. This is reported and I wonder why the Government is taking that position, if the Minister can tell us something on that? First will he confirm whether that is so, and, secondly, why the Government is taking that position?

Number two, for example it is not usually the Government's job to tell any contractor what rates of pay they are to pay, they set the minimum wages, they set the minimum rates and then it is up to the employer and employees to negotiate the rest.

I understand that it has been stated that they cannot pay more than the prevailing rates at Come By Chance, because this is forbidden by the Government. Now whether that is true or not, the Minister can let us know. That is one point and, secondly, this House passed legislation, I think it was two or three years ago, that permitted at Churchill Falls, a contract to be negotiated, without any vote of the employees up there, what union they belonged to and so on. A five year contract, to be entered into by the building

MR. CROSBIE: trades, and the situation up there, as far as most of the men working there are concerned, seems to be quite unsatisfactory. They do not get any satisfaction from the unions up there when they are laid off or dismissed. At least that is what the twenty-five or thirty who contacted me in the last twelve or fourteen months say. They go to this union up there, with a grievance, and they are not processed. They lose their jobs up there and the union is not much interested in them. They say they cannot get any action from the Government up there either.

Now this House passed legislation that enabled the workers who went to Churchill Falls to be captives of the unions and the companies that entered into that agreement and, as far as I can see, Mr. Chairman, the Government has done precious little about seeing that these men, if they have a grievance, have it properly looked into. I have raised this issue in the House before, last year and this year. Little result, I just get scoffed at but the Minister can see some of the correspondence I have done. I got another letter yesterday, a man with the same experience. He says, in his letter, that he went to the union offices, here in St. John's, six times. In the afternoon here the union offices were not opened. That he complained at Churchill Falls, when he was dismissed, and they did nothing for him up there.

What is the Government doing about this? I have suggested several times that there should be some kind of _____ I know the Government has a representative up there, but some kind of an ombudsman set up just for contracts like this, so that any man with a complaint, forget the man on the scene at Churchill Falls, has somebody to go to in the Government service, who will investigate all this report, whether there is anything to it or not. They report that the unions there are not interested in their grievances. They have got their contract, it is in effect for five years. They are getting their union dues every month from the men up there and they just do not bother to go into their complaints, This is what they say. Now is the Minister having that checked out at all?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that Procon and the construction Unions are currently negotiating a collective agreement covering working conditions and rates of wages at the Come By Chance Oil Refinery project and I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that it was not the intention, at least the deliberate intention of the hon. member for St. John's West, to try to muddy up the water in any way.

The Government, at least the Department of Labour, has no idea what, eventually, what rates will be agreed on between Procon and the construction unions nor what their working conditions will be. I think it is very unfair, Mr. Chairman, and, as I say, I am sure that the hon. member did not mean to muddy up the water while these negotiations are in progress.

MR. CROSBIE: I am muddying up nothing. Has the Government made any directive that they are to be paid no more than the prevailing rate set elsewhere in Newfoundland? That is the question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the construction unions are also negotiating at the moment with the construction trades and I understand that the electricians, for instance, have been locked out, that there have been a number of strikes in the construction industry recently. I have no idea what rates of wages have been agreed on or what the IBW or the electrical contractors will agree on. I have no idea what Procon and the other construction unions will agree on. But one thing that I know that Government has impressed on Procon, Mr. Chairman, and that is the fact that there should be no delay in the work at Come By Chance because they have been unable to reach an agreement with the Unions. The Government is watching it very carefully and we...

MR. CROSBIE: Did the Premier, on behalf of the Government, tell Procon they could not pay more than the prevailing rate?

MR. NEARY: We have told Procon, at least, Mr. Chairman, this is to my knowledge, we have told Procon that we do not want any delay in the work at Come By Chance.

MR. CROSBIE: That is not the question.

MR. NEARY: As far as collective agreements on construction, on big construction projects, are concerned, Mr. Chairman, my understanding again is that the unions like this set up.

You know, who am I to say that they should not have joint collective agreements on these projects? In Churchill Falls I think it worked out excellently Mr. Chairman, in spite of what the hon. member said. I think that is borne out by the fact that the Churchill Falls Hydro-Project is running almost a year ahead of schedule. They have had complete harmony and labour peace in Churchill Falls, Mr. Chairman. There have been some gripes. I think the bugs have been ironed out and all the reports that I get from Churchill Falls are that everything is working out satisfactorily. They had an excellent collective working agreement with the unions at Churchill Falls, Mr. Chairman. I would say one of the finest in Canada, one of the finest. Now whether certain individual members were able to process their grievances or not, I do not know. There are bound to be some complaints. Nothing is perfect. But overall I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee would have to agree that the contract, the collective agreement at Churchill Falls, was a good one. The one at Stephenville is a good one. They did have some difficulty in the beginning but the problems were overcome and everything is working smoothly in Stephenville and I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that when Procon is able to come to an agreement with the construction unions, here on the Avalon Peninsula, that things will work out just fine at Come By Chance also.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the question has not been answered. I understand that Procon stated that they have been directed by the Government not to pay on that job in excess of the prevailing local wage rates in the building trades. Therefore they cannot pay.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is utterly untrue.

MR. CROSBIE: That is what I want to find out. The Premier says it is utterly untrue so then we can take it that this is not so, that there has not been a directive.

MR. NEARY: They are negotiating now.

MR. CROSBIE: Right. The Premier has answered the question now and says it is not true. So we will have to accept that.

The other point is, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister's statement about Churchill Falls really begs a question. Nobody is saying that the agreement is not a good one, the collective agreement itself.

What is wrong with the situation is that, while this is fine for the Union, it is fine for the employer, it is not fine for the individual member, because they are completely at the mercy of the employer plus the union. Their rights, these between the Union and the company, are minimal, practically nil. The employee who gets discharged from his job and he thinks he is discharge unjustly cannot get anyone to properly pursue the matter for him. He gets shipped out of Churchill Falls and he finds he has no recourse, and their complaint is that the union is not carrying out what they should be carrying out, that is to see that the rights of their members are properly pursued and protected. This is only a natural human tendency because the union does not have to worry that at the end of the year there is going to be another vote and some other union may come in. There can be no other union go in there. That was the weakness of that legislation, when it was passed, and it is the weakness now. But I gather from the Minister that he is quite satisfied with the situation and he thinks it is going all right and sees no need to change anything, so that is his position.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Mr. Chairman, the high ranking officials, the highest ranking officials of Procon came in to see me the other day, I think about seven of them, to report to me, as they do from time to time, This is the largest number that did come in to see me since the

MR. SMALLWOOD: signing of the agreement, when there were even more. They came in to report to me on the progress they were making, because I had been complaining very bitterly, very, very bitterly indeed, and at the highest possible levels in that Company, about their slowness in getting going. So they came in the other day, with the glad news that they were going to get going now, right away, starting engaging men and they were negotiating union contracts, and I said; "Well, that is just fine, I take it you have been to the Department of Labour," He said; "no," I said; "what?" He said; "no." I said, "you have not been in touch with the Department of Labour;" He said; "no I have not," I said; "you had better get cracking and get in touch with them. We have a Department of Labour in this Province and you had better get in touch with them, and do not ignore them."

I do not know whether they have completed their negotiations with the unions. They have not? The Minister of Labour tells me that they have not.

Now with regard to project labour contracts, I am a very strong believer in them. I am a very, very strong believer indeed. Now it does not matter perhaps on a small project. If a man takes a contract to build a house, and if he has three strikes against him by his employees, in the course of construction of that one house, it is bad for him but it is not so terribly bad overall. But if you have \$1,000 million, a billion dollar industrial project in Churchill Falls, and it takes ten years to construct it, a ten year construction programme, yesterday Mr. Mulholland, William Mulholland, the head of BRINCO and the head of Churchill Falls, spent the whole afternoon with me until six o'clock, at my home, yesterday, Sunday afternoon. He flew down from Montreal to have a chat with me, which he does from time to time. I was interested to hear from him that this fall, this coming fall, they will be producing power, but that is unofficial, it is next spring, the spring of next year, about a year from now or a bit less than a year

MR. SMALLWOOD: from now that they will be officially producing power. But actually, on the first of July, I am to perform some function there that will start the building up of the biggest lake this side of Lake Ontario. It will be the highest one of the Great Lakes of North America. That will be one of the main sources of water that will start backing up then, and building up and building up to a vast lake.

Five years more they will be working on the construction of Churchill Falls, yet another five years, 1976 I think it is, another five years of construction on the Upper Churchill, not counting the Lower Churchill, where there will be another \$600 million spent on construction. Another four or five thousand men and another five or six years of construction, not counting the additional five years there still will be on the Upper Churchill.

Now is it conceivable to a rational man, unless he is a fool, an utter fool or a villain, a scoundrel, unless a man is a scoundrel or a fool, is it conceivable, can anyone even begin to imagine a ten or twelve year construction programme, liable, with say sixteen unions in there and any one union, say the Bakers' Union, baking bread, say ten bakers, they have a strike and everybody closes down and not cross the line. Can you imagine that? Any one of sixteen unions, at any moment, call a strike, put up a picket line and close down a ten or twelve year construction programme, what kind of insanity is that? The alternative is that.

MR. CROSBIE: No it is not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the only alternative.

MR. CROSBIE: The middle way.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no middle way. There is no middle way.

So what did they do, in fact? They called in the sixteen unions and they negotiated a labour contract to last the whole life of the project, and signed it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In it they provided wage scales for every classification of worker. In it they provided automatic built in pay increases. That is why there has been no strike. They began with a higher rate of pay and I think it is every six months there is an increase, an automatic increase. Is it six months? I think it is every half year.

AN HON. MEMBER: Every year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Ever year is it? Every year there is an automatic increase, That was provided long ago when they were negotiating the agreement, five years ago, and that is good for another five years, ten years, with an automatic built in increase. Now by this means the Company knows what the power is going to cost them when it is finally constructed. They have got to know that, have they not?

How could they make a contract to sell power, say six million horse power of electricity, how could they make a contract to sell it at a price, a firm price? How could they do that if they did not know what the power was going to cost them, cost themselves to produce? The cost of producing power is the cost of installing the cannals, the dams, the generators, the turbines and so on, they have to borrow that money, They borrow that money, they spend it and that is the cost. Now how much have they got to borrow? That depends on what wages they have to pay. It also depends, of course, on the cost of the generators and the cost of the turbines and the cost of any other installations they have to buy or get made or get manufactured, the cost of bringing it in, the cost of installing it and getting it going. Largely the cost of labour and, if they do not have firm, ascertainable, foreseeable labour costs throughout the whole period of the contract, if they do not have that, how can they know what the power is going to cost them? If they do not know what the power is going to cost them, how can they make contracts for its sale? If they do not have contracts for its sale, who is going to lend them the money? They have to borrow

MR. SMALLWOOD: hundreds of millions of dollars, hundreds piled on hundreds of millions. Who is going to lend them money to put in a big electric installation unless they have a sale made of the power? Not only a sale made but a firm price and not only a firm price but knowing what it will cost so that they will make a profit. They have got to make a profit or they cannot pay back the loan, can they? They cannot pay interest on the loan, can they? They cannot pay back the principle, can they? Unless they do it out of a profit and the profit is the difference between the price they get for the power and what it cost them to produce the power. What it cost to produce the power is life and death and, in that life and death picture, the cost of labour is everything, so they have to have a project contract.

Now the unions, sixteen unions, thought so, They agreed, the Company agreed, the Newfoundland Government agreed. Who disagreed? One man, one man, a member of this House, that is all, no one else. He sat over here at that time, he disagreed with the idea, he disagreed with the idea of a project contract covering the life of the project, ten years of construction. With good wages built in, good conditions built in, with an automatic increase in pay every year, built in all in the agreement, all provided for so there would be no strikes, so there would be no stopages, no lock-outs, no rows, so that the greatest hydro project in the world's history, in the history of mankind, could be built successfully and profitably, it could not be done without that kind of an agreement. When you get that kind of an agreement the danger is that you have about sixteen fat cats, sixteen unions, with a ten year agreement, built in escalation of salary rates, fat cats, they grow fat and sleek and smug and self satisfied, That is the danger, and we have had that. I did not hear the hon. gentleman.

MR. CROSBIE: Like a Government that has been in power too long.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. We are very sleek and fat cats.

MR. CROSBIE: Self-satisfied.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes self-satisfied, no ambition, no desire to drive her, we would not take any chances. We do not gamble. We take no chances in this Government. Fat cats, sleek and self-satisfied, smug and complacent, we never take any chances. We do not gamble because we are so smug and complacent. But if you get a union with a ten year contract, and they are going to collect the dues and the unions have a check off and every man who goes to work is a member of the union and his Union dues, the Union does not have to send a collector around to him every month and dun him and torment him and be a nuisance to him and collect his dues and the next month have to go back again and go through all the trouble of collecting the dues, no nonsense like that, the

Mr. Smallwood.

company deducts the dues and writes a cheque and passes it over to the union. So with a contract for ten years and the dues deducted by the company and passed over to them all the time, the danger is - this is a danger and I have said it before in this House, not just today - I have said it before. I said it to the unions. I have complained to the unions, when Newfoundlanders have come to me and I have said to them; "well what the devil, why did you not go to the union? Do you remember the union?" "Oh, yes sir." Well I said; "Why did you not go and see the union delegate?" "Well I do not know." Nine times out of ten, Mr. Chairman, they do not, they do not go to the union delegate. Then I would say to them; "well then, all right, did you go and see the Newfoundland Government's representative?" "No, sir I did not go." They come in to see me. They come in from Churchill Falls. They come into Confederation Building. Right there in Churchill Falls the Government have a man stationed, whose job is just one simple thing, to receive complaints of Newfoundlanders and go down to the company and straighten it out with the company, with the employer. We put him in there. We made him independent of everybody down there by giving him his own house. The Newfoundland Government put a house there for him and his wife. He represents the Government, so he would be independent of everyone. But they do not bother to go and see him. They do not bother to go and see the union delegate. They will get fired. They will lose their jobs. They get on a plane and they will come home. When they are home a few days, they come and see me or write a letter to the hon. gentleman across. That is just stupid, is it not? Is that not stupid? It is stupid not to use the unions. On the other hand it is pretty stupid of the unions. It is pretty stupid on their part to become fat cats, smug and fat and sleek and oily and greasy and lazy and just collect the dues every month, without even having to lift a little finger to do it.

Soon, Mr. Chairman, those unions will expect the company to come over and bring the cheque over to them. Now that is the only argument there is or can be against the project or a project contract.

Mr. Smallwood.

Now they are trying to get the same thing at Come-by-Chance. They are going to be two years, two and a-half years building this oil refinery, and the firm that is going to build the great wharf, three-quarters of a mile long, that is part of 300 men, that will be two and a-half years. In fact it is going to be a race to get that wharf built in time for when the oil refinery begins to receive its first big tanker load of oil. They have to fill up the big, huge tanks on the tank farm. There will be a number of ship-loads of oil, I suppose, tanker-loads of oil, arriving in Come-by-Chance before the refinery is actually on stream. So that wharf will actually have to be needed and will have to be built a bit before the oil refinery is completed. There again, during that two or two and a-half years, they want a project contract. Now you get a paper mill starting there, which I hope to see before very long. That will take two years, two and a-half years to build. In fact there are two mills that they are talking of building. They are talking of a 600 tons a day newsprint paper mill and a 600 tons a day second mill, bleached sulphate pulp. Well that is two mills. We are talking here of something in the order of \$140 million or \$150 million, two big mills, a paper mill and a pulp mill, two separate mills. That is two and a-half years of construction as well.

Well this would run altogether - you might not have this number at one time but there will be, I would say, from last Monday, a week ago today, until the oil refinery is completed and until the paper mill is completed and until the big pier is completed, I would say that probably 8,000 to 10,000 men will go through the ropes out there. They will work and be fired or quit or get a job somewhere else. There will probably be the best part of 10,000 men. There will be a number of unions involved. There will be the electricians' union, the plumbers' union, the pipe fitters' union, the carpenters' union, the plasterers' union, the labourers' union, the iron and steel workers' union, the riggers, the painters' union, a whole host of unions will be involved. Can Newfoundland, I ask this question, can this Province, the half million souls in this Province, with the stake they have in Come-by-Chance, can we

Mr. Smallwood

afford for any union to tie it up, this one for a week, that one for a week another one for a week, never knowing what moment there is going to be a close-down? Can we afford that? Are we that rich? Not on your life! Not on your life! Not on our lives! We cannot afford it. So the sensible thing, the rational thing, the level-headed thing is to have union agreements covering the whole life of the construction job. Is that not sensible? Now if you have a union contract, a bunch of unions together, a - what do you call it? When you have a lot of unions all joined together to make one contract with the employer, what do you call that? Well it is an association of unions. If you have that and you make the agreement, they are not going to be satisfied. Nobody is going to be satisfied to have a wage rate written in now that is going to be unchanging for twelve months and then for another twelve months and then maybe the best part of another twelve months - you know, twenty-four or thirty months. No union is going to sign an agreement and say this is the rate of pay for these thirty months. There is going to be built in escalation. There has to be. The employers, the contractors must provide for that. I have no doubt in this wide world that Procon - at this moment, are building four oil refineries in the world - four. They have built dozens. I have no doubt that they have provided in their expenses for escalation of wage rates. Of course they have. These will be reflected in the labour contracts. I am ashamed to be saying this. I feel ashamed to be saying what is so obvious. It does not need to be said. You know, if you do not like the Government, if you just simply do not like it, if you have no use for it, if you do not like the smell of them, if you do not like the look of them, if you do not like the sound of them, if you do not like anything about them, if that is the way you feel, you can find all kinds of ways to twist and twist and put a little pin prick here and a little bit of tail twisting there, you know, and you can make it sound like the utterance of a statesman.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, before we..

MR. SMALLWOOD: I thought that that would get him up.

MR. CROSBIE: No, that did not get me up. I enjoyed the Premier's performance. It was a most interesting performance.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He did not enjoy it a year and a-half or two years ago down in the arena. He did not enjoy it one bit.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, I thought that was hilarious too, especially the Premier crawling behind that band. It was quite humorous. But, Mr. Chairman, everything the Premier has said...

MR. SMALLWOOD: I came in ahead of the band, not behind it.

MR. CROSBIE: Well you should have been behind. You will be this fall.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes?

MR. CROSBIE: Now, Mr. Chairman, ninety per cent of what the Premier said I can agree with. In fact, I supported that legislation when it went through in 1968. I was sitting across the House then. But the point the Premier is missing, as he well knows, is not that you have not got to have this kind of contracts for these long projects like Churchill Falls, what the Premier is forgetting is that the individual disappears when he is put up against a big union and a big company. That is the problem. It is probably inevitable that you have to have these kinds of contracts. But what happens to the individual? He is up against the company and the big union who together the company is enjoying the labour peace and getting the job done, the union is enjoying the collecting of union dues and wants peace and quiet and does not want to be bothered with a lot of work and the individual, who gets fired unjustly or he thinks it is unjustly, is stuck. He has no one to turn to.

MR. SMALLWOOD: So what do we do? Do we do away with the union?

MR. CROSBIE: I was just going to suggest what the Premier should do.

Now the Premier said that at Churchill Falls they have this gentleman from the Department of Labrador Affairs there. That is true, but most of the men do not go to him or do not know he is there or they are not alert. They are not

Mr. Crobbie

on to everything, as the Premier knows. They are ordinary working men. They are not aware of all their rights and what is being done. What I would like to see the Government do, not only for Churchill Falls but for these others - we passed the legislation that enables these things to happen. I feel that the Government (i.e., a man goes to the Premier or he comes to me or some other member of the House) should have a team. They should say; "all right you say that you have been dealt with unjustly by the union, by the company. Now we have Mr. so and so, who is a man experienced in processing grievances and union matters and labour. We have a lawyer who he can refer to, if he wants legal opinions. I will send you to him. He will look into this matter. He will advise us, the Department of Labour, whether you have been treated unjustly by the union or by the company or both or neither. They will settle the matter for you. All right, you say you are up against the union and they will not help you. This is what they tell me and this is what they must tell the Premier. They tell other members also. The company, of course, dismissed you and you will say unjustly.

"The union will not process a grievance or you are going to the unions office and they are shut. The last letter I got said that the man went six afternoons to their office here in St. John's and it was shut every afternoon. This is what you say, all right. We have somebody we can refer you to, to check all this out. If there is anything in what you say, he will see your grievances processed. 'If there is nothing to what you say, he will tell you so and he will tell us so and that is it.'" Now that is what I suggest to the hon. the Premier what the Government should do because of all these complaints, and they must amount in a year to a few hundred. Some of them are bound to be justified. I mean the union has got a five year agreement or ten years. The union officials are men like you and I. They do not want to be working twelve and fourteen hours a day processing grievances. So they do not pay enough attention to it. They know that they have

Mr. Crosbie.

the dues coming in every year anyway. Therefore, it is the Government's responsibility, who has made this possible for the House of Assembly to pass this, that made possible these contracts. We should be doing more about seeing to it that there are no individual injustices. I am sure now that there are. The union is necessary to act for the employees. We now have big unions, Mr. Chairman and big employers. Anybody who reads the law cases, Berchard verses Tunney, and there are all kinds of others and any lawyer who has any people like this for clients, who have come up against trouble with the union, will tell you that a man is just as much at the mercy of the union: today, if he strikes an official who is a wrong-headed, arrogant official, he is just as much at their mercy as he is at the mercy of the employer. This is a situation where we permit these long-term contracts to be entered into. We should do more about it than we are doing at the moment. That is what I suggest to the Premier and the Minister of Labour that in addition to our man at Churchill Falls that we have another man here in St. John's, a man who is experienced in union matters, experienced in processing grievances, to whom we can send those people, with freedom to refer to a lawyer if he needs legal advice, who takes these things down and reports on them. I think, if that were done, this might be the way to get around this problem.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, on another point: We have going on in the Province now almost identical construction jobs some of which are being paid for under cost-sharing. I understand that these jobs are subject to the Minimum Wage Act of Canada. The Federal Government insist that Federal Government minimum wages be paid to any person working on these cost-sharing projects. Then, almost side by side, you have a Provincial project going on, road construction is the best example I can think of. You have a DREE road going on the Burin Peninsula and you have a Provincial road under construction in Trinity South, both of the same standard, same design, close to it anyway, certainly the men are doing the same job. My understanding is that the wage

Mr. Hickman.

rate is quite different on both jobs, for the simple reason that the Federal Government insists that their minimum wages prevail on anything in which they are involved; whereas, the Provincial Minimum Wage Act, which is considerably below the one from Ottawa, prevails on provincial jobs. You have a great disparity of wages being paid between two men working on roads in Newfoundland, both doing precisely the same job.

Now could the hon. minister confirm: (1) .

MR. NEARY: All taxpayers.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, all taxpayers' money, the same taxpayers, to some extent anyway. Would the hon. minister confirm that that is a factual statement? Secondly, could he give the committee an indication as to how widespread it is?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the hon. member that he ask the hon. Minister of Highways and the hon. Minister of Public Works when we are doing their estimates, because the Provincial Department of Labour does not let Provincial contracts of any kind.

MR. HICKMAN: The Department of Labour is responsible for the enforcement of the Minimum Wage Act.

MR. NEARY: That is right, but that is not the question that the hon. member asked me.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, before we let that go, probably the minister might respond to this: A number of arguments can be made for increasing the minimum wage in Newfoundland. There is no doubt about that. There are possibly some arguments why it cannot be increased, in terms of the inability of some firms or some businesses to be able to pay a higher rate. Certainly, Sir, there is no argument against the Government, on government projects, projects which have been paid for from the public chest, there is no argument why the Government Minimum Wage could not be raised at that particular instance. I am not suggesting that all the fish plants or all the farmers or others across the Province have the ability to pay. Chances are some of them do and some of them do not. I would have to have some research

Mr. Collins.

done on it before I can make up my own mind. But there is no doubt at all that the Government should, on government sponsored projects, raise the rate to \$1.50, \$1.75 whatever it might be. Did the minister ever think about this? Is he willing to take this to Cabinet, to see if he can get a decision on it?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I have thought of it a number of times, as well as every other member of this House, as I assume. One of the first recommendations that I will be making to the new Minister of Labour, when he is appointed, is to carry out a census of all employers in Newfoundland to find out certain information - the number of employees they have under payroll, the rates of wages they are paying, etc., etc., The Government do not want to rock the boat, Mr. Chairman. I do not think we have sufficient information at our finger tips, at the moment, to say whether or not the Minimum Wage should be increased to \$1.50, \$1.75 or \$2.00 an hour. I think we need to do some research. I will certainly be consulting with the new minister and recommending to him that these be one of the first things he does, in his capacity as Minister of Labour, that is to take a census of all employers in Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. COLLINS: What about Government financed projects? That is another field, but whether the businesses can afford it or not, does not enter the picture. The Government should not be letting out projects, as the hon. member for Burin just mentioned. Road work is a good case in point where, if it is a Provincial contract, the men are paid \$1.25 per hour. If it is a Federal cost-sharing arrangement, then the Federal minimum wage rate must apply. Now local businesses and industry are not involved there.

MR. NEARY: No.

MR. COLLINS: But the Provincial Government are involved.

MR. NEARY: That is a matter which is beyond control in the Department of Labour, believe me.

MR. COLLINS: I do not see why Mr. Chairman that the Department of Labour..

MR. NEARY: The only thing we can do is enforce the minimum..

MR. COLLINS: I do not see why the Department of Labour is responsible for the regulations and so on with regard to minimum wages.

MR. NEARY: The only thing that the Provincial Department of Labour can do is enforce the minimum wage regulations. If the contractors are paying the minimum wage then you know, what can we do?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, just before 01 carries, there is another point that I would like to ask the minister. Last year, around about this time, there were reports circulating to the effect that there were differences over in Holiday Inn on Portugal Cove Road, specifically as between certain employers and employees, who wanted to join the union, and Atlific Limited that runs the Holiday Inns. There were persistent reports to the effect that certain employees had been laid off because of union activities. The question has been asked of the Government, as to whether or not there were any complaints with respect to unfair labour practices on the part of Atlific Limited or Holiday Inn, to which, I believe, a negative answer was received. As everybody knows, the requirement of taking steps under the unfair labour practices, I think, requires a complaint to the Minister of Labour first. But now, in view of the fact that Holiday Inn is a pseudo-Government organ, Holiday Inn itself is put there by the Government, in effect the plant is owned there by the Government. It is a Crown corporation operated by the Atlific Limited. I wonder could the minister inform whether there were any investigations, with respect to these reports, and what the results of these investigations were? I would have thought that if these reports were circulating, (the minister is nodding his head. I think he is aware of these reports) if they had come to the notice of the officials of the Department of Labour, it being a Government corporation, that the Government would have taken action on its own initiative.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if every department of Government had to chase down rumours and report, we would have to double the number or probably we would have

Mr. Neary.

to have ten times as many Civil Servants. We do not go looking for trouble, Mr. Chairman. We do not track down rumours. There is a procedure that workers have to carry out in order to lay a complaint. There was no complaint made in this particular case. I answered a question already, earlier in the session of the House. There was no official complaint, therefore there was no need to investigate.

MR. CROSBIE: On 16-02-01, I have a question on this vote

Mr. Chairman. I notice, in the salary detailed estimates, that there is \$2,500 allowed for a special allowance to Assistant Deputy Minister.

I was just wondering what that is. Why would the Assistant Deputy Minister have a special allowance?

MR. NEARY: What was the number again, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CROSBIE: It is General Office, Salaries, page 89, Salary Estimates, Special Allowance to Assistant Deputy Minister, \$2,500.

MR. NEARY: I will get the answer to that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: On 01, Mr. Chairman, This is the Minimum Wage Board.

I would not mind asking the minister: What does the Minimum Wage Board do exactly? What is their function?

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, for the information of the committee, the Chairman of the Minimum Wage Board is Mr. W. G. Adams, LL.D. The members are: Reginald Norman, he is the employer representative of St. John's; W. T. Walsh is the employee representative of St. John's' secretary is Mr. Cyril Churchill, Department of Labour. Remuneration, is that the Chairman gets \$50 per day, while the board is in session. The members get \$35 a day, while the board is in session. The secretary receives no additional remuneration beyond his voted salary. They hold office during pleasure. They held one meeting since April 1, 1970, up to the present time. The principal function of the Minimum Wage Board, Mr. Chairman, is to investigate rates of pay, terms and conditions of employment in any trade, industry, business or occupation,

Mr. Neary.

in any area of the Province and to make recommendations to the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council and to review minimum wage orders at least every two years.

MR. CROSBIE: Have they made any recommendations in the last year?

MR. NEARY: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: The Labour Relations Board, what is the salary of the Chairman?

MR. NEARY: The Labour Relations Board, remuneration of the Chairman is \$3,000 per annum.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, on this Labour Relations Board, I believe this board meets once a month. I think this is the time, and it meets here in St. John's. I was wondering whether the time has now come or whether any consideration has been given to possibly having the Labour Relations Board meet in other parts of the Province as well, such as Corner Brook, Central Newfoundland and in Labrador? The other question is this: Other provinces, specifically I can think of Ontario and Nova Scotia, have what they call a 'style', as construction sections of their Labour Relations Board, which are available for speedy certification of unions, particularly with respect to construction jobs that are going to last for only a short period of time. This situation has pertained and will pertain, particularly in the Labrador section of the Province, where there is a lot of industrialization going on. I feel really that it is time perhaps for the Department of Labour to look to the possibility of appointing a construction section, a division or a section of the Labour Relations Board, which will travel to various parts of the Province, specifically for the purpose of considering applications by contractors and sub-contractors of jobs that are going to last a very short period of time. A situation presently exists, if you take a sub-contractor in Churchill Falls or a contractor in Churchill Falls on a job, the employees of that unit, by the time their application is heard and considered by the Labour Relations Board here in St. John's, the job may be

finished or substantially finished so that certification to them is useless. So I wonder then, would the Minister inform as to whether or not the Government have given any consideration to this aspect.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has made a very valid point. As the Committee can see, the Labour Relations Board and its members have been extremely active serving management and labour in this Province in the last year or so, in a semi-judicial capacity. They are handling an increasing volume of work in an extremely efficient manner, Mr. Chairman, and only recently I had representation from the construction unions and they asked me to place before the Labour Relations Board certain matters, which I did about two weeks ago. I am waiting now for the reaction of the members of the Board on their proposals.

MR. MARSHALL: So we may have a construction -

MR. NEARY: Well, it is quite likely. I could not say for sure, Mr. Chairman, because as I say we treat the Labour Relations Board as a semi-judicial body and they run their own affairs. They go along with the idea, if they want to visit other parts of the Province, they have a right to do that. We will just have to wait until we get the reaction of the Chairman and the members of the Board.

MR. MARSHALL: Can I say on that, Mr. Chairman, just before it carries, that the Labour Relations Board is well known to most members on this side of the House and they are very efficient and a good Board. The composition and the membership is excellent. However, despite the fact that they may be a quasi or semi-judicial body, I do not agree with what the minister says; that they are going to determine. They should determine exactly what they are going to do. It is obviously a function of the Minister of Labour, in the Government itself, to set up the proper labour relations climate in this Province, and it is, I am glad to see that discussions are taking place, with a view to expanding the operations of the Labour Relations Board, but I want to underline the point that I disagree entirely with the Minister when he says that he is going to more or less leave it to the Labour Relations Board

itself. It has to be a matter which government is going to consider and government implement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall -02 carry? _03.

MR. EARLE: -03 Mr. Chairman. \$100 token vote, what is this for? Why should there be a token vote for the Workmen's Compensation Board?

MR. NEARY: It is a token vote of \$100, Mr. Chairman, the Department pays the excess over fifty dollars for blind workmen's claims. Only five claims so far. One for twenty-two dollars, 1959-61; For \$233. 1961-62. One for \$210, '64,-65, one for \$292 '66-67. One for \$2,083 in -69-70. The note here says, "if Accident Fund short of money, the Lieutenant Governor in Council may direct that that money be advanced to the Board," and it is repayable. Nothing has ever been required.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, while we are on the question of the Workmen's Compensation Board, I would like to make a few comments particularly as they relate to St. Lawrence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I think the general comments were in order under the first heading. All the members spoke rather fully on that. We are going down now to a particular item, I think I am going to have to ask members to be a little more relevant to the particular vote that is before the Committee, as we go down through the items. We cannot have a general discussion on each one. The practise was that we would have our general discussion on the first item. I notice there is a tendency on the part of members to depart from that.

MR. HICKMAN: I am going to restrict myself, Mr. Chairman, completely to the Workmen's Compensation Board; the manner it is performing its duties and its functions. My experience has been related to a large extent, almost exclusively, with its dealing with claims arising out of industrial diseases in St. Lawrence. I want to relate to the Committee something that I would find almost incredible, if it had not happened and if it were not true, in so far as the operation of the Workmen's Compensation Board is concerned.

A few years ago, I do not know how long ago, there was a gentleman from St. Lawrence who received what was called - it is referred to down there as a bad x-ray. He was obliged to quit work in the mine, This invariably happens, This does not necessarily mean the man cannot work. He cannot work underground. But, if he has been a miner all his life, chances are he is not employable. Some of them try and do some work in - one man I know started a little shop, They potter around. They may go on for ten years enjoying reasonably good health. In any event, this man moved to Vancouver, with his family. I do not know what he did out there but, last year, 1970, he suddenly realized that lung cancer set in. He came back to Newfoundland, His claim has been well documented, There was no question at all that this lung cancer had been contracted during his employment in the mines at St. Lawrence. He came into St. John's, Workmen's Compensation benefits were paid almost immediately. He underwent cobalt treatment, during the first part of the year, here in St. John's. Then he was sent home, obviously with a life expectancy of only two months. He died. He did not die of lung cancer, he probably would have lived another two weeks. What actually happened, he had a heart attack, That is what he died of. That is what was shown on the death certificate. It was obvious that the heart attack had been brought on and caused, to this comparatively young man, by the tremendous suffering that he had undergone.

Immediately that happened, the Workmen's Compensation Board cut off Workmen's Compensation payments. They said to this lady; "your husband's death was not attributable to an industrial disease or silicosis or lung cancer." She followed the same course, as most people do in that. They do not rush around, immediately going to their member or going to the lawyer or going to the Union President. She tried to carry on negotiations herself. Eventually she got a letter, and I have it in front of me now, I do not know if we should read these letters, but, anyway one paragraph says: "The information, we now have on file, indicates, without any doubt, that silicosis was not the cause of your husband's death. even though he was affected with

that condition, to some degree." She was then told, you know; this she could not comprehend, nor could the doctor's comprehend, particularly the local doctor.. She was then told, (she relates this herself, she related it publicly in a letter to the editor) that maybe the husband's body should be exhumed, so that they could have a further examination carried out, to ascertain what was the cause of the death of this husband. Having gone, she went through and gives a catalogue of steps that she took on her own. She tried the Minister of Health. She tried the Premier, they referred her to the Workmen's Compensation Board, she was getting nowhere.

Eventually she came to see me. (Now I am not going to read the rest of the letter). The thing that disturbed me was that this decision could be made when the Compensation payments were long gone. You know the natural reaction from anyone, knowing what this man had suffered, was that, even though he did technically have a heart attack the moment before he expired, that obviously he is receiving treatment, that you do not cut this off. You do not write a woman and tell her to have her husband's body exhumed. For the first time I can say, without any doubt at all, Mr. Chairman, that I received proof positive of the validity of the Legislation that was passed in this House in the '66-'67 session, giving Right of Appeal from a decision of the Workmen's Compensation Board. I said then and I say it now that the only people who can ever benefit from the Right of Appeal, from a decision of the Workmen's Compensation Board, the only people who will ever avail are workmen and their dependants. The minute I asked the Workmen's Compensation Board for a copy of the evidence and a written decision, activity broke loose in no uncertain terms, Eventually the decision was reversed. I do not think that that is the type of interpretation of the Workmen's Compensation Laws of this Province that we are expected to receive. There were some other overtones and disappointing attitudes that I might just as well not refer to. I simply say this; I do not care how a Board is appointed, whether it is the Workmen's Compensation Board or the Utilities Board or any other Board, if a man has qualifications (and he is friendly with the administration, more power to him) then administration should appoint

them. When once they are appointed then, in my opinion, they must show complete and absolutely unbiased treatment to any person over whom they have a jurisdiction regardless of who makes the representation. They do not do that. They are not going to maintain protection that, in my opinion, commissions and public servants should have in the advent of a change of administration. I am not satisfied at all, I have a fair amount of evidence in the files here and down here on the floor. I am not satisfied that the people, at least the ones that come from the St. Lawrence area, have been getting the fair unbiased treatment to which they are entitled.

Then again, Mr. Chairman, still on the Workmen's Compensation Board, last year there was an announced policy that there would be a further appeal. You recall Mr. Chairman there was -

AN.HON.MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR.HICKMAN: Right. Again I do not believe, from what a workman tells me, that the results are going to be very satisfactory. At least he came away quite frustrated and quite displeased. Another man who has a bad x-ray, if he walked in here today, looks as healthy as any of us. You would never believe there was anything wrong with him. But, he went before this Board, the Board of Referees, the first Board that was set up, two years ago. They are all doctors and obviously they have to rely on technical evidence, medical evidence, professional evidence that come before them. They insist that these men undergo a biopsy. The simple fact is that no miner in St. Lawrence will undergo a biopsy, and I do not blame them. The record is clear. I have a letter here from one of the officials of the Workmen's Compensation Board, confirming that when once they undergo a biopsy, (let me read just this paragraph) "...the miners will not accept this procedure, as referring to biopsy to establish the presence or otherwise of the disease, claiming that in every case where the method was used the man died within two or three months." Whether or not it is true is immaterial. They simply refuse this form of diagnosis. I do not blame them. The record, as to what happens following a biopsy, has been pretty frightening and they are prepared to take the chances.

So then last year, rather than to take the individual cases, I remind this Committee that the Royal Commission, in this recommendation to Government as related to the Workmen's Compensation Board and to relieve the Workmen's Compensation Board of some of its problems, as there were problems created as a result of certain men working in the mines prior to the passing of the Act. There were other who worked with this old company, the Seibert Company, and accurate records on their terms of employment were not available. So the Royal Commission dealt with each case individually, recommended yes or no. These recommendations have not been accepted. Instead we had this other recommendation, that there would be set up an appeal, a further appeal, a Medical Appeal Board appealing from the other Board. But this Medical Appeal Board runs smack up against - precisely, the only difference is that the Workmen now has a nominee, the Board has a nominee, the two of them select the Chairman. But they too run smack up against the same problem as the Board of Referees, namely; that they want the technical, professional evidence, showing beyond doubt that a man is suffering from lung cancer. They cannot get it without a biopsy. Yet, the doctor on the spot, Dr. Hollywood, with frightening accuracy, can tell you almost within hours how long a man is going to live. There are cases outlined in great detail - you hate referring to these things. This man obviously does not mind his name being used, because he contributed a very lengthy article to the April 10, edition or there was a lengthy article, at his request, in the April 10, edition of the "Evening Telegram." I recall he wrote a letter.

This man, the first month I think after I was elected to this House, he came to see me. He had been out of the mines for ten years, operating a small shop in St. Lawrence. He had a large family, all dependants. He told me that

MR. HICKMAN:

he now had what he called a bad X-ray and that he could no longer operate a shop. When you looked at him, you could not see that there was a thing wrong with him. He had not lost any weight, healthy, except when you walked up the stairs with him he just would have to stop on the way up, as he could not breathe. We tried everything to get that man Workman's Compensation. The doctor in St. Lawrence, there was no doubt in his mind at all what this man had, but the man would not undergo a biopsy so he was turned down by the Workman's Compensation Board. So I said to him, "You have another chance. There is a Royal Commission set-up and the chairman is from St. Lawrence and he knows the background of your problem and many others. On this Board there are two doctors, so take your case to that Board." He did, well documented, it presented a strong case and the upshot of it was that when the Royal Commission handed down its report and its findings, this man was recommended for Workman's Compensation.

Now to me that was the end of it, as they had served the purpose for which they had been set up, in respect of that particular problem. They dealt with about one hundred and some odd cases and some they rejected. If there were no proof at all, they rejected and others they availed of the case history and the medical advice on the spot. Now this man was recommended. He was turned down again and, as of today, he is not receiving Workman's Compensation. I do not suppose there is a man, who visited St. John's so often or the Workman's Compensation Board, as Jim Haley has, with no luck. He has visited Ministers of the Crown, I met with him one time, with the hon. Donald Jamieson, and it is the most pathetic case you ever ran into. Because here is a proud man, who said three years ago; "I will never go on social assistance because this country owes me money and the Workman's Compensation Board owe me money and I am entitled to get it." Well eventually he had no choice, he had to go and seek social assistance. It broke his heart to do it, I know it did, you talk to the man and you cannot be but impressed by his sincerity.

MR. HICKMAN:

He is embarrassed. It is all written up by himself in the papers, embarrassed by the fact that his children now are in receipt of social assistance.

But still nobody will say, except the Royal Commission on radiation, that Jim Haley is disabled, but now he has followed the pattern. Jim Haley now is permanently confined in St. Lawrence Hospital. But he is not going to get Workman's Compensation. He is not going to have the peace of mind to know that what he fought for, the last four or five years, is going to come to fruition. This is wrong, Mr. Chairman. It is wrong. I know it is repetitive, I know I have mentioned it here a thousand times and I am going to continue to mention it until there is a firm policy decision on the part of Government to take that report, to take that and create that fund and to pay Workman's Compensation to the men who had their cases dealt with in the minutest detail. It is no answer and it is no consolation to say to a miner, whose name appears in here where they listed each individual case, "Entitled to compensation under our recommendation. James Haley entitled to compensation under our recommendation." His name is there. It is no consolation to say to James Haley; "You have the right now to take a further appeal. You can go before another Board of medical referees."

The poor fellow has himself appealed into the ground and he is no better off than he was the day he started. On March 25, he may, and the Workman's Compensation Board in some of these cases, I am not sure that this gentleman is one of them because I believe his case history of employment is such that they can tie it in with the amendment to the Act of three or four years ago. There are many of these names here, who have been recommended, that the Workman's Compensation Board pay or that they are entitled to compensation, that will have to come out of the special fund that was recommended. There again is where I have to take issue with the statement of the hon. the Minister of Labour, acting Minister of Labour, dealing with the Workman's Compensation Board and the function of the compensation generally.

MR. HICKMAN:

On March 25, 1970, there was a statement tabled in this House by the hon. acting Minister, in which he refers to one of the major recommendations (and it certainly was) of the Royal Commission, and that was to set up the fund. He tells us that prior to his death, and I submit it was just prior to his death, within a matter of a month or two, the late W.J. Keough, in his capacity as Minister of Labour, wrote the Seibert family concerning the recommendation of the Royal Commission, but received no reply. Since it appears improbable that the Seibert family will contribute to the foundation, the Government has decided to set up the fund, provided the Government of Canada will join the Newfoundland Government and Nuflor in contributions. Now remember, Nuflor stated at the Commission hearing that they were prepared to pay their share of the contribution to the fund.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is now nearly eighteen months or more than that, say eighteen months, twenty-one months from the time this report was made public and it was not until two or three months ago that the then Minister of Labour wrote the Seibert family. Now I think that that part of the report, referring to the Seibert family, is a waste of time, as they moved out of St. Lawrence many, many years ago. Their mines have been abandoned. I do not know if their people have wealth or not but, in any event they are outside the jurisdiction of this Province. A letter written, say September 30, 1969, could have solved that problem within a matter of two weeks. There was no trouble to find the address. The address of the Seibert family was not known. So a year and a-half goes by before they are written and now Government has come to the conclusion that it is improbable that they will contribute to this fund for compensation. The next tack now is to move on to the Government of Canada, but why was all of this not done at the same time?

This statement, for instance, was on March 25. Now I would like to hear from the Minister as to whether or not representation has yet been made

MR. HICKMAN:

to the Government of Canada, because on April 8 the Minister of Labour and the Minister of National Health and Welfare, they had never heard of it. They had not received any request from the Government of this Province for any contribution to any fund and surely these are the two departments of the Government of Canada that, if any funds are available, that funds would have to come from. The member for the riding of Burin-Burgeo was unaware of this, on March 26, 1971, that was only a day after, but up to that time, you know, this is something to happen in the future. Now I think that the Government of this Province and the Minister will really have their work cut out, for them to try and convince the Government of Canada that it should become involved in a Provincial problem.

It is true that the late Judge Winter referred to it as a national disaster, but I can see years and years being lost trying to convince the Government of Canada that this is a national disaster and national funds should go in. You can make a case for it but convincing them, I do not believe it is possible. Now what I say, Mr. Chairman, is that this fund should be created, it should have been created a year ago, it should be created now. The responsibility is a responsibility of the Province and a responsibility of Nuflor and that is where the responsibility is going to finally rest. What I would like the Minister to say today is that, anyway we are going to forget the Government of Canada, the Government of this Province will put up, whatever the ratio is, seventy-five per-cent and Nuflor will put up twenty-five per-cent and it will be retroactive to the date we receive the Royal Commission's report.

Now will the hon. Minister advise the House and the Committee on what date representation was made to the Government of Canada? When were they told of this recommendation of the failure of the Seibert family to respond to the Government's inquiries and what Minister or Ministers are involved in this problem?

MR. NEARY: The only answer that I could give there is that, when is that Ministerial Statement dated? March 25, I am not sure if it was the same day or the next day, Mr. Chairman, that I, in my capacity as acting Minister of Labour, I do not know what representations were made before that, made representation to the Minister in the Government of Canada, from Newfoundland, on this matter of setting up the special fund.

MR. HICKMAN: Has there been any reply?

MR. NEARY: To date I have not had a reply, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, before you rise the Committee, could I answer a question that was asked by the hon. member for St. John's West, on an earlier vote? The special allowance to the Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour was to Mr. T.A. Blanchard, when he was Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, as advisor to the Government on Labour Legislation and Industrial Relations.

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again presently by leave.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 6:00 P.M., I do leave the Chair until 8:00 P.M.

The House resumed at 8:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. SMALLWOOD(J.R.): Mr. Speaker, the House is greatly honoured tonight in having present the members of a Parliamentary Commission from Ottawa. There are some thirty members of the Commission. Twenty of them are members of the House of Commons, ten of them are members of the Senate of Canada, a total of thirty men and women, distinguished Canadian statesmen and stateswomen. They have been appointed by the Parliament of Canada to travel across this great Nation to meet with the Governments of the provinces, insofar as it is practicable to do so, with the Legislatures of the provinces and certainly with the people of Canada, the population of the provinces, to hear the views of as many people as care to come and meet them. When they leave here now they are going to Holiday Inn where they will meet with such Newfoundlanders as wish to go and confer with them. They have been to every province in Canada except one. That is the province of New Brunswick and, when they leave here tomorrow, they will go to that province. That will then complete their tour of the ten provinces. Newfoundland is the second last.

The Government just had the great honour and pleasure of entertaining them at dinner. We have renewed personal acquaintances of a number of M.P.'s and Senators who we had met before and it is a very great pleasure, very, very great pleasure indeed.

The delegation of thirty Parliamentarians of this Nation are led by Dr. Mark Macguigan, a member of Parliament who represents, in Parliament, in the House of Commons, the seat that was formerly represented by the hon. Paul Martin, one of the great names in contemporary history in Canada.

Dr. Macguigan was born in Prince Edward Island, where his father was a Judge of the Supreme Court and had, in other ways, a very distinguished career in the public life of this Nation. Dr. Macguigan sits in Parliament today and he is the Chairman of the

MR. SMALLWOOD: Parliamentary Commission.

I know that many of them are known personally to your Honour and that you will feel very proud indeed to renew acquaintance. I think that it would be the unanimous desire of the House that Dr. Macguigan, the leader of this distinguished group of Parliamentarians, should come on the floor of the Chamber and speak to us and, if your Honour would be pleased to invite Dr. Macguigan, I am sure that it would be the pleasure of the House to hear him.

MR. SPEAKER: May I take it then that this is the unanimous wish of the House, that Dr. Macguigan be invited to take his seat on the floor of the House and speak to this Assembly? Agreed.

I would ask the Sergeant-at-arms if he would be good enough to escort Dr. Macguigan to a seat here on the floor of the House.

DR. MACGUIGAN: Mr. Speaker, this is a very great and I might add a very unexpected privilege for the members of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate of the House on Commons on the Constitution of Canada.

As the Premier observed in his opening remarks, we are a Committee which represents the Senate and the House of Commons and we also represent all the Parties in the Parliament of Canada. We came here humbly to hear the citizens of your Province and now we find ourselves in the unexpected position, through me as Joint Chairman on the House of Commons side of the Committee, of having the great privilege of saying a few words to you, their elected representatives.

Before going any further, I would like to introduce the Acting Joint Chairman, on the Senate side, and, if I might, with your permission, ask him to rise to the Gallery, I will introduce Senator Gil Molgat, from Saint Rose, Manitoba.

Our mission, given out by the House of Commons, more than a year ago, is to go across the Country and to hear the views of

DR. MACGUIGAN: Canadian citizens on the future form of Government, the new Constitution or views on changes in the Constitution of Canada. We have been fulfilling that mission since last September. We are now almost finished. We have not left Newfoundland to the end for any reason except that we like to save the best for the last.

We have had some 12,000 Canadians at our meetings, up to this point, and we had more than ten per cent of that number speak at our meetings and we very much hope that those Newfoundlanders who are waiting, I hope patiently, for us at this moment, to get to the meeting, will have a great deal to say to us this evening.

We are very conscious, in coming to your Province, of the tremendous interest that Newfoundlanders have in preserving Canada. We are conscious, of course, of the fact that your Premier is the only living Father of Confederation and we are conscious of the position which he and the Government of Newfoundland and the Legislature of Newfoundland; because I know this is not a matter which divides the Parties here; have advanced, very positive views with respect to the Government and the Constitution of Canada.

I think all the members of the Committee were especially struck, as we came in from the airport, in seeing the sign "Bienvenu à St John's."

This surely is one of the things that Canada is all about and Newfoundland we know and we see, our eyes have borne us witness, is one of the leaders in this movement toward a recognition of the bilingualism of our country.

Les Députées: Nous sommes enchanté d'être ici chez vous ou députées de Terre Neuve ou citoyennes du Canada vous avez travaillé ici et à travers le Canada pour le profit du Canada et c'est notre but aussi.

DR. MACGUIGAN: As we have gone across the country, Canadians have told us many things about Canada. I suppose that we knew many of them before but actually for many of us it has been our first opportunity of visiting the various Provinces of Canada. Some of us indeed are here tonight in Newfoundland for the first time in our lives. We promise to repair that in the future, now we have experienced the warm hospitality that your Premier and your Government have shown us here this evening, as well as seeing the beauty of your landscape.

We have heard about the problems of Canada, the alienation of the West in some ways, the alienation of the Maritimes in some ways and the need for regional development, the various problems which French-speaking people feel they have in Canada. Recently we have been hearing about the problems of Ontario. There are many problems in our country, and I think that we in the Committee feel that we will have to make sacrifices, all of us, in order to have a bright and lasting future for our country. But, if there is one thing that we have been convinced of in our travels throughout Canada, it is that Canadians, in all parts of the country, of their great love for their land and their determination - and this is true of the vast majority of Canadian - their determination to make our country succeed, to give it an even greater future than it has had in the past.

We are not at this stage prepared to make our recommendations. We will be doing that in the fall, after we have spent the summer contemplating the views which we have heard from Canadians from coast to coast.

We believe in the future of this country and we believe that Canadians believe in the future of this country and we are very happy to be here and to have this opportunity of speaking with you about our country and its future.

MR. SPEAKER: On behalf of the House of Assembly, thank you very much for taking the time out to come in and speak to us this evening. Thank you!

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, shortly before the House broke for dinner, the hon. member for Burin asked me if I had a reply to my correspondence to the hon. Minister of Transport, Mr. Jamieson, concerning the setting up of a

MR. NEARY: special fund for the survivors of the deceased miners of St. Lawrence. My reply was in the negative and, low and behold, when I went down to my office after the House closed for dinner, I found a letter on my desk that had arrived this afternoon from the Executive Assistant of Mr. Jamieson, Mr. Andy Chatwood, dated May 10, in which he informed me that the letter to which the hon. member referred is being studied by the hon. minister at the present time, and he would be in touch with me in the near future.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, two other points I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. minister. I thank the hon. minister for the information.

I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister with respect to Workmen's Compensation - one is the rate that is being paid by the Board to recipients of Workmen's Compensation benefits who from time to time have to come to St. John's to undergo further medical examinations or treatments or to meet with the Board for the purpose of having their case reviewed.

The amount, I am told, and I received this only recently from a gentleman who was from Central Newfoundland, is \$5 per day for room and board. Now that may have been a very realistic figure some years ago but I can think of very few places in St. John's, at this time, where anyone can get adequate, even any accommodation, at the rate of \$5 per day for room and board. I have always felt it a great pity that the Workmen's Compensation Board did not follow the recommendation of the Winter Commission and build its own building in the downtown area of St. John's, for the convenience of those who come in. Because so many of them stay, as the hon. Minister knows, in that area not too far from City Hall, in the Brazil Square area, A large majority of them stay there and I think we can see the reason why, when we know what the rate is, \$5 per day - no man can be adequately accommodated.

When you realize that most people coming in, Mr. Chairman, to seek treatment, coming in at the request of the Board or coming in because the

MR. HICKMAN: Board has directed his or her appearance, is probably totally disabled, which means that their total source of income is the amount they receive from the Workman's Compensation Board. So they have no funds to pay for anything extra or to supplement their board out of and consequently what they can get for \$5 is what they put up with. Again a lot of these people obviously are not enjoying the best of health and they should not be placed in a position where they have to share three or four to a room in boarding house, down on Brazil Square.

This is happening quite frequently. Anyway those of us who represent districts outside St. John's quite often have to meet constituents down there and we had an opportunity to see, from time to time, the overcrowding and what they put up with, But it is \$5 a day. It might have been a realistic figure in 1949, it is totally out of line and outrageously out of line in 1971.

The rate is set by the Workman's Compensation Board, As I understand it, it is, at least this is what the gentleman told me who received it, He has told what he can get.

The other problem is a problem of interpretation. I am not sure (there is a Bill before the House, if this Bill is designed to meet this problem or not. It may be and it may not be. The maximum amount that is payable, payable arising out of the death of any workman, is \$275, regardless of the number of children. The maximum amount payable to each child is \$35 per month. The monies are paid so long or the widow's portion of it is paid until she remarries.

Now I had a case recently brought to my attention, where a man was killed, leaving a widow and ten dependent children and the maximum amount of \$275 per month was paid to this widow for herself and children. She subsequently remarried, still with ten dependent children, all under sixteen years of age. Now the children had been receiving Workman's Compensation benefits, at the rate of \$27.50 per month, because the widow's allowance, there was so many of them that they could not get the maximum, but once the

MR. HICKMAN: widow remarried, her allowance was cut off, This is in accordance with the law but the ten children then continued to receive the amount that they had been paid when their mother was receiving Workman's Compensation. In other words, they did not go to the maximum of \$275. The interpretation that has been placed on it is that the Board has no discretion, if, for instance, there had been seven children, the seven children would have received \$35 per month and the widow would have received the balance to make up \$275.

To me the intention of the Act is quite clear. Once the widow remarries, these children who are receiving, say \$30 a month or whatever the amount is, should then go to \$35 per month, rather than remain in this case at \$27.50. I draw this to the attention of the hon. Minister that obviously, even the maximum of \$35 per month per child, when you have ten dependent children all under sixteen years of age, no one is going to become very affluent on that amount. It seems to me that the interpretation of that section has not been a correct one.

In all fairness to the Board, the Act is not that clear but the intention of the Act is clear. I believe and the hon. Minister can advise the House on this, that there is an attempt to correct that under the present legislation, I am not certain.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member is perfectly correct. Not only are we hoping to correct that situation which he just outlined for us, but we plan also on lifting ceiling and increasing the assistance by \$5, per dependent, a month.

MR. HICKMAN: The widow's allowance is going to \$120?

MR. NEARY: Yes, that is right.

MR. HICKMAN: It is \$100 now.

MR. NEARY: I do not remember the precise figures but we have legislation before the House, to amend The Workman's Compensation Act, to lift the ceiling that my hon. friend has been so concerned about for a good many years. This came about as a result of the Aylward Royal Commission on St. Lawrence Miners.

MR. HICKMAN: Winter Commission.

MR. NEARY: Winter Commission, was it? They were also going to increase the Workman's Compensation rates for dependents, if we ever get back to Legislation again, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HICKMAN: I have one more question on that, Mr. Chairman, while we are on Workman's Compensation. Over a year ago, under the provisions of the Workman's Compensation Act, the Review Committee was appointed, under the chairmanship of Mr. Herman Batten. The Act requires that every five years there must be a review - this is uniform legislation. The Winter Commission was appointed to do the same thing. Now that commission was appointed, I know it was when the House was in session last year and I remember appearing before it, about this time last year, would the hon. Minister give this Committee an indication as to when that report will be completed, because it was a straight review and not that much work involved?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Batten informs me that he should be able to report sometime in the late fall. In the meantime the amendments that are now before the House were brought in, in very close consultation with the Chairman of the Commission.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, there is just one question I would like to ask and it is a case that I was dealing with most of the winter, with a gentleman and it involved a lot of medical evidence and so on and so forth. So I suggested that he should ask for an Appeal Board, which he did, and the Appeal Board were the same members that he had been dealing with in his case. Is this usual, where the Chairman of the Commission and Mr. Baggs and one other, people whom he had been going back and forth to with evidence and all the rest and when he got the Appeal Board the same gentleman heard the appeal and still kicked it out?

MR. NEARY: That was not an Appeal Board.

MR. MURPHY: Well, that is what it was supposed to be, an Appeal Board.

MR. NEARY: I do not think the hon. member is referring to an Appeal Board,

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman. These are officials, Mr. Bagge is the secretary of the Workman's Compensation Board appointed by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council. I do not know who the other gentleman was that the hon. member referred to but it was probably an official of the Workman's Compensation Board. They are not a board of appeal.

MR. MURPHY: Well, that is what he had and they gave the final decision on it.

On motion, 1611(03) carried.

MR. NEARY: (04) - Mr. Chairman, this vote was established for the purpose of providing a history of the Trade Union Movement. The total grant was \$12,000. The date of completion of the history of the Trade Union Movement in Newfoundland is sometime this year, as the hon. member for St. John's West knows. It commenced in 1967 and we were told at that time it would take four years to complete. Professor Hattenhauer asked, think, for an extension of one year, as I think it was originally planned to complete the history in three years. He asked for an extension of one year, so it should be finished sometime this year. I think my hon. learned friend from St. John's West can confirm that, because we both confronted Professor Hattenhauer on this question, the other night.

On motion, 1611(04), (06), carried.

MR. NEARY: Does the hon. member want an explanation for this? Mr. Chairman, the Labour College of Canada is jointly operated by the Canadian Labour Congress, McGill University and the University De Montreal. It is a bilingual, bicultural institution, open to workers of Canada and those of foreign countries, and offers courses of instruction in economics, history, sociology, political science and trade unionism. Eight other Provinces and the Federal Government contribute. The minimum contribution is \$1,000. and this is, I think, paid by PEI and New Brunswick and Newfoundland. We pay the minimum.

MR. MURPHY: Has this been attended by members of Labour Union, who attend this for these courses?

May 17th, 1971

Tape 670(Night)

NC - 10

MR. NEARY: Yes, that is right.

On motion, 1611(07), 1612(01); (02)(01), (02), (03), (04), (05);

1612(03)(01)

MR. CROSBIE: 1614-01 Mr. Chairman, the Minimum Wage Division now has, as I mentioned earlier today, six personnel. One director grade III, one director grade I three officers and one officer grade IV. \$605.00 is provided for extra assistance. If that \$605.00 is extra assistance to carry out the new policy of equal pay for men and women, it is not going to carry very far. Will the minister now give us a comment on this question.

MR. NEARY: Yes Mr. Chairman, I would like to set the hon. member's mind at ease. The investigating officers in the Department of Labour are not all listed under the Minimum Wage Branch. They come under various subheads because, they are not only enforcing the Minimum Wage Act, but all the other legislation that comes under the Provincial Department of Labour.

I might also add, Mr. Chairman, that we are in the process at the moment of recruiting a director of Human Rights. We are reshuffling some of the employees in the Department of Labour, resulting from the promotion of Mr. Alex Bannister to the post of Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour. We just hired a university student to become the chief executive officer of the Labour Relations Board. All in all Mr. Chairman, we are strengthening the various branches of the Department of Labour, and I can reassure the hon. gentleman that we will be able to cope with the investigations that are necessary to be carried out, resulting from the equal pay for equal work in the same establishment.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chariman, even taking all that the minister says as gospel, which of course you naturally do, there were fifty-five employees in the Department of Labour

altogether, last year. This year's estimates provides for fifty-seven employees, altogether. That is an increase of two. It does not seem a great increase, so I still point out to him that if he is going to do very much in the way of equal pay for men and women doing the same work, he is going to have to take on more people than the estimates allow for.

The minister might also comment on the question of special allowances to the Assistant Deputy Minister, which he was going to check on. \$2,500.00 extra.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): If the minister will allow me, I would beg leave very humbly to suggest that the fifty-five employees in the Department of Labour, if increased by two in number to fifty-seven, would be able to take on a number of additional duties without nervous and physical prostration. I just suggest, I throw out the suggestion humbly, that if the fifty-five employees of the Department of Labour or of any other Department of Government are increased by two, three or ten, or whatever the number is, they could perform additional duties without either mental or physical prostration.

I just suggest that as a possibility that the Committee might consider. It is just a possibility.

MR. MURPHY: I do not think that anyone will object to the Premier suggesting that, Sir. I do not think it will create any headlines across the nation, but when we speak of this great human rights code, we heard the introduction to it and the great announcements made and all the rest, I think people actually were looking forward to something that was going to happen, where the rights of people would be upheld. We were looking forward to these estimates, to find out just what provisions were made. We hear a lot of great announcements

and great hot air statements, but we see nothing to back them up. This is the main problem in all of this. I know that since I have been in this House, the past eight years, the Opposition has been fighting for an increase in the minimum wage and equal rights for men and women doing the same work. We get the great announcements.

The hon. member for St. John's West, I think, went through it today. It is not my intention to go over it again. We have heard -

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): The hon. gentleman cannot possibly compete with the hon. member;

MR. MURPHY: The hon. gentleman finds it very difficult to compete with a lot of people, as far as wind is concerned. Mr. Chairman, if I may continue...

MR. SMALLWOOD: I appreciate the hon. gentleman - I know what he needs. I know just what he needs.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, what happened here twenty minutes ago is a good instance of what the Premier needs and I will not go into that. I will not go into that. It was never done in another Parliament, I guarantee you that, what happened here this evening. At least someone had notice of what was going to happen, pre-notice

MR. SMALLWOOD: What was that?

MR. MURPHY: Inviting people into this House without consultation with side or anything else. Terrible eh? Terrible that I should suggest this?

MR. CHAIRMAN (HODDER): Order please!

MR. MURPHY: The Chairman noticed.

Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, during the years the Opposition has been fighting very hard to get the minimum wage brought to a half decent level. We are very happy that the Government saw fit this year to increase it somewhat. Not

nearly as much as we were looking for. We were looking for one dollar and fifty cents right across the board, for men and women with equal work. I know, since the great announcement was made, the civil service, no sweat there, that was going to be looked after the next day. All these rights were going to be in. I brought forward today about the female nursing aides, as compared to the male nurses in the hospitals, and there is quite a wide gap, as I understand, in their wages.

We had hoped, we knew possibly that these were great announcements that we hear so often, but we had hoped in this vote in the Department of Labour there would be something set aside for this Human Rights Commission. We have one appointment, Mrs. Gertrude Keough, widow of the late Hon. Minister of Labour. I do not know if the lady is the...

What is that? There is nothing there. There is nothing in the estimates on it, no. We are trying to get it in under minimum wages here, that is the whole thing. There is no "human rights." Is the Department of Labour the one that will administer this? There is not even a heading for it this year, although we have Mrs. Keough, and I presume she has begun work. I do not know where her office actually is. I have received several phone calls. Is she down in the Department of Labour?

MR. NEARY: If the hon. member will permit me. At the moment I think she is attending a conference on human rights at the United Nations, representing the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. We are in the process of setting up an office and giving her some clerical help in the Department of Labour. It is taking a little time, because, my hon. friends knows, there is some reorganization going on at the moment in the Department

of Labour, and it is a matter of one person moving out of an office so that we can move Mrs. Keough in.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, as I say, the announcements are made about a year or a year and a-half before the function of the group is actually ready to start operating.

Mr. Chairman, as I say, I am quite fearsome of any great work by this great Human Rights Commission. The first application, of course, is going to be from the members on this side of the House, to look for their rights. I am afraid we will have to postpone it for a while. We will just have to wait and see, I suppose, just what monies are granted. Mrs. Keough is at a conference now, so I presume - I think I heard the hon. minister say that there is another appointment to be made shortly.

MR. NEARY: Well, we are almost ready, Mr. Chairman, to recruit a Director of Human Rights. Of course, we will have to go through the procedure of running the advertisement in the newspapers and so forth.

MR. MURPHY: That is just a procedure, of course.

MR. NEARY: As far as increasing the minimum wage, Mr. Chairman, I think I indicated this afternoon that, in my opinion, this should be undertaken only after careful study of its impact on the continued existence of present employer firms and so forth.

Personally, I do not think that an employee would be any better off by being unemployed through the Government causing firms to become bankrupt, for instance, even if we brought in a minimum wage of one dollar and seventy-five cents an hour. As I said this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, I think that this matter will probably have to be given top priority by the new Minister of Labour, following his appointment.

MR. MURPHY: Well, we have not a man just yet, but "it won't be long now."

Just a few thoughts on this minimum wage and equal pay for equal work! I am just trying to think what would be happening in the department stores for example, where we have female clerks and male clerks doing just about the same type of work. the employer has the choice of paying the young lady, perhaps seventeen or eighteen years of age, the same wage as he is paying a male clerk who has been with the firm, either serving shoes or a tin of milk or whatever the case may be. I am just a little bit scared that there will not be too many females find employment as clerks in the stores. Perhaps this is a subtle way to get the housewives back to the kitchen.

I do not know, but I think it will be somewhat of a problem to deal with, when you have to deal with an employer who has the choice of dealing with a male, as I say here, I do not know what the ramifications will be, whether it will depend on the years of service, But it just says; "doing equal work for equal pay." I could^{go} down possibly and sell a pair of shoes...

MR. NEARY: The hon. member is confusing minimum wages with equal work for equal pay.

MR. MURPHY: I am just trying to cover the whole scope of minimum wages and these human rights.

Mr. Chairman, as I say, as time passes I think we will see the results of a lot of these great announcements, In this historic year of 1971, the twenty second year of Joseph the Great, I think the people of the Province will really be looking at some of these things in a different light. My hon. colleague announced on television this afternoon that he has the report of the Goldfarb Commission and it does not look too good for the other side of the House. That is beside the point, We might get to commissions a bit later on when we can

MR. CROSBIE: Before we leave this, what the hon. minister said, with respect to raising the minimum wage, is so ludicrous that it would almost make one throw. The Government, eight weeks ago, without any exhaustive investigation into the effects on the businessman or the small firm or anything else, announced it was raising pay for women so that it would be equivalent to that of men.

Last year in this House, the then Minister of Labour made a statement, on May 18, 1970. The minimum wage for women was set at one dollar an hour and the minimum wage for men was set at one dollar and twenty-five cents. The reason given for the difference then, and the reason given the year before, and the reason given the year before that, and the reason given in 1967, and the reason given in 1966, and the reason given every year, going back to 1949, for having a different minimum wage for men and women, was that the Newfoundland economy could not stand it, that the small business firms, particularly in isolated parts of the island, would have to shut their doors if it happened and so on. But, eight weeks ago, out of the blue, the Premier announced that this was going to be the new policy.

We know apparently that there was little investigation done, because we have been given no explanation on how this was going to be carried out. I pointed out that this year, in the estimates, fifty-seven employees are provided for the Department of Labour. Last year it was fifty-five. In the Minimum Wage Branch we have the same number this year as last year. The hon. the Premier suggests - really his remarks are most insulting, to the present staff of the Department of Labour. What he suggested was that they were doing nothing. They had lots of time and capacity and so on to take on this

big new task and no new employees were needed. In other words, they are overstaffed down in the Department of Labour, that there is just not enough to keep them busy and there is no need for extra employees to carry out this new and complex policy. The complexity of this is almost enough to boggle the imagination Mr. Chairman.

To really enforce it, you have to take every job done by men and women in the island and compare them, in every establishment, to see if the women in that establishment, doing a certain job, should get the same pay as the men. It is a terrifically complex thing, if it is to be carried out. If the Government hires no new people for it, and the hon. the Premier suggest that the Department of Labour can handle it - it is a mere nothing, and suggest, insultingly really, when you analyze his words, they are overstaffed down there and do not have enough to do now or they are not doing as much as they could do there anyway.

The minister gets up and says that the minimum wage cannot be raised for men and women, from one dollar and twenty-five cents to one dollar and fifty cents...

MR. NEARY: No, the minister did not say that.

MR. CROSBIE: The minister said that this would have to have exhaustive study and we did not know whether the economy could stand it and all the rest of the bushwah. If the Government decides that this is necessary, in connection with the coming election, it will be announced overnight with not one second's exhaustive investigation, survey or anything else; the same as equal pay for men and women was announced.

What was announced last year? "Minimum overtime rates of time and a-half, which up to now must be paid for any hours worked in excess of forty-eight a week, to all employees except domestics, farm employees and those employed in fish processing-

will in future be paid to fish plant workers as well.

We have not heard of any fish plants being closed in the last year because of that. I asked the minister a question this afternoon and he tried to give me some nonsense. He said that he had to have all the details to answer this question. The question is quite simple. A man in question is paid one dollar and seventy-five cents an hour...

MR. NEARY: Well document...

MR. CROSBIE: Document nothing. He works in excess of forty-eight hours a week and he employer pays him for the extra time, not time and a-half, at one dollar and seventy-five cents, but time and a-half at one dollar and twenty-five cents which is the minimum wage. I asked the minister whether, in administrating this Act, it was Government policy that the time and a-half meant that you just had to pay time and a-half the minimum wage or was it time and a-half the wage he was getting?

The minister said he could not answer the question. He would have to have documentation and all this tripe and nonsense. What is the minister doing, if he is not overseeing this kind of thing? He must have had this kind of complaint before, Mr. Chairman. He does not need the man's name. He does not need his name. Here are the facts. He get one dollar and seventy-five cents an hour for forty-eight hours. His employer works him twelve hours overtime, and then he gives him one and a-half time a dollar twenty-five for his overtime.

Now, what I asked was, is this...

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Right. This is not just an isolated case. I asked the minister, what is the policy of the department when they get a complaint made like that? Do they agree that it is

in accordance with the regulations or not? He tells me, that he has to have it documented. Either the department agrees that the law at present permits that. If the law permits that, then the law should be changed. If the law permits the employer to work them overtime and give them one and a-half times the minimum wage, then the law should be changed. Obviously, it means one and a-half times the regular hourly wage of the man in question.

The minister should bring amendments into the legislation at this session, if there is any question about that in the legislation and the regulations.

The Department of Highways was also reported as doing the same thing. Paying time and a-half at the minimum wage instead of time and a-half the regular wage. When the Government gets up and announces, makes these brave announcements, equal pay for men and women and all the rest of it, and they asked questions in this House and cannot answer them and they are asked how it is going to apply in the civil service, and they cannot answer the question, when we are told that it is going to take a year to get this information to answer what classifications of women in the civil service are going to get equal pay, we realize that it is all hypocrisy. Pure hypocrisy!

MR. NEARY: I answered that question this afternoon.

MR. CROSBIE: The minister did not answer it.

MR. NEARY: I told the hon. member that we can only enforce minimum standards.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman who just sat down said that in 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, and in 1970, the Government has said that we could not have equal pay for the same work in a plant, for men and women, and that he had given the reason. The reason was that our economy could not stand it.

MR. CROSBIE: That is right. Exactly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, in 1971, which is an election year, we suddenly discover that our economy would stand it.

MR. CROSBIE: Exactly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is his statement and he now confirms it. He said, "exactly."

MR. CROSBIE: Exactly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no doubt that I am quoting him correctly.

MR. CROSBIE: No doubt in this world.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No doubt about it at all, I am quoting him correctly. I am not distorting it. I am not garbling it. This is exactly what he said. Right?

MR. CROSBIE: Right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We agree on this exactly. This is what he said.

MR. CROSBIE: We are heart to heart on it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are heart to heart and shoulder to shoulder.

MR. CROSBIE: Mind to mind.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, not mind to mind.

MR. CROSBIE: On that point alone.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On nothing. Whiskers, ideas, philosophy, loyalty, treachery, renegade, we are not eye to eye or shoulder to shoulder on anything, and never will be I suggest.

Sir, the Government for years have felt philosophically, our philosophy, as liberals, has been that men and women doing the same work in the same place should be paid the same pay. We wanted to do it, we are eager to do it and we are anxious to do it. Then we started an enquiry. We made a very exhaustive enquiry. We made the enquiry in the supermarkets. We made an enquiry in the large mercantile shop companies. We made an enquiry in the fish plants. We made an enquiry. We investigated in each individual company. We interrogated the companies. We

got their rates of pay, that they paid to men and that they paid to women. We made an enquiry, an exhaustive and a thorough going enquiry. We made it. This Government made it, to find out whether in fact, (in actual fact, "f-a-c-t", fact, not opinion, not conjecture, not guess-work, but fact) whether in fact, if the supermarkets, if the shops and most of the plants in the Province that employ men and women (that would be the fish plants. There are 10,000 employees. There are 10,000 employees in these fish plants, many of them men, many of them women. Most of them are women.) whether in fact, "f-a-c-t", fact, whether, if we require, if the law said that they were to get the same pay for doing the same work in the same plant, it would hurt them and put them out of business. We made that enquiry, and it was because the enquiry we made showed clearly and beyond any doubt that it would not put them out of business that we made the decision in Cabinet to order, with six months notice, that they had to make the same rate of pay for women and men, in the same plant, doing the same work.

That is why we made the announcement. The announcement was not caprice, it was not a whim, it was not just a sudden inspiration, it was based on a very, very solid, factual investigation of all the fish plants of this Province and all the supermarkets. We made that investigation, and that investigation convinced us that it would not put one single fish plant, nor one single supermarket out of business, if we made it the law that they had to pay the same to men and women, doing the same work in the same plant.

Take any plant you want to think of. Take one. Grand Bank, Trepassey,

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Fermeuse, Catalina, any plant you like, any fish plant in this Province, take anyone you like, take any supermarket, St. John's, Grand Falls, Catalina, Carbonear, Gander, Corner Brook, anywhere you like, take any supermarket in Newfoundland and imagine any one where there are men and women working. doing the same work in that plant, in that supermarket to require that the men and the women doing the same work shall have the same rate of pay would not put one single supermarket out of business, not one single fish plant out of business. When we discovered that, we decided not before, Not before, only after we had made that investigation and we established the FACT, not opinion, not guesswork, fact that not one firm would go out of business, then and then only and not a minute before, we made the decision to make equal pay for equal work.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, it is always interesting to hear the Premier's explanations. The Premier says it is FACT. I say it is FICTION. If there was an inquiry, Mr. Chairman, that just encompassed employees of fish plants and employees of supermarkets, what kind of a farce of an inquiry was it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That was ninety per-cent of the women working.

MR. CROSBIE: Ninety per-cent nonsense, nonsense, ninety per-cent.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Outside the Government offices.

MR. CROSBIE: Supermarkets, let us just look at supermarkets. We had a case in St. John's, just several weeks ago, where Dominion Store employees went on strike and, after the strike was over, they got an increase in pay and whatnot. The supermarkets have not gone out of business. Is the Premier suggesting that the Government's worry was, in failing to bring in equal pay for men and women sooner, that the Government's worry was that supermarkets were going to go out of business.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, fish plants.

MR. CROSBIE: What absolute tripe. I will come -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Chiefly fish plants, chiefly fish plants.

MR. CROSBIE: I will come to fish plants, I am on supermarkets now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Fish plants not supermarkets.

MR. CROSBIE: Supermarkets, what a farce that the Government introduced equal pay for men and women in supermarkets and it cost supermarkets more money so they naturally raise an apple, a cent an apple, and they put eggs up, no they do not dare put eggs up but they put something else up a few cents and so on and so forth, to get it back, the same as when they had to pay higher wages when they were dealing with unions. Now supermarkets could not have been the worry. Now fish plants might have been a worry and the Premier said there was an inquiry done on fish plants. Well, there are women working in this Province, Mr. Chairman, in every branch of endeavour, not just in fish plants or supermarkets, they are working in hotels, motels, they are working in restaurants.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The law covers them all.

MR. CROSBIE: We know that. That is why we say the enquiry into this fish plant

MR. SMALLWOOD: The enquiry was ninety per-cent of the women working in this Province. That is the Governments, the fish plants and the supermarkets, ninety per-cent of the women.

MR. CROSBIE: I would like to see the Premier's sources.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You would like to see, you would like to see a lot.

MR. CROSBIE: I hear the Premier's statements time after time, ninety per-cent of this and fifty per-cent of that and never are there references brought forward, never are the sources referred to.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh, sit down. Do not be such a jackass.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. Premier says that an inquiry is made. Table the inquiry in the House here. The Premier says ninety per-cent of all the working women are in the civil service, fish plants and supermarkets; produce the source.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hospitals, the Government offices, the institutions,

MR. SMALLWOOD:

the fish plants and the supermarkets, ninety per-cent of all the women who are working for wages.

MR. CROSBIE: Did the Premier go around and actually talk to them all himself or has he -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh, sit down, sit down. You make me sick, you really do. You make the House sick. They are all sick of you.

MR. MURPHY: No, we are delighted with him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You more than anyone, you are sick of him.

MR. MURPHY: Delighted with him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You are jealous of him.

MR. MURPHY: Delighted with him. Jealous?

MR. SMALLWOOD: You are scared of him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: Now, let us get back to the facts. One would expect, Mr Chairman, that the Premier would produce the sources of DBS statistics. What are the sources of these statistics?

MR. SMALLWOOD: You could kill him.

AN HON. MEMBER: We could love him.

MR. CROSBIE: We are having a love feast over here, are we not?

MR. SMALLWOOD: You and Frank Moores now, you love him. I know how you love him.

MR. MURPHY: The Premier knows.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A little more love and he is dead.

MR. MURPHY: The Premier knows. He knows what?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I know all about him. I know all about him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I hate to cause all this excitement.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down, sit down! We are fed up with you!

MR. CROSBIE: Boy golly! I better resign my seat, the Premier is fed with me.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Newfoundland is fed up with you too. The Province is fed up with you.

MR. CROSBIE: The Province is fed up.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. CROSBIE: They are all fed up.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right.

MR. CROSBIE: They are fed up with the Government and its deceit and deception and bluff, such as the figures. Where are the figures that ninety per-cent of the women in Newfoundland work in fish plants and supermarkets?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is only 89.9.

MR. CROSBIE: Produce the source.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. CROSBIE: So the hon. the Premier says that a study was done on fish plants and supermarkets. Now, Mr. Chairman, so far, to date in this session, we have had no information on where the figure of \$750,000. is arrived at, that it is going to cost the Government to give equal pay to men and women in the civil service, and not a word of explanation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do the hon. gentlemen want to come back tomorrow morning?

MR. CROSBIE: Have them twenty-four hours a day, we do not care.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A session in the morning, nine o'clock.

MR. CROSBIE: Go ahead, sure!

MR. MURPHY: 7:30 will do me.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nine o'clock.

MR. CROSBIE: You are going to threaten us.

MR. MURPHY: Come early and avoid the rush.

MR. CROSBIE: The Premier threatens, Mr. Chairman, that if I do not stop talking we are going to meet at nine in the morning.

MR. SMALLWOOD: For God's sake, if you do not stop talking we will all go in the Mental Hospital and so will Newfoundland and so will you. You are practically ready for it now.

MR. CROSBIE: What an easy solution to the problems of the country.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, any gentleman is supposed to have the right to speak.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A gentleman.

MR. MURPHY: A gentleman yes, a real gentleman.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the whole point is that the Government made this announcement for political reasons. Now it is a good principal, but we have already demonstrated here today that the Government is not going to be able to implement it properly in six months time or twelve, if the only action that they have taken so far is anything to go by. The enquiry the Premier mentions, he says it is fact but I say it is more likely fiction. We have not had any results of any enquiry placed on the table of the House. We have not been given his sources, that ninety per-cent of the women work in those three categories. There have been questions raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. He says, "What about nurses aides? Are they going to be paid now the same as male orderlies and so on?" These are some of the questions that are raised, if the Government is serious about equal pay for men and women.

So when the Minister is asked what about increasing the minimum wage and he says, we have to give this great study and so on, if it was the same kind of study that was given the question of equal pay for men and women, the Minister can have that study done in twenty-four hours, so do not expect us to swallow it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, may I remind the hon. member, who just took his seat, that after the announcement of the implementation of the Human Rights Act a very unfortunate thing happened and we lost our late and wonderful colleague. So that set the progress of the department back somewhat and I am only keeping the seat warm there. I have been doing the best I can, to try to -

MR. CROSBIE: You better get hot pants, if you are going to keep that seat

MR. CROSBIE:

warm.

MR. NEARY: Pardon!

MR. CROSBIE: You better get hot pants.

MR. NEARY: Well, I can assure the hon. gentleman, reassure, Mr. Chairman, this is the third time I have done it this afternoon, that anybody who has a complaint or a grievance under the Human Rights Code, it will be processed. We will have the machinery in the Department of Labour to process it. He need not have any fear about that.

MR. HICKMAN: On that same point, Mr. Chairman. The hon. the Minister has indicated that the Human Rights Legislation will be enforced by the shifting around of personnel in the department. But let us just take a very quick look,

MR. NEARY: We are on minimum wages now.

MR. HICKMAN: We are on minimum wages but minimum wages and equal pay for men and women are all related to wages and the hon. Minister admits that it is his department which is responsible for the enforcement of this. Now where are these people going to come from? We have sixteen under apprenticeship and, obviously, they are not going to come out of apprenticeship because that is not related at all. The training that is required for someone to work in the apprenticeship department will not help that person work in the enforcement of the Minimum Wage Act or the enforcement of Human Rights Legislation. Boiler inspection, another twelve; industrial standards, one; elevator inspection one, that only leaves then the general office and in that general office, if you exclude shorthand-typists, you have about seven or eight and these men, as I understand it, are those who are required to do the conciliation work and the conciliation services of the department.

MR. NEARY: They do investigations to.

MR. HICKMAN: They do investigations under the Labour Relations Act. Now the ability of these men to perform any additional services is not in the

MR. HICKMAN:

control of the Minister of Labour at all. It is in the control of the Trade Union Movement and Management because, if we have a period of industrial crisis similar to what we are having today, every conciliation, my guess is that the Minister is shorhanded right now, that every conciliation officer in the Province has more than he can do to take care of that kind of work. So that, when you examine the salary categories listed in the supplement to the estimates that are before us, it seems to me quite obvious that there is just no way that this Legislation can be enforced by the present fifty-seven employees of the Department of Labour. Bearing in mind that whoever is going to be responsible for this and whoever is going to make the judgement and the decisions as to whether or not complaints have to be enforced are well-founded, it cannot be an officer taken out of some other branch, out of apprenticeship or boiler inspection, It has to be somebody who knows something about industry and a great deal about classification.

So either you are going to fire some of the people who are already under some of the headings here now, general office or boiler inspection, and use their salary grants to provided these additional posts or, alternatively, this appears to be, from what we have heard today, more likely it is not going to be done.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say this that, as I am only keeping the seat warm in the Department of Labour, I do not want to do anything that may not meet with the approval of the new Minister when he is appointed. I am making the moves that are essential at the moment. For instance, I indicated this afternoon that we are in the process of recruiting a director of Human Rights. We just hired a university student to become the chief executive officer of the Labour Relations Board.

MR. HICKMAN: A university student or a university graduate?

MR. NEARY: A university graduate, That would free up Charlie Rennie to assume other duties in the department, and we just appointed a commissioner of Human

MR. NEARY:

Rights and there are two or three other moves that we are making, Mr. Chairman. But I would also like to point out to the hon. member, that Treasury Board can approve posts as the need arises. So as I said, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to move too fast, make all kinds of changes that the new Minister may not approve of.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that is not quite good enough. The Minister may be the Acting Minister of Labour but he is also presenting the estimates of the Department of Labour and should be able to explain them. As the hon. the member for Burin has indicated, there are only two additional posts here provided in the estimates, One is under the apprenticeship section and the other is under the boiler inspection division. Now we have two elements here in the Department of Labour this year, one the Human Rights Commission, for which there are going to be additional salaries, and there is no provision made for them whatsoever, apparently, in the salary portion of the estimates, and we know that we are going to have, if this equal pay for equal work is enforced and enforced properly, we are going to have to have a great number of additional workers, in the Department of Labour, to enforce it.

It is not just good enough for the Minister to come in here and say, "I am only acting Minister of Labour."

MR. NEARY: There is nobody disagreeing with that, but Treasury Board can approve posts as they need them.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, but we are talking about the estimates of the Department of Labour now and, in other words, the Minister is admitting that he is presenting estimates that are not accurate, that are not complete. What is the purpose?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Agree, agree.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, we agree, we agree.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All Tories, Liberals, Liberal Reforms,

MR. MARSHALL: No, never Liberal, never Liberal.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Tories, Tory Reforms.

MR. MURPHY: Do the Liberals disagree?

MR. MARSHALL: But the point is you are bringing in estimates before this House and we are entitled, you know you do not bring in estimates and say, "Oh, we are going to adjust them later on," this is ridiculous. The purpose of this House is to examine the Minister's estimates as they come before this House and the House is at least entitled to expect that the estimates are accurate insofar as the projections, the reasonable projections can provide. We know we have extra salaries for the Human Rights Commission, as I say. We know we are going to have to have considerably more salaries than are provided here for the enforcement of the equal pay for women and they are not here, and I feel, quite frankly, that the Minister's estimates ought to be referred back to his department so that he can come back in, and referred back to Treasury Board if necessary, so that he can come and present to this House some accurate figures.

Now that is on that point. On the other point brought up by the hon. the Premier, he talks about the surveys that were made all throughout the Island and it has only lately come to this Government to realize the fact that there must be equal pay for equal work. It was said by the Opposition -

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the hon. gentleman will allow me. Will he allow me?

MR. MARSHALL: If the hon. the Premier wishes to ask a question or clarify a point.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To clarify a point.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, yes. Certainly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does he not remember that for the last three years, until almost a year ago, the fish industry of Newfoundland was on the flat of its back and it is only in less than a year that it has come back and that fish plants are beginning to make money again? Does he not know that?

MR. MARSHALL: Certainly, Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly aware of that but I am also perfectly aware of the fact that there are many, many females in this Province who have worked in institutions, other than the fish plant, and that equal pay ought to have applied to them, even if (and if is a big if) even if it were necessary to not make it apply to the fish industry. This position was brought forth time and time, the Government talks from time to time about people on this side of the House taking a different view from that which they took a few years ago. Well, the fact of the matter remains that the Government is taking a very, very different view this year from that which it took in 1966 and 1967 and 1968 and 1969 and so on, when Mr. Ottenheimer, the member for St. John's East, brought forth, time and time again, resolutions to this effect, and they were voted down and voted down.

So we are told that a survey was made, that in-depth surveys were made and that is good because the Government of this Province and the people of Newfoundland can stand an awful lot of in-depth surveys. But I would like to know, I would like this answered. Could the hon. the Premier or the hon. the acting Minister of Labour name to us, tell us the managers who were contacted, at what periods they were contacted, the businesses concerned, the reactions received, the individuals who conducted the surveys themselves? If there were this in-depth survey surely we are entitled to this information. If it were completely impossible to bring it in, up to a few years ago, only up to this election year, well certainly the people of Newfoundland are entitled to know the reason why. The only way they can find the reason why is if the hon. the Premier gives us the information.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will give the hon. gentleman names of some of the firms, yes. Ayre and Sons, the fish plant at Burin, the fish plant at Grand Bank, the Newfoundland Fishery Products, practically all the fish companies, most of the large department stores, these are the firms we inquired of. We got their salary rates, we got what it would cost them. Each one gave us the figures of what it would cost them to pay equal rates for the same work in

MR. SMALLWOOD:

the same establishment. Yes. I did not make this up. This is not imaginary.

MR. MARSHALL: What was the extra cost to the fish plants?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Never mind that.

MR. MARSHALL: Come now, give us the whole story.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, the House is not getting that. No, not a bit of it, not a moment, no way. If Ayre and Sons or any other private firm gave us their wage bills, for men and for women and what it would cost them, that is private information. We got it, we needed it and, on the basis of it, we made our decisions. But does that mean we are going to reveal the private wage figures of every individual private company? How ever would we in future get information like that, if we reveal it?

MR. CROSBIE: Tell us the total for the industry.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Never mind the total. The total is such that we feel confident that it will not put them out of business to have equal pay. That is what we needed to know to make our decision. We made the decision on the basis of concrete information that we gathered, but we do not have to give that information out to the public and we are not going to.

MR. CROSBIE: That is not very convincing, that is not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We do not care whether the hon. gentleman is convinced or not. It is not the hon. gentleman we are trying to convince.

MR. CROSBIE: It is not convincing to anyone.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right. We will see.

MR. MARSHALL: Would the hon. Premier inform us whether they did the like surveys in 1966 and 1967 and 1968?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, we did not.

MR. MARSHALL: You did not do them?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, we did not. With the fishing industry dying on its feet -

MR. MARSHALL: But there is more than the fishing industry.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And one firm after the other collapsing in Newfoundland, they collapsed in Harbour Grace, they collapsed here in St. John's, there were half a dozen other firms at the edge of collapsing and we saved their necks. No, we did not need to make an enquiry.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, the sort of accusations that have been flying back and forth across the House are all very well but they still do not answer the question. I am rather surprised that the Premier says he will not reveal total facts. It is customary, in organizations like the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and anybody else who conducts these surveys, they do not disclose the individual names of firms but they are not adverse at all, in fact they are very much in favour of disclosing totals, and that is all this side of the House is asking for. Now to refer to the Minister, who is defending these estimates or trying to, I think he is being extremely naive, to say the least, no more employees or very few, two in the total complement of the department to carry out this brand new policy in the Government.

MR. NEARY: I did not say that. My hon. friend knows the Treasury Board has to approve new posts.

MR. EARLE: Well, this is our very gripe that we have with these estimates. It only goes once again to prove that the hon. Minister is not presenting the true picture in his estimates because, if he knows that he is going to have to build up his staff and add additional posts, now is the time for this House to know it and the public. At least he should put in a sizeable vote, a reasonable vote that could cover such contingency, and not come to this House in twelve months time and ask for supplementary supply, when he knows that his expenditure under this particular heading is going to be more than is shown here. He has admitted it by what he has said.

But what I was saying, Mr. Chairman, is that he is extremely naive because to bring in a regulation of this sort or a proposal of this sort, business is a very closely controlled affair, as he should well know, and, if costs go up in business, the businessman has only two ways of recovering it.

MR. EARLE:

Either he ups the price to the consumer or he cuts down staff or he increases the efficiency of his operation. Now we have seen it happening in many cases where labour unions go on strike and so on, demand higher wages and immediately what happens? When they get back in the store you see a cut down in the staff, you see a longer lineup at the checkouts, you see people carrying home their own groceries, you see people bundling their own packages, they cut back on staff to save this extra cost. If this regulation is carried out, and we are all in favour of equal pay for men and women doing similar jobs, the stores and all the businesses will either try to improve their efficiency or will either cut back on staff or in some way they will recover it or they will up their prices to the consumer. There is no magic formula in this. Business exists on profit and they will get their profits.

So when the Minister says that this is a policy which his department can administer, I do not think that he realizes just what the sort of can of worms is being developed, because this will have to be watched very carefully. In a former vote we were discussing Consumer Affairs, this whole thing should be tied in very closely with Consumer Affairs because, if the consumer is the one that suffers either through lack of service or higher prices or some other way, the Government's policy as of now will be self-defeating because somebody is going to pay for that. This whole thing, which the Minister is trying to defend, does require additional staff, it does require careful watching and it does require an increase in this vote. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that this department's estimates are not correct because they already know, when they present these to the House, that, in order to carry out the policy of the Government, they are going to have to increase staff, they are going to have to increase their wages and they are going to have to increase their budget.

So this is no way to go about trying to convince this House that the Government knows what it is doing, It does not or, if it does, it keeps

MR. EARLE:

it very closely under cover.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I have never heard the Premier make such a floundering argument as he has made tonight about this so called enquiry.

MR. SMALLWOOD: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: 'Fiction!' "Floundering!" Look, Mr. Chairman, the Premier says that it could not be done in the fish plants before, last year and the year before and the year before the fish plants were going under. Well, how is it then, Mr. Chairman, that last year -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right, right!

MR. CROSBIE: Does the Premier want to listen and learn or interrupt?

Last year, in this very House, the Minister of Labour, May 18, 1970, changed a discretion the Government had, up to last year, up to May 1970, actually up to July 1, 1970, fish plant workers did not come under the normal Minimum Wage Legislation on overtime work? Up until July 1, last year, if the fish plant workers worked overtime, they were not required by law to get time and a-half, so last year there was an amendment for that purpose.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right, right!

MR. CROSBIE: So last year there could have been an amendment for equal pay for men and women.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, wrong!

MR. CROSBIE: Right! RIGHT! Right! Before that it could have been the case. Now the Premier says there is an enquiry done and here are some questions. When was the enquiry done? What was the date of the enquiry? Can it be tabled in the House here? Further questions, as the hon. member for St. John's East! What is the total, for example, what will it cost the fish industry to have equal pay for men and women? Will it cost them \$50,000. or \$100,000. or \$300,000. or \$500,000.? What will it cost the supermarket firms? The Government must have the figures, as the Premier

MR. CROSBIE:

says, there was an enquiry done.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have, we have them.

MR. CROSBIE: Will it cost \$100,000.?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have the figures but we are not tabling them.

MR. CROSBIE: We do not care what it will cost Dominion Stores, individually.

We do not care what it will cost Steiners, individually, or any of Sobeys or
the rest of them.

What are the figures for the industry? Not small. Because if those figures are small it merely proves what we have been saying here today; that this is not going to^{be} realistic, it is going to be meaningless. While on the other hand, if the costs go up by a considerable amount of money, it will mean that there is really going to be something accomplished. So, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that whatever this enquiry was, it was a pretty half - I will not complete the phrase - half-done, half-baked, half-donkey it was a half-donkey investigation because it was limited, The Premier says the fish plant workers and supermarket employees, the Premier cannot tell us -

MR.SMALLWOOD: He can but he will not. He can, he will not.

MR.CROSBIE: What the costs are. First the Premier used the fallacious argument he would not reveal what Ayre & Sons were paying. Who cares what Ayres, what it was going to cost Ayres? He was not asked. So when we asked now for the industry the Premier had to change, now he cannot find a reason for not giving it, except that he will not.

MR.SMALLWOOD: That is right. He will not.

MR.CROSBIE: He will not.

MR.SMALLWOOD: He has seen that the order was made that it would be paid. That is what matters.

MR.CROSBIE: So when we hear this - Mr. Chairman, if it were the fishery industry alone that was worrying the Premier and the Government, then under the Minimum Wage Act and regulations they could have been exempted last year, the year before, five years ago, ten years ago. It could have been equal pay for men and women, except in the fresh fish industry. They could have been exempted the same as they were for overtime. So it just does not hold water. For twenty-two years has the Premier held out against equal pay for men and women doing the same kind of work. For twenty-two years, as far as I know, the official opposition pressed it, certainly in the last five. Now, in 1971, the Premier has to have an election, a hasty announcement is made and the Premier tries to pretend it has nothing to do with politics. Well, we are glad that politics brought it about. But the Premier

should be quite frank about it and say—"look this is election year, the women of Newfoundland have a vote, naturally we want to be as attractive to them as we can, in this election year." It is not going to do any good. We heard the results of ^{the} Goldfarb poll today, thirty conservative seats. It was on the news tonight, the member for Gander announced the results.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What were the results, what were they?

MR. CROSBIE: Thirty P.C.'s, five doubtful, six Liberals.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Good! Good! We are going to have six, good, good, six, marvellous, six. How lucky we are. Seven? Is it six or seven? Seven.

MR. CROSBIE: One for each election. The seventh election.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Seven, boy is not that wonderful?

MR. HICKMAN: Well, that is settled, Mr. Chairman. Now we have that out of the way. That is settled, yes. There is one other item, there is one bit of information that this House is entitled to receive. It is now stated it is the Government's position that we will not get the information on the cost of the industries. There is a third group, and remember a very large group, probably the largest, certainly one of the largest, these are the public servants. Obviously, if the equal pay for men and women apply to the public servants, as it must, no Government can bring in a law, applying to everybody else, saying we exclude public servants. What we are entitled to receive -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Or traitors or treachery, Liberals, renegade Liberals -

MR. HICKMAN: The result of the survey that presumably was done by Government to find out the cost to Government of bringing in this order, the hon. member for St. John's West I think or some hon. member this afternoon mentioned the figures \$750,000. I do not know if this is correct or not. Is it correct? Then if it is correct, why is it not contained in this year's estimates?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is in this year's estimates. It is in there. It is in there.

MR. NEARY: Primarily in the Department of Health and the Department of Social Services.

MR. HICKMAN: Every time I see the Premier like that, he reminds me of the statement of W.H. Eliot, "the cock believes that the sun rose in the morning just to hear him crow." But, Mr. Chairman, can we assume then that all estimates, for all departments, salary estimates, have included in them the survey, the additional \$750,000 over and above any general increase -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right. Correct. Correct it is all there.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HICKMAN: This is over and above any general increase. I was going to thank the Minister of Labour for the information, I do not know who the Minister of Labour is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we have had demonstration enough, shouting, interruptions, debate, delays and abusive language. This is not conducive to the prestige of the House. I will ask the hon. gentleman to carry on.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, can I, I wonder if it is possible, I wonder if it is possible to throw a little sanity on this discussion. Is it possible, am I imagining, am I making it up, is it just a bit of lying propaganda on my part when I say that the fishing industry of this Province has gone through hell, up to less than a year ago? Is that propaganda? Am I making that up? Am I the only one who thinks that, that the fishing industry of this Province went through hell for three years? That companies either failed or went out of business and sold off for a song? BirdsEye had a vast plant at Harbour Grace. They had one at Old Perlican. They had one at Ship Cove. They had one at Fermeuse, four great fish plants. They went out of business, they lost \$10 millions. Ten millions. I am talking about dollars. They went out, Ross-Steers, went out, they were in business three months. A brand new plant that cost something of the order of between four million and five million dollars. They were in business about three months when they folded and lost millions. Not through labour, because their market collapsed. The market collapsed. The fishing industry went through hell. The great Marystown plant notified me in writing that they were closing that great plant that cost \$9 million, not counting the.

cost of eight or ten draggers, something like fourteen, fifteen million dollars. They wrote me officially, as Premier of the Province, that they were closing it. It was only by the mercy of God that we were able to stop them from closing. Does anybody not, is there anyone that does not know the fishing industry has gone through hell? Only less than a year ago it began to come back. They began to make money. Why, it was going through hell? What kind of an irresponsible government would we be, what kind of fools would we be, what kind of traitors to Newfoundland would we be if we had put them out of business by ordering them to pay the same rates of wages to the women, doing the same work in the same plant, as they were paying to men? We would have been madmen, we would have been lunatics, if we had done it. We were not lunatics, we did not do it, we refused. That did not stop the Opposition, year after year after year after year, in the depths of depression when the industry was on the rocks, when they were at death's door, that did not stop them for political reasons, no other reason but sheer, downright, old-fashioned, partisan politics, nothing else. That did not stop them.

Year after, year after year suggesting that we should make the women get the same rates as the men, which would have plowed every fish plant in the Province under. These fish plants were employing ten thousand Newfoundlanders, 10,000, ten thousand, and in addition to employing ten thousand on their payroll they had something like 800 other men on draggers.

In addition to that, they were buying fish for cash, from fishermen, amounting to another nine or ten thousand men. This would have plowed them under. You could not exempt them, Mr. Chairman, because, if you had exempted them every woman in those fish plants would have been out - you know what would have happened - I will tell you what would have happened - there would have been a strike in every single individual plant. The sympathy of all Newfoundland would have been with the women. The Government would have looked like a crowd of curs. a crowd of yellow dogs not fit to live. That is how we would have looked. So you could not ordain

that in the government service, in the supermarkets, that the equal pay for equal work, but not in the fish plants, you could not do it, you could not do it. Anyone with any common sense knows you could not do it. Anyone with any feeling of decency and fair play knows you could not do it. You could not do it and we did not do it. The moment we found that it could be done, without hauling those firms under, how would the hon. member for Burin, how would he like to have that great plant in Burin closed down, that great plant in Grand Bank closed down? We put it there. The Liberal Government put it there. Every nickel that went into it we put it there. The great plant at Fortune, every nickel of that we put there, have that closed down?

MR. HICKMAN: (inaudible)

MR. SMALLWOOD: They put money there too but we put the plant there, we put it there. We put the plant in Burin, we put the plant in Grand Bank, we put the plant in Trepassey, we put the plants all around this Province. We have nearly \$40 millions of the people's money. This Government put out nearly \$40 million of the people's money in these plants. Every one of them would have gone under, they do not go under now. The market is good. The market is very good, they are all making money. Let me tell you of one company, I wish I could give you the name. I will not give you their name. One company lost half a million one year, three-quarters of a million the next year, a million the next year, one and a-quarter the next year, one and a-half million the next year, but last year they made over a million. This year they will make the best part of two million. They are beginning to get back their losses. Now what is the time, what is the time to make equal pay for men and women doing equal work in the same plant? When is it? When they are losing money or when they are making money? As soon as they are making, when they are making money. Yes. What the hon. gentleman now is suggesting, that we should not do it now, we should wait, we should not do it. He is now arguing, in effect, I gather he is arguing in effect that we should not have done it when they were losing money. We should not

do it now they are making money, just to get their losses back. We should wait until they get their losses back and then do it. I do not agree. I do not agree. I feel, we studied each individual company. Remember, Mr. Chairman, the Government gets the balance sheet of every fish company in the Province. Annually, yearly, we get the balance sheet. We know to the last nickel what the fish companies are making, what they are losing. We know what they sell. We know their tonnage. We know what they sell it for. We know what their costs are, their expenses are. We have it down to the last nickel. We have a director. The Government appoints a the director on/Board of Directors of practically every company.

How many fish companies are there today in Newfoundland that we have not a member on their Board of Directors? Not very many. So, we know the story, inside story. We know the inside story of the frozen fish industry. We know the money they have lost. We know the money they are making now. When we made it the law of the land, giving them six months to put it in force, when we did that, we did it on the basis of our own knowledge, our knowledge that the Opposition have not but we have, and we are not going to give it. We are not going to give it. It is secret information. It is secret commercial information. We would be infamous crooks, we would be scoundrels if we were to reveal that information.

What would it do in the markets? What would it do to their competitors? What would it do to Newfoundland's competitors? We would be scoundrels if we did it. If the Opposition started now, for the next three months, morning, afternoon and night, demanded, we tell them you can go straight to (you know where). The answer is no. "N-O." We are not giving it. You can say what you like, you can do what you like, you are not getting it. But we have it. We have it. On the basis of our knowledge that we have, we have made our decision. Our decision has been announced to Newfoundland, by me, some weeks ago. I announced it, not as a personal observation, not as a personal decision but as the decision of the Government of this Province, the Sovereign Government of this Province. We announced

that they were to pay equal pay to the women and the men. We gave them six months to do it. That announcement was based on our knowledge, not the Opposition's knowledge, our knowledge. We made the decision. The Opposition did not make the decision, we made the decision. We based it on our knowledge not on their knowledge. They did not make it, we made it, we are responsible for it. We will take the blame or we will take the praise.

MR.CROSBIE: Before this is carried, Mr. Chairman, you know we cannot be accused of obstruction, certainly after the last ramble we just had. The whole argument - anyone, Mr. Chairman, who have seen a whale driven upon a beach, will recognize that tonight they saw another whale driven upon a beach, when they listened to the Premier's argument. What nonsense to justify equal pay for men and women.

MR.SMALLWOOD: What tripe?

MR.CROSBIE: .What tripe. Any more words to suggest.

MR.SMALLWOOD: What tripe, That is the hon. gentleman's word - that is the only word that he knows and he cannot even spell that. What tripe.

MR.CROSBIE: Now, the hon. the Premier just spoke. I did not interrupt him. I watched him with amazed amusement.

MR.SMALLWOOD: Stop grinning. Stop grinning.

MR.MURPHY: The Premier just cannot stop he has to work out gradually -

MR.SMALLWOOD: Stop grinning. I know you hate his guts. I know you are jealous of him and you hate -

MR.CROSBIE: The Premier's propellor is still whirly. Now to get back to the Premier's argument: The Premier said that the fish industry in the last two or three years could not afford equal pay -

MR.SMALLWOOD: There is only one out of the whole -

MR.CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, can I have the floor for a minute? Could not afford equal pay for men and women because the fish industry was not earning money the last three or four years - well, it was earning money in 1966. It was earning money in 1965, '64, '63.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Was it? Was it?

MR. CROSBIE: That was the Premier's great expansion, Oh yes, we heard the announcements Ross-Steers were coming. Lever Bros. were coming. It was the second coming as far as the fishery of Newfoundland was concerned.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And lost their shirts. They came and they lost their shirts.

MR. CROSBIE: Before they lost their shirts, the hon. the Premier was spouting throughout the land that the fish industry was in great shape, they were making money and they were going to have dozens of trawlers built in Marystown.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Never said they were making money.

MR. CROSBIE: Did the Premier introduce equal pay for men and women then?
No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Never said they were making money.

MR. CROSBIE: Now the Premier said the fish plant companies are making money, he is introducing it now. Is he going to take it back again, if he is able to, in two years time they are not making money. The cycle is up and down. We heard about the cycles.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before we allow that we will nationalize them.

MR. CROSBIE: Good. We are getting information -

MR. SMALLWOOD: We will. We will not let them go back on that.

AN. HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: I do not know, he will not even be in office, the Hon., the Premier.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Only seven seats.

MR. CROSBIE: The Hon., the Premier will be telling us to nationalize them - we may not listen to him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What fun I am going to have reminding the hon. gentleman of that. What fun I have had in the past. We were going to be wiped out in the last election, remember. You remember. No we were not, we got thirty-nine out of forty-one, that is the way we are going to be wiped out this election too. Same way.

MR. CROSBIE: We have a short time ahead of us Mr. Chairman, to enjoy this

last session that we are going to be in. Why does the Premier interrupt us and prevent us from making our speeches, we are not even going to be back here next session, if his forecast turns out? So, during these last few days that remain to us, may we speak uninterrupted and have our words reported in Hansard? Will I proceed Mr. Chairman?

The Premier's argument is so fallacious, so obviously fallacious it does not need really to be rebutted. The fishing industry have had its ups and downs, but equal pay for men and women was never instituted. Now, the pulp and paper industry are having their ups and downs, and their peaks and valleys. Well that is going to peak and valley back again. The Premier says; "it all goes in cycles." So if that was the reason the Government never introduced it, why are they introducing it now? They know that the fish industry will have its downs and ups again in the future. It has been introduced this year for one reason only, because the Opposition has pressed for it through the years and because this is election year. There is not such thing as a study. The Premier cannot give us the figures. What difference does it make to the fish industry of Nova Scotia if this House is told that equal pay for men and women will cost the Newfoundland industry \$100,000 altogether. What earthly use can that be to the fish plants up in Nova Scotia? None at all. The Premier cannot give us the figure because there has been no study done. No sensible study.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He can. Oh, he can. But he will not.

MR. CROSEJE: He cannot. Fiction. F-I-C-T-I-O-N. Not fact. F-A-C-T. Facts are far away from the Premier's mind when he started this debate here tonight. The point is it is being done, there are not even the funds provided here to see it is done properly and efficiently. The Government cannot even tell us what the costs are going to be to the employers of Newfoundland, to institute this, much less what it is going to cost the Government. We are unconvinced. The Premier's argument does not impress.

MR. MARSHALL: Just a few points, Mr. Chairman, about what the Premier mentioned.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down for God's Sake, sit down. Sit down. Sit down.

MR. MURPHY: The boss;

MR. MARSHALL: To have said there was going to be a strike in every plant, if they had exempted the fish plants from the provisions of equal pay for equal work, is absolutely incorrect. It is wrong. It is ridiculous, because this Government, some time ago, instituted an increase in the minimum wage, at the time, and exempted the fish plants from it. It could have done the self-same thing here with respect to the women. The fact that the industry, the fishing industry, was in a bad state in this Province, the fact that that was in a bad state has no relationship whatsoever. If the fishing industry needed to be subsidized, it should have been subsidized by the Government. In effect, what the hon. the Premier has in effect admitted is the fact that he allowed the wages of women, working in the fish plants, to subsidize the fishing industry of this Province. Instead of allowing the women of this Province to have worked in the fish plants for years for what amounts to slave labour rates, this Government ought to have paid attention to the positions taken by the Opposition certainly within the past five years. How ridiculous to get up and talk about the fact that if you had invoked it for one industry and excepted the fishing industry from it, you would have had a strike in every plant, because all the women in the fishing plants would have seen that their counterparts in other industry were given -

MR. SMALLWOOD: They would have been right. They would have been right.

MR. MARSHALL: You would not have been - the Government did it before; they could have done it again. They should have done it. But instead, instead this Government, this Government that talked in 1949, 1959 and so on about the fish merchants of this Province, chose to subsidize the fish merchants at the expense of the poor women working in the fish plants, allowed them to work at these slave labour rates. Each and every member of the Government supporting the position now taken by the Premier should hang his head in shame.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman,

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh, God, not Hickey! I agree with you, I agree it is almost unbearable, is it not? Hickey!

MR. HICKEY: Are you all finished now? Mr. Chairman, I am well aware of the fact that some hon. gentlemen on the other side do not like to see anyone get up on this side and say anything.

MR. ROBERTS: —

MR. HICKEY: What was it the hon. minister of Health just said?

MR. ROBERTS: I said if any one on the other side could say something it would be okay.

MR. HICKEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, at least it was effort, give us marks for effort on this side, more than we can say for the hon. minister. He just strolled in there a few minutes ago. He has been reading a book ever since. We have been lucky tonight, Mr. Chairman, we have dragged some information out, dragged it out. Is it not amazing how you have to get, what you have to do around here to get some information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! the hon gentleman go on with the subject.

MR. HICKEY: I am right on the subject, Mr. Chairman. Right on it, hitting the nail right on the head. We have asked for information. The Premier will not give it to us. When he gets mad a little bit seeps out. He forgets and something slips out, we find out

MR. HICKEY: when the survey was done. We asked for details. He is not going to give them to us.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What a fool I am. What a fool I am.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, the Premier would not be a fool if he gave details on that. Certainly not. This debate might be much shorter than it is, if he did. We are accused of obstruction, it must be clear, Mr. Chairman, for all to see, for all to hear tonight, where the obstruction comes from. If we are obstructing on this side, why?

MR. NEARY: Is this in order, Mr. Chairman?

MR. HICKEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is in order.

MR. SMALLWOOD As much as anything else is.

MR. HICKEY: This is in order, all right.

This afternoon Mr. Chairman, I raised a couple of points. Constructive criticism? Of course, the minister got up and he twisted that around in such a way you could hardly recognize it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You have nothing to add to the debate, really, you have not.

MR. HICKEY: That is a matter of opinion, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It has all been said.

MR. HICKEY: That is a matter of opinion. I have this much to add to it. When somebody tells me this afternoon that I do not understand what is meant by equal pay for equal work. This is what the minister told me.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Tell us. Tell us. Tell us that you do know. Explain it.

MR. HICKEY: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that it must be the minister and the Government who do not understand. It must obviously be, because it is quite clear for anyone to see, Mr. Chairman, that the legislation pertaining to equal pay for equal work can be beaten by an employer, seven days a week. I

thought at least the minister would be man enough to admit it. He knows it as well as I do.

The member for St. John's West brought up a very interesting point about when complaints were made to the department. Just how would the department deal with them? On what basis would they be dealt with?

When we talk of employers' classifying positions, who is going to set the standards for classification? Is the Government going to set it? Someone must set it. If an employer can set the standard for classification, he can beat this legislation, as I said, seven days a week. If he takes a man out of a position...

MR. SMALLWOOD: Let him try.

MR. HICKEY: Or if he has a man and a woman employed, and it will appear that both are doing the same work, all he has to do, Mr. Chairman, is delete some of the duties from that woman or add some, in terms of the classification under which the man is employed, and this legislation is not worth a damn. It is worth nothing.

Mr. Chairman, it must be great news to the employees all over the Province, when the minister says that he is just keeping the seat warm in the Department of Labour.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the hon. gentleman hope to go there?

MR. HICKEY: Pardon?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is the hon. gentleman going to run in St. John's East Extern?

MR. HICKEY: That is another matter, Mr. Chairman. We have already covered that several times.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out this afternoon, surely there must be some hon. gentleman across the way who can fill that post. My comment was not out of concern for the hon. minister entirely, but I must admit that some of it was.

It is quite obvious that I do not agree with the way that he is running the department for which he is primarily responsible,

MR. STRICKLAND: The hon. minister can take it.

MR. HICKEY: I realize that.

MR. STRICKLAND: Sixteen and eighteen hours a day.

MR. HICKEY: I realize that he can take it all right. What I also realize, Mr. Chairman, is that the employees cannot take it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What vote are we on, by the way?

MR. HICKEY: I suggest that after the election we are all going to...

MR. SMALLWOOD: What vote are we on? What is it?

MR. NEARY: The whole debate so far has been out of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Minimum wages?

MR. NEARY: The whole debate is out of order.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, if the whole debate has been out of order, it is about time the hon. gentleman woke up. It is a poor time to bring it to the attention of the Chairman now. How many...

MR. SMALLWOOD: Any time that the hon. gentleman is on his feet is the right time.

MR. HICKEY: How many things, Mr. Chairman, have gone on here tonight that have been out of order? How many? As I said, we got information out of a heated argument that made little sense. I might add, to some of the things that have been thrown across this House tonight. One should not even be subjected...

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hodder): Order please! Would the hon. gentleman keep to the subject at hand.

MR. HICKEY: That is what I am trying to do, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: The Minimum Wage Vote we are on, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HICKEY: That is what I am attempting to do.

MR. NEARY: The Minimum Wage Vote.

MR. HICKEY: If the hon. gentleman across the way would keep

quiet, I just might stick right to the subject.

MR. NEARY: Okay, let us hear about the minimum wages.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He might, he might, try it. Let us give him a try.

AN HON. MEMBER: Carried.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, it is a job to have patience here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am beginning to understand why the hon. gentleman's party wants to get rid of him. I am really beginning to understand it.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is cruel. As a matter of fact...

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is cruel. How cruel is it for us to put - Grown up men, listening to this!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, it has all been said about the equal pay for equal work. When one gets up to answer some charges or stupid remarks that are made, he is termed out of order. I imagine the people all over the Province realize, only too well, who is in order and who is out of order around here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, there is just one final point.

MR. SMALLWOOD: One final point.

MR. MARSHALL: One final point, yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: One final point from him, and a final point from each one of them, but there is no obstruction.

MR. MARSHALL: One final point from me yes, unless there are other points brought up by the hon. the Premier, then I might talk on it a little bit more.

The fact of the matter is that we on this side have always been very anxious for the equal pay for equal work.

MR. NEARY: This is not the heading for equal pay for equal work. We are talking about the minimum wage.

MR. MARSHALL: We are talking about equal minimum wage.

MR. HICKEY: There is no heading there to talk about.

MR. MARSHALL: The minister has come before this House without

being able to show us that he has enough positions in his department to cover the increased work of enforcing the proclamation of that Act. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in the interest of seeing that the women of this Province are no longer receiving slave wages, I move that this item of 16-14-01, salaries, stand over until such time as the minister can show this House that he has enough staff in the department to handle it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question Mr. Chairman. Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item stand? Those in favour "aye," contrary "nay," I take it that the "nay's" have it.

Standing vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is lost, sixteen to seven.

On motion item carried.

On motion total subhead 16-14-02-01, carried.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, 515-01, would the minister give us an explanation as to what this vote is for.

MR. SMALLWOOD: \$200.00 more than last year?

MR. MURPHY: What was it for last year?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I asked for an explanation.

Industrial standards.

MR. NEARY: Is it the extra \$200. the hon. member wants to know about?

MR. HICKEY: I want a general statement, Mr. Chairman, so that when I have some comments to make I will not be told that I do not know what I am talking about. Tell us and then we will all know.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, this division was set up in 1964 -65. The Industrial Standards officer is Mr. Bannister. It is set up so that employers and employees or their representatives can petition to have a conference to consider establishing an industrial standards schedule for their industry, zone or region

If the hon. member wants a breakdown of the petitions that we have received so far, I would be very happy to let him have it. There are a number of schedules in effect at the present time. For instance, there is a schedule in effect in the construction, carpentry industry, in Central Newfoundland. It came into effect in 1965 and was revised in 1967 and 1969.

There is a schedule in effect for the painting and decorating industry in St. John's, which became effective in December 1969. Plumbing, hydronic, commercial and domestic heating in the St. John's area have a schedule which came into effect in 1969. The construction carpentry industry in the Gander-Glenwood area petitioned for a schedule of rates and working conditions in June, 1970.

There are a number of schedules pending at the moment. I might add that the Industrial Standards Officer makes periodic visits to the areas that are covered by schedules, for the purpose of routine checks and to investigate any complaints that were referred to the department.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, we have heard the explanation, would the minister now tell us the standard of work that has to be done. Are there inspectors going around? Would the Minister kindly tell the public, does this deal with wages, etc. in various areas? He did not mention wages or anything else.

MR. NEARY: It deals with all sorts of things. Working conditions, wages, apprenticeship training, practically everything.

MR. MURPHY: It is not standards of workmanship, as one would gather from this here.

MR. NEARY: No, no, no.

MR. MURPHY: The minister just stated that officials of his department would travel to these areas. They are not going to do much travelling on \$500.00

MR. NEARY: There is not really all that much travelling to be

done under this subhead, Mr. Chairman. In 1970, as a result of the representations that were made to the department and the investigations carried out - some of these investigations, I might add, are carried out by some of the other officers in the department who are charged to other subheads, like the minimum wage inspectors and so on.

The sum of \$12,399.00 in unpaid wages was collected on behalf of employees in 1970. Since 1965, a total of \$24,500.00 has been collected.

MR. MURPHY: Was this under industrial standards or minimum wage?

MR. NEARY: Complaints that we have had, you know.

MR. MURPHY: The elevators. There was a report, I think a few weeks ago, where - are all elevators like those in hotels and public buildings under this?

MR. NEARY: Yes, they do, yes. As a matter of fact, the hon. Leader of the Opposition might notice that right here in the elevators in Confederation Building, there was a certificate posted in each elevator recently, certifying that it is now safe for the members of the House to ride up and down in these elevators.

MR. MURPHY: Well, there was a difference in the western one for a while there. It carried seven less than the others. Was that the one for the Opposition?

MR. NEARY: That is right.

Motion, total subhead 16-16, carried.

Motion, Block Provision, Canada Pension Plan, Carried.

Motion, Block Provision, Salary Adjustment, Carried

MR. CROSBIE: They are not carried yet, Mr. Chairman. There is one question the minister has not answered yet. Special allowance for the Assistant Deputy Minister, \$2,500.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I answered that one. The hon. member

was out of the House this afternoon.

That was \$2,500. that was paid to Mr. Blanchard for special duties that he had in advising the Government on Labour Legislation.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, one last question. The block provision salary adjustments \$30,300.00. Is that five percent or ten percent or how is it arrived at?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, we are in negotiations.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, but there is an amount put in. We know the Government is in negotiations, but there is an amount put in the estimates here for salary adjustments. Is that five percent of a department's normal payroll, or ten, or what?

MR. NEARY: I would assume, Mr. Chairman, that this is just an estimate. We are into negotiations with the Government employees at the moment.

MR. CROSBIE: The N.G.E.A. that was

MR. NEARY: Yes. This is purely a guesstimate, you know.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, but when the estimates are being done, they do not just guess at each department. Surely, the department allows five percent or ten percent?

MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, it is a little bit better than a guesstimate, I assure you. Actually, this block provision - we did the same thing incidentally, last year when we found that we had to support an increase to all the civil servants and the police and others. We put in a block provision. It was an estimate of what we thought would be the cost. I think that our estimate was fairly accurate.

We have arrived at these figures for each department in two ways. One, by having the Public Administration Division look at the classification, the new classification, which is in the process as my colleague has said, of being negotiated, as it would effect each department, and then, having the figures

reviewed by the secretariat of the Treasury Board.

Then we have broken out each department, and tried to apply it as nearly as we can. You will notice that it varies, I think from a high of \$3.4 million in Health to I think, and this is the low, in Labour of \$30,300.00. There is quite a bit of background work that has been done on these figures.

On motion, Total Department of Labour Estimates, carried.

LABRADOR AFFAIRS 19

MR. CROSBIE: Could you tell us by the way, Mr. Chairman, what department will be after Labrador Affairs? Can we have some advance notice? Perhaps the minister wants to speak first.

MR. WINSOR: No Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to speak at any length in introducing the estimates for Labrador Affairs.

Labrador Affairs, Mr. Chairman, have been subject to a lot of criticism from certain people, and especially from the other side of the House, at times without justification, as far as I am concerned. The department is carrying out a very useful purpose and that is what it was set up to do. It was set up to provide a service primarily for the people of Labrador, to give them a closer association and to keep them in touch with the department, or rather, in touch with Government. The Department of Labrador Affairs was set up as a liaison officer between the Government and the other departments.

It has performed a very useful service and I feel sure that the people of Labrador are appreciative of that service. From what I hear and the requests that I get from the people of Labrador, especially from Labrador North, this service will continue. I think that is about all I have to say Mr.

Chairman, at this time.

MR. MURPHY: The minister was very brief, and probably this is what this department calls for. In our opinion, it is ornamental in a great many respects.

As far as Labrador itself is concerned, of course, we have three different areas. We have Labrador South, which incidentally I guess the whole House regrets, and extends its sympathy to the member for that district in the loss of the replacement ferry today, by fire. I know it must have been quite a blow to his district. As I say, this will be quite a blow unfortunately, because, I know the trials and tribulations of that ferry on the straits. It had a pretty rough time, and served a useful purpose, as far as it went, but it just could not do the job that was expected of it.

There is one thing that we ran into, when a group of our party toured Labrador South this winter, (Am I interrupting the Premier, Mr. Chairman?) and that was the twenty-five cents tax on gasoline. I know that we are not the only ones that have been made aware of this. In Labrador particularly where I think, the great majority, as a matter of fact, of the residents of Labrador use the skidoo type machine instead of the dogs, there were a great many complaints that some consideration should be shown to those residents of Labrador who, through no fault of their own, must use those skidoos for getting around and doing their normal work.

There has been some misunderstanding in past years, as far as I understand, where tax free gasoline was supplied up until the 31 of December of last year. Am I right on this? Perhaps the hon. member for Labrador South or Labrador North who are in the House, might give us some explanation on that.

The skidoos are used, of course, to obtain fishery

supplies for their flakes and to obtain firewood. They were not used on any highway where normally the gasoline tax would apply. There are no highways, except for the few miles that-I understand the Minister of Highways made a statement today that, I think, out of December, January, February, March and April, the road was blocked for ninety-four days, which would be just about ninety percent of the time.

MR. HILL: Actually, it was one of the worst winters we have seen.

MR. MURPHY: It must have been, yes. Perhaps for that reason, Sir, I am wondering if we could hear from the minister that there should be some special provision made to the residents who are compelled to use the skidoo type machine, (I think skidoo is only a trade name, but the snow-mobile type.) having to have to pay the full twenty-five cents a gallon tax on their gasoline. As I understand it, it was tax-free up to last December or perhaps the December before. Then they all had to come under the tax, the same as the motorists on the island part or any other part of Labrador or Newfoundland, and they have to pay it.

I think their big objection, and a very valid one I would say, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that the gasoline tax, if not designated as such, is usually put on for the purpose of creating better roads for the driving of cars.

Perhaps the minister might give us some thoughts on this. Whether representation has been made on behalf of all districts of Labrador, particularly North and South, as to the exemption of this gasoline tax. I do not think it would be too difficult Sir, because, I believe, like the old Act on gasoline, and I think that is still in effect, for motor boats

and what not, perhaps the same system could be used for Labrador for the use of skidoos.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Chairman, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has a very valid question there, but, he is correct when he says the skidoo has replaced the Labrador dog.

MR. MURPHY: There was only one team in Labrador South as far as I could learn.

MR. WINSOR: That is so, but it is only over the past three or four years that the dog teams have gone out almost completely.

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. WINSOR: People are using the skidoo as the only means of transportation during the winter season. I do not recall when there was an exemption made for skidoo operations, on gasoline tax. I do not recall if there was or not. However, I was going to suggest to the hon. Leader that it is a matter of course, entirely up to the Department of Finance or the S.S.A. Tax,

MR. WINSOR:

that we have made, the hon. member for Labrador South and myself have made representation to the department for an exemption of the gasoline tax. We will still pursue it.

MR. HICKMAN: Would the hon. Minister indicate to the Committee some of the work that is now being preformed by the Department of Labrador Affairs? It is my understanding that, if there is a health problem involving Labrador that this is dealt with by the Department of Health, if it is in the Justice Department it is dealt with by the Department of Justice, welfare is dealt with by the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation. The hon. Minister has just indicated that the problem with respect to exemption from gasoline tax is referred to the Minister of Finance, to be dealt with by that department.

Now there certainly is nothing in the estimates of the Department of Labrador Affairs to indicate that any of these services, as they relate to Labrador, are being handled by the Department of Labrador Affairs. The vote is just too small. Labrador is treated health-wise, justice-wise, welfare-wise, highways-wise and everything else by the appropriate department the same as every other part of Newfoundland. There is a vote here for air passenger subsidies of \$150,000., that subsidy and the administration that is involved in connection with that subsidy obviously can be dealt with and I suspect it is being dealt with by the Department of Finance, otherwise it is only a matter of issuing the cheque.

Now what work is being done to justify a completely independent Department of Labrador Affairs?

MR. WINSOR: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Labrador Affairs is, as I stated at the beginning, a liaison office between other departments of Government. There are numerous occasions when people from Labrador have difficulty in getting action from certain departments of Government. Their request originally is channeled through the Department of Labrador Affairs

MR. WINSOR:

and the Department of Labrador Affairs will undertake to contact that department and try and eliminate any difficulty or try to resolve the problem for them. I recall just a little while ago when they were short of gasoline and oil in Southern Labrador, the request came through the member for the district and the member for the district passed it along to Labrador Affairs and we immediately contacted the Department of Transport and made the arrangements for an ice breaker to go in there with those supplies. Those are things that are happening every day. The only thing about requests like this is that they come directly to the department and the department, of course, was set up in 1968 and I was not the first Minister of that department but I think it was a very wise move and it gives the people of Labrador a feeling of belonging to the Province of Newfoundland and rightly so. It is through this department that we have cemented relationships very, very well indeed.

There is no complaint in Labrador, as far as I know, objecting to a Department of Labrador Affairs.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the Department of Labrador Affairs is about the most useless one in the Government, despite what the Minister says. Now the Minister has just given an illustration of how they needed gasoline up in Labrador South and the member for the district from Labrador South got hold of the Minister and the Minister arranged to get gasoline for them. Well that is something that the member for Labrador South could very well have done himself. In other words what the member -

MR. WINSOR: He may not have gotten the action though.

MR. CROSBIE: What the hon. Minister is saying is that his department is doing what in other areas the members of the district do. For example, if somebody in Burgeo-LaPoile, there is a shortage of gasoline in Burgeo-LaPoile, the district of the hon. the Chairman, and they contact him, the hon. the Chairman sees to it that something is done about it. He does not

MR. CROSBIE:

need a Department of Burgeo-LaPoile Affairs to go to to ask the Minister to do something about it. The member for Labrador South, in any event, is a member of the Cabinet and he could just as easily have gotten after the CNR and gotten gasoline there. I am surprised to see that he bothered the Minister for Labrador Affairs at all.

Now one of the things that Labrador Affairs is supposed to look after or does look after, Mr. Chairman, is the question of employment at Churchill Falls, and the answer that the Minister gave in this House earlier in the session as to the employment situation at Churchill Falls was a most peculiar one. The Minister said that on March 1, 1971, and I realize that this is a period of low employment, that there are going to be more people working and these percentages will change, but at that time only 56.23 per-cent, let us call it fifty-six per-cent, of the 2,543 people employed at Churchill Falls were born in Newfoundland, are permanent residents of Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: I thought it was seventy-two down there.

MR. CROSBIE: I will come to that. 1,430, - it has not come to seventy-two. The Premier made a statement Friday that seventy-two per-cent of the hourly paid workers were from Newfoundland. That is not seventy-two per-cent of the total workers. But on March 1, 1971 there were 2,543 people employed at Churchill Falls and of that total 1,430 were from Newfoundland or Labrador and 1,013 moved into the Province to work there. Now the breakdown on that was that there were 1,137 hourly paid workers from Newfoundland and 512 hourly paid workers from outside Newfoundland. So sixty-eight per-cent of the hourly paid workers even on March 1, 1971 were from Newfoundland but the amazing thing is that of the hourly paid workers, Mr. Chairman, at that time only sixty-eight per-cent of the hourly paid workers were from Newfoundland. These are not white collar workers, these are men paid by the hour, all the building trades and crafts and the rest of it and that is quite amazing

MR. CROSBIE:

that there were 512 hourly paid workers up there from outside Newfoundland at that time.

Of the salaried employees 293 or thirty-three per-cent were from Newfoundland and 601 or sixty-seven per-cent of the salaried employees were from outside Newfoundland. Now when the Premier gave the statistic on Friday it was seventy-two per-cent, I believe the Premier said, of the hourly paid workers at Churchill Falls at the moment are from Newfoundland. That is not seventy-two per-cent of everybody working there, that means that there is only an improvement of four per-cent since March 1. Now March 1, sixty-eight per-cent of the hourly paid workers were from Newfoundland and now apparently, at the end of last week, nearly the end of May, seventy-two per-cent which is just a difference of four per-cent.

Now it is going to take the Minister to present some convincing facts, I think, to persuade the Committee that it is necessary to have 512 hourly paid workers at Churchill Falls from outside Newfoundland together with another 601 salaried employees. Surely all those people, surely all those forty-four per-cent cannot be people who could not be gotten from within Newfoundland to work up at Churchill Falls. It cannot be so that, on March 1, forty-four per-cent of everybody working at Churchill Falls had to come from outside Newfoundland because we did not have people in Newfoundland trained to do their jobs. Can that be right? I would like to see a list of every position up there and what they were doing. Of the white collar workers that only thirty-three per-cent of the white collar workers can come from this Province, I mean it does not seem to me to add up.

I remember when the Premier announced this great project years ago, that there were going to be thousands of jobs up there for Newfoundlanders and the Government was making every effort to see that every job that could be filled by a Newfoundlander was filled by one. So I think the Minister

MR. CROSBIE:

should produce some facts and figures now to show that this is the case because, in view of these figures that the Minister gave in his answer and in view of the statistic the Premier gave on Friday, it just does not appear to be that way. Now we discussed this afternoon the business of employment at Churchill Falls and there is no point going all over that point again. The Government has not satisfied me, it has not satisfied this man, whom I got a letter from on Friday, that justice is being done to Newfoundlanders working at Churchill Falls.

Here is a man who had a dispute up at Churchill Falls, He was employed there and he had a conflict with the union and the company over wages. He refused to work as a labourer while employed as a grouter and he was being paid a labourer's rate of \$3.30 when he should have been receiving a grouter's rate of \$3.61. This is what he said. A grouter is a man that grouts but what grouting is I am not sure. I do not know if it is grubbing or perhaps the Minister knows. In any event he was dismissed. He insisted on being paid as a grouter and he was paid as a labourer, so he was dismissed. He comes back to Newfoundland and has not been able to get another job since and went to the Manpower, the Unemployment Insurance, the Department of Labour and made complaints to them all, Churchill Constructors and the union representative, who advised him that he was entitled to what he was asking for, which was thirteen weeks wages as a grouter rather than just as a labourer.

He visited the Union representatives office, here in St. John's, on at least six occasions, only to find that either the offices were closed between ten and twelve noon and between three and five P.M. or that there was no one to take a statement from him. "Therefore, I feel that it is useless to try anymore. Once I believe that if you could find the time to look into the matter, things may very well be made better for other Newfoundlanders who are presently working in Churchill Falls and who are

MR. CROSBIE:

in fear of speaking their cases to either the union or the firm of which they are employed because they may lose their jobs."

Now that, Mr. Chairman, expresses the feeling of dozens of men who work up at Churchill. If they complain to the firm or they complain to the union, they lose their job. They have this arrangement up there that is in effect for the next five years and they do not seem to believe that the man at Churchill Falls, that the Government has there, will do anything for them, or they do not know about him. They come back to Newfoundland and they cannot get anything done by the union. There are dozens of cases like that, as the Minister knows and this is wrong, as the individual should not be left in that position.

So perhaps, if the Minister has other information that will counteract that and that would reassure me, I would be delighted to hear it. One last point, Mr. Chairman, on Labrador Affairs. As the Minister knows, \$6,585,344. was spent on the road from Happy Valley to Churchill. There was no money spent last year and there was no money spent the year before but in the year 1967 and 1968 there was \$6,585,000. spent on the tote road from Goose Bay up to Churchill Falls. Can the Minister tell the House is there going to be anything spent on that road this year or just what the position is on that road? I agree the Government or at least I do not see how the Government itself can afford to expend one hundred per-cent of the cost of doing it, but just what are the prospects on that road now? The work that is done there is going to be pretty near next to useless, if it is not followed up within the next year or two. So perhaps the Minister of Labrador Affairs will be able to tell us what is likely to happen this year. The Minister of Highways was asked about a month ago and he said he could not give any information then but there would be some later on and, since the season must be approaching for road construction, could the Minister tell us what the position is?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, on the matter of employment I happen to be the one who gave the figures that were given and I did that on Friday at six o'clock just as the House was rising on the motion to adjourn. I gave the bare fact of 72.4 per-cent, seventy-two and one half per-cent of the hourly paid employees at Churchill. That was the number and that was the percentage, on May 5. The number of Newfoundlanders working at Churchill Falls on May 5 was 1483. The total number of hourly paid employees was 2,049. So seventy-two and one half or 72.4 per-cent of them were Newfoundlanders but, Sir, I did not read this figure. In addition to the 1,483 Newfoundlanders, there were 299 jobs that they tried to fill in Newfoundland and could not and did not. There were 299 jobs that became available in Labrador that the various contractors and Canada Manpower tried to fill in Newfoundland, 299.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hourly paid workers, hourly workers.

MR. MURPHY: Do they have trades?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Trades, of course. Practically nobody else works at Churchill Falls, practically nobody else works down there but tradesmen.

MR. MURPHY: With all our trade vocational schools they could not fill these jobs?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They could not fill those 299 jobs and they could not and they did not. Now if they had been able, the jobs were there but they could not get the men, if they had gotten the men, the proportion of Newfoundlanders would have been 87 per-cent. The percentage, the proportion of Newfoundlanders on May 5, instead of being 72.5 per-cent, would have been 87 per-cent.

MR. CROSEJE: That is hourly paid now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is all I am talking only of hourly workers. I have made that abundantly clear, that that is what I am talking about. The 1,483 Newfoundlanders were there in a total of 2,049 hourly workers, that was 72.4

MR. SMALLWOOD:

per-cent. But there were 299 other hourly jobs that were available, that they tried to fill here in Newfoundland in all the Manpower offices of the Province, and could not get them, so they got them where they could get them, which was not in Newfoundland. So those 299 workers brought into Churchill Falls from outside the Province dragged the percentage down from 87 per-cent to 72.5 per-cent. There would have been fifteen per-cent more Newfoundlanders working there, if they had been available, but they were not available. There are all kinds of Newfoundlanders available, thousands unemployed Newfoundlanders, desperately looking for jobs, but there were 299 jobs that they could not get Newfoundlanders to fill at Churchill Falls, call it 300, 300 men, 299. So they got them where they could, which was in Quebec and Halifax, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario, wherever they could get them they got them, and you cannot blame them. I mean we would be fools to blame them, would we not? They had to get them, they had to have them and they did, they got them. They could not get them in Newfoundland, although there were thousands of Newfoundlanders looking for work, going two and three times a week to the Manpower offices in Harbour Grace, in St. John's, in Grand Falls, in Corner Brook or wherever these Manpower offices are, Bell Island, all over, Gander. They went week after week after week, thousands of men, and yet there were 300 jobs that went without the men to fill them. It is sickening, it turns your stomach. These men had to be got. They did get them, they succeeded in getting them. They recruited the men but not in this Province, 300 men. If they had, it would have brought the percentage up to 87 per-cent.

Now is anyone in this Committee, in this Chamber, going to say they should not have gotten the men? They could not get them in Newfoundland, is anyone going to say they should therefore have done without them? Anyone going to say that? No, no one. They had to have them, admittedly. Disagree! They had to have them. They tried to get them in Newfoundland. In every Manpower

MR. SMALLWOOD:

office in the Province they tried to get them and they could not get them and they did not. They failed absolutely and completely. But they had to have them, so they went and got them where they could and that was outside the Province. That dragged the percentage down from 87 per-cent Newfoundland hourly workers to 72 per-cent. Now the others, the others were supervisory employees and technical people. I would say that at Churchill Falls there are about twenty-five contractors, twenty-five say contracting companies who have tendered, put in their bids and won the contracts, as some Newfoundland companies tendered and failed to get the contract. There have not been more than perhaps ten companies in Newfoundland that have tendered to try to get contracts in Churchill Falls. I would not say there were ten. There were certainly not more than ten in my opinion.

A few got contracts. The Crosbie interests did, not the gentleman over there but the good Crosbies, the solid, the constructive Crosbies, the creative Crosbies, those who believe in building up not those who believe in tearing down, the builders, those Crosbies, those Crosbies.

MR. MURPHY: Who is the power behind those Crosbies? The gentleman does not take any credit or anything else for it but he is the man who is really guiding the whole thing, behind the scenes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What a laugh that is, what a laugh. Andrew will be charmed to hear that. Andrew will be delighted, of course. They will be -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SMALLWOOD: You know the throne he is behind, you know the one they have in the joke books, that throne and that is the one he is behind. That is the only throne he is behind and the Leader of the Opposition privately, in his heart, smiles, look at the smile on him, how he appreciates that. He loves that. He knows what I mean and he agrees with me. That is the only throne that - However the Crosbies tendered and I believe they won a contract. The Lundrigans tendered and I believe they won a contract but

MR. SMALLWOOD:

neither one of them on their own. I think the Crosbie firm went in with another big outfit, the Lundrigan firm went in with another big outfit. They went in with Foundation Company of Canada. But very few Newfoundland firms have been able to achieve success in tendering. You have about twenty-five contractors in Churchill Falls today and they are all from outside Newfoundland and naturally those contracting firms, the Crosbies took their people, their own people that they had on their payroll, their key people, the people they want when they do not have contracts they still keep them on the payroll because they cannot afford to lose them. They keep them for when they do get contracts and sometimes months pass and they pay them on the dead but they must keep them because, if they lose them, they lose their organization.

The same thing with Lundrigans and when they got contracts they took these key men down there. Now when the other twenty-three contractors got contracts they brought their key men there, but the men they brought were not Newfoundlanders. They brought their own key men, as all contractors do, with the result that in Churchill Falls, from the first day to this day, all the key people, all except the hourly workers, are non-Newfoundlanders. That is the penalty we pay, Mr. Chairman, when the contracts are given to non-Newfoundland companies.

Now I myself, from the day I became Premier, had been a strong, stern, bigoted, intolerant, irrefragable, unfailing believer in building up Newfoundland by building up Newfoundland companies. I would rather anytime have a Newfoundland contractor because, if you build up Newfoundland contractors they employ Newfoundlanders. Every last man they have is a Newfoundlander and, if they do have to bring a man in the man comes in, brings his family in, gets a home and becomes a Newfoundlander, and so you build up the Province. I do not see how you can build up this Province by building up firms in Quebec and firms in Nova Scotia and firms in

May 17th, 1971

Tape 675(Night)

JM - 11

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Ontario. Frankly I do not see it. No one has ever yet succeeded in making me see, getting my eyes open because I am so stunned, I am so stupid that no one has yet succeeded in making me understand that you can build up Newfoundland by building up Mainland contracting firms. I persist in my stupidity in believing that the way to build Newfoundland is to build up Newfoundland companies. Now if you have to have a company from outside, bring them in and let them become Newfoundlanders, so that the money they make stays here in Newfoundland, so that they employ Newfoundlanders.

But I am eccentric that way, you know I am peculiar, strange character. It is hard to understand that a man could be so stupid, but there you are. You must not blame me for my stupidity. Thickheaded, stupid, cannot learn, you know, just condemn me for that. Now this is why the great majority of the non-hourly paid workers, the monthly men, are not Newfoundlanders. It turns my stomach, it makes me sick, it makes me sick. Those men will come into Churchill, they will make big money, a thousand, twelve hundred, fifteen hundred dollars a month, hundreds of them, and every nickel they make goes back to Halifax or Quebec or Toronto and Newfoundland gets precious little out of it. The bulk of it goes out of the Province and I hate it,

Mr. Smallwood.

I despise it. I would like to see every last person down there, a Newfoundlander because then their families are here. They do their business here. They do their trade here. They raise their children here. They help to build up our Province. They are not just sojourners, visitors in here to make their rake off and then get out again fast. That is what those visitors are. But you have to have them when you cannot get Newfoundlanders to do it. When the contractors in Newfoundland do not get the contracts and the contracts go to the outside contractors, they are going to bring in their key personnel. Now every one over there can get up and make a speech but you cannot deny that. It is the simple truth. Everybody with any common sense knows that it is the simple truth. It is disgusting. It is true. It is a pity that it is true. It is true but a pity that it is true. But it is true.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, I think we have wandered far enough away from the subject to allow me to have a few words on this particular department. What we are really talking about here or at least should be talking about is the operation of this department and the need for it. It seems to me that this department was one of the well-intentioned mistakes of Government, in its creation. It may have been created with the best of motives. It probably was. It seems to me to have backfired. A territory such as Labrador, such a huge part of our Province and produces so much of that magic word that we are hearing so much about, so often, "the gross national product," if the residents of Labrador see a department of this dimension to be the liaison for their affairs, it seems to me that, with the wealth coming out of Labrador that a department which spends somewhat less than \$500,000 a year is more of an insult to the residents of that great part of our Province than it is a compliment. I have not been down there for some years, I do not think since 1969. At that time there seemed to be, the people I met, ill-feeling amongst them. They were regarded as sort of an invaded territory, a foreign part of Newfoundland. The various titles of the people that were down there, the resident representative and this sort of thing, made them feel like they were a British colony where the commissioner^{was} sent down to look over them and the

Mr. Earle

poor ignorant people just had to sort of watch what the big fellows did and told them to do. I think that that is an awful insult to them. This department, after it was created, very quickly found that there was not much work to do, nothing actually that it could do. As all of the operations of this department have been pointed out, it can be done so much better and so much more efficiently by other departments of Government. You take things like a "Student Exchange Programme", well the Department of Education and Youth has a huge student exchange and travel programme which they are very competent to handle and do handle properly. Why could not this particular vote come under that department and be done within their scheme of things?

The air passenger subsidy which is handled by this department is, as I knew very well and painfully when I was Minister of Finance, something that the Department of Finance had to keep a very close eye on. At that time the actual checking of the affairs, the subsidy itself and how it was reclaimed and so on and the leeway which there was for abuses in that programme gave the Department of Fisheries nightmares, to try to see that it was handled properly. I think afterwards they did work out a scheme where this thing got properly controlled. It is probably working quite well now. At that time it certainly was not. It is just another point that that particular item could have been much more efficiently and better handled through the Department of Finance. So it goes all along the way with this particular department. I think the fact that all other departments of Government, practically, are involved in Labrador Affairs and have operations down there, which they have representatives for and various things, does away with the need of a small department of nineteen employees, who are really a sort of a go-between, while I imagine they do their best to help the situation..

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the hon. gentleman move that the department be abolished?

MR. EARLE: No, I am not going to move that it be abolished.

Mr. Earle.

I am not going to move that. I am just pointing out that it is not useful. There are nineteen employees for a department of this sort. It is neither one thing or the other. It is too small. It is not big enough. It cannot do the job. It cannot make any real impression. It does not really have an awful lot of importance to do. It is just a liaison. I do not think, for one, that (Newfoundland being one Province and we are struggling our best to make it) all people who live in Labrador feel that they are in truth a part of this Province. I do not like the attempt to segregate them in any way. I do not think that it should be done. I think they should come under the same departmental operations as all the rest of Newfoundland and not have this token shoved in somewhere between which, as I started out to say, is really more of an insult to them than a compliment. I cannot see the use of the department. Its full operations can very well be handled by other departments probably more efficiently and certainly with less inconvenience to the residents. Now this is not a reflection on the minister. The minister of this department has a job to do and he is trying to do his best. But he must find that he is very frustrated because the true status of a minister, if he did not also have or if he was not also acting as Minister of Fisheries, I think he would go crazy from lack of activity. The very fact that he is a minister of two departments, Fisheries certainly warrants a full-time minister, not just a part-time minister. That in itself should occupy all of his time. This is just sort of an after-thought. That is no compliment to the people of Labrador. I do not think they appreciate it. I am sure it is entirely unnecessary.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, may I direct the attention of the minister to an area where it would appear that the Department of Labrador Affairs did not discharge their responsibilities during the past year the way they should or the way it was intended that they should. I understand from the hon. minister's comment that the responsibility of the department is to ascertain the needs of the people of Labrador and to make representation

Mr. HICKMAN

to the various departments of Government to see that these needs are met. On April 12, of this year, I heard a live radio programme emanating from Labrador South, in the afternoon. It was one of these telephone things, three-way conversation involving the Anglican or an Anglican clergyman at Red Bay, the Captian of the ice breaker "Sir John A McaDonald," Captain Burdock, and some one at the CBC studios here. The Anglican Priest was very strong and loud in his complaint over the treatment that Labrador South is receiving from the present administration. This has been triggered and brought to a head by the unreasonably long period of time that the roads L'Anse au Clair, Red Bay area had been closed. As I heard this Reverend gentleman unfold his complaint, and these were corroborated by the Captian of the "Sir John A. MacDonalld," as a Newfoundlander, with a great deal of experience on the Labrador Coast and indeed further north. He was on the "Manhattan" when she went through the North West Passage. He also confirmed that, whilst there was a great deal of snow in the area, it was not more than could reasonably have been anticipated and not that much more than you would get in a bad year on the coast.

MR. WINSOR: That is utter nonsense.

MR. HICKMAN: Well now whether it is utter nonsense..

MR. WINSOR: Utter and complete nonsense.

MR. HICKMAN: Well maybe it is utter and complete nonsense. I am simply relating what transpired on that programme. I am talking about the conversation, that was between the Priest stationed in Labrador and the Captian of the ship who had gone down with supplies or was about to go down with his second trip of supplies, had some announcements. In any event, they talked about the equipment and the age of the equipment and the complaint was that there was insufficient snow-clearing equipment in that area to take care of the foreseeable needs of their area. It prompted me to place a question on the Order Paper, to ask the hon. Minister of Highways for

Mr. Hickman

some information. The first question was: 'List in detail the snow clearing equipment stationed at Red Bay and L'Anse au Clair in the electoral district of Labrador South prior to and at the beginning of the winter season? The answer was: 'Four bulldozers, two front-end loaders, one with a v-plow and wing, snow blower attachment on standby, one four wheel drive grader with a v-plower and wing and two trucks.' The second question was: The answer to this question was tabled today. The number of days the main highway or highway leading to Red Bay and L'Anse au Clair were closed during this winter? The answer: 'Pinware to Red Bay closed ninety-four days (94), Pinware to L'Anse au Clair closed forty-four days (44).' The third question was: 'The year and model and make of the snow clearing equipment available at Red Bay and L'Anse au Clair at the beginning of the winter season?' The answer: 'Available at Red Bay, one 1953 D-7 caterpillar bulldozer. That is the only equipment. It was at Red Bay for snow clearing. That was a 1953 D-7 caterpillar bulldozer. It was a bulldozer eighteen years of age - eighteen years of age. Now this was the allegation that this reverend gentleman was making on the radio. It was precisely what he said. He did not give the year model. He just said that it was an old model. Available at L'Anse au Loup, I presume it should have read L'Anse au Clair: one 1954 D-6 caterpillar bulldozer, one 1946 D-7 caterpillar, one 1958 D-6 caterpillar, one 1954 D-6 caterpillar traxcavator the others were bulldozers, one 1966 Hough loader and one 1969 Austin Western Grader.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the implication and the suggestions were made and I am sure that the hon. member for Labrador South has to agree with this. You cannot apply, obviously, the same yardstick for Labrador South with respect to snow clearing equipment as you apply say to the Burin Peninsula. Obviously the snowfall in that area is considerably heavier and lasts much longer. I do suggest that the Department of Labrador Affairs must have been aware of this. They should have been aware of this in advance and I would like to hear from the minister

Mr. Hickman.

as to what representations were made not on April 12 when the boat was loading to go down, not on April 12, 1971 but say on September 1, 1970 in anticipation, because there is a meeting, for instance, in the office of the Minister of Highways every fall. It is a good meeting, a worthwhile meeting to which all members are invited to come individually and to talk to the superintendent for that area and to go over the snow clearing programme for each district throughout the Province and to make recommendations to the superintendent for Grand Falls or the superintendent in Clarendville or wherever it is, as to the number of pieces of equipment that the member feels should be provided for his district that year. Also to indicate to the superintendent and to the Minister of Highways where the trouble spots have been and where you need extra equipment, on an emergency basis, to take care of an extremely high snowfall.

MR. WINSOR: That would be the work of a prophet, would it not?

MR. HICKMAN: No, unless all members are prophets, I am sure every member here, each year, has been invited to that meeting and any responsible member must have attended. I know I have attended them. You go there and you meet your district superintendent and sometimes some of the others who are working under him. He gives you the snowfall for last year. You tell where the trouble spots are that you encountered and where the complaints came from. Then you get a picture as to what the department can afford to put in, in the way of equipment, next year.

MR. WINSOR: Would the hon. gentleman permit me one question? Did you as member for Burin district forecast and see all the troubles that they had on that road the year before last, when roads were blocked with snow for days and days? Is there any difference in that area than up in Labrador?

MR. HICKMAN: I cannot recall that road ..

MR. WINSOR: That road was blocked up there.

MR. HICKMAN: I cannot remember that road being blocked for days and days, certainly not since 1963.

MR. WINSOR: Since you have been a member.

MR. HICKMAN: Not since 1963.

MR. WINSOR: Oh, yes, yes.

MR. MURPHY: Would the hon. member permit a question? All the members invited to discuss this? I was never invited to one. I do not know anybody of the Opposition being invited.

MR. HICKMAN: I have been at them. I have to confess that I was not invited this year. Maybe there was not a meeting this year. I do not know. But any year that I have been there,

AN HON. MEMBER: There are no more meetings.

MR. HICKMAN: There are no more meetings? Well I think the meetings serve a worthwhile purpose. I do not know what the hon. minister feels. I think it was an innovation of the hon. Minister of Finance and it was a good one. It gave you an opportunity - obviously you do not predict every snow storm. But what you do do is go over - they use to be most co-operative on this. They could tell you the trouble spots. If they could not tell you, you had a pocketful of complaints anyway from the previous winter. Then they would say that this year we are going to put a second four wheel drive truck with a wing-plow, there and we are going to put another grader somewhere else. We think that, barring a tremendous snow storm that nobody can anticipate, we will take care of it.

Now I am only relating the facts. I am only relating the facts as I heard them. But it seems to me that in Southern Labrador, in the Town of Red Bay, that one eighteen year old caterpillar bulldozer, no matter what condition it is in, could not reasonably be expected to take care of the average Labrador winter. This whole area deals with Pinware to Red Bay, Pinware to L'Anse au Clair. I am only giving the answers. Do not get after me. Get after the hon. Minister of Highways. He is the one that furnished the information. All I wanted to find out, for the benefit of the House, was whether or not the allegations that I heard on April 12 were correct. It seems abundantly clear from this answer that the allegations were correct. What I would like to know from the Minister of Labrador Affairs, that in interpreting his role, as a liaison officer, of transmitting to the appropriate department of Government the

Mr. Hickman,

needs of the people of Labrador, what demands and what steps were taken by the Minister of Labrador Affairs say in September? (Surely he did not go to the Department of Highways and say that I consent to one 1953 caterpillar bulldozer for Red Bay). Will the hon. minister tell the committee what was done or let the poor hon. member for Labrador South tell me?

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Mr. Chairman, before my hon. colleague replies on that, there are two points that I would like to make in response to two completely erroneous statements that have been made on the other side of the House. To start of with, the fact that there was only one machine at Red Bay has no bearing on the entire matter at all. You could very well find out, i.e., that on the Trans-Canada Highway, in some great blizzards, that there is no machine at all at Bishop's Falls or there is no machine at all at Badger. Of course there is not. If you have a continuous stretch of highways, as you have there in Labrador South, I ought to know because I built half the roads there, more than half, at one end you have L'Anse au Clair and sixty miles at the other end you have Red Bay.

MR. HICKMAN: Right.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): You do not have to have your machines stationed at every one of the twelve or thirteen settlements that there are on that stretch of road. Particularly you do not need to have them and you do not have them, as a matter of policy, at one extreme end of that highway. Normally the bulk of the snow clearing equipment is centred somewhere midway or as near as possible midway so they can operate in both directions. Now it is as simple as that. The fact that there might have been only one machine at Red Bay or no machine at L'Anse au Clair does no indicate any neglect or negligence on anybody's part. It simply indicates what is the policy You keep your machinery and equipment concentrated. In Central Newfoundland your machinery and equipment

Mr. Rowe (F. W.)

are concentrated at Grand Falls. In Western Newfoundland for that stretch, they are concentrated at Deer Lake. In Eastern Newfoundland at Clarendville and at the other sub-stations. Now that is number one.

MR. HICKMAN: On what point on the highway between Red Bay and L'Anse au Clair is the equipment stationed?

MR. ROWE (F.W.): I do not know. Probably it is at L'Anse au Loup. L'Anse au Loup, I would think.

MR. HICKMAN: L'Anse au Loup, that is right.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): It is about midway.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. CROSBIE: Why, if the minister is correct, was the road closed ninety odd days during the winter ?

MR. ROWE (F.W.): I am coming to that. Would you just give me a little time? I cannot deal with three questions at the one time! Give me a little time on that. The member for Burin said that there was inadequate equipment there to deal with a normal winter or normal conditions in Labrador. This is not true. There was inadequate equipment to deal with the most abnormal winter they have had in the past, certainly in the past twenty years, (This I can assure the hon. gentleman) just as this winter, the snow conditions in St. Barbe North and White Bay North and on the Baie Verte Peninsula were the worst in the past twenty years.

MR. HICKMAN: How many days were they closed?

MR. ROWE (F.W.): They were closed a good many days down there in St. Barbe North. But not closed as many days as they were in Labrador and for obvious reasons. Labrador is separate by water. This was one of the big problems there. The other thing I want to say is this, Mr. Chairman: We had here in the month of January three or four blizzards. As a result of it, we were demobilized here for several days and a state of emergency was declared. In the month of February, we had three or four storms equally as severe as they were in January. In the month of March, we had three or four right here in St. John's, equally as severe as they had been in the

Mr. Rowe (F. W.)

month of January. They had the same storms in Labrador South and in St. Barbe North. The only difference was that we got it in the form of rain here and they got it in the form of snow. Now I say this: I have some experience with this. I spent five years sweating over this, problem in the Department of Highways. Had we, in the month of February, here on the Avalon Peninsula, had we had instead of four rain storms, of the first magnitude, the highest or the heaviest rainfall in our winter history right here, in February and March, the heaviest rainfall ever known, (that is what we had) had that been snow as it was snow down in Southern Labrador, St. John's and the Avalon Peninsula would have been immobilized for weeks. That is simple common sense. At the end of January, we were immobilized here as it was for the best part of a week. If we had had three more or four more, all within a week or two of each other, a week or ten days, if we had had three or four more blizzards of that kind, with all the equipment that the City Council had and all the Department of Highways had, we still would not have moved probably for three weeks.

In 1958, everything ceased in the City of St. John's for ten days. I was Minister of Highways at the time. I remember it very well. With all the resources that we could put to supplement the City Council's Highways Division or Roads Division here, we still could not open a school for ten days. The stores were virtually closed. They might have had token openings for ten days. For the hon. gentleman to get up here and try to accuse the Department of Highways or the Department of Labrador Affairs, this is what he has done inferentially, of neglect in this matter. This is the inference, in a year which was admittedly the worst year, the worst year for snowfall in the history, in the recorded history of Southern Labrador. It is completely unfair. It is completely wrong. I have every sympathy with the people of Southern Labrador. I represented those people for five years and I know the problem down there. I want to say this: "The proof of the pudding is the eating." The fact is that that road was started and opened

MR. ROWE (F.W.):

in 1953. I had that road started in 1953 and two years afterwards we were ploughing snow on it, that was 1953. That is fifteen years we have been ploughing snow down there - fifteen years.

MR. CROSBIE: With the same plough. It is the same plough.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): It is not the same equipment. It happens to be one there that is fifteen years old. There is nothing abnormal about operating a fifteen year old tractor. My hon. friend must know enough about construction work to know that half of the equipment..

MR. CROSBIE: Eighteen years old.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Half of the equipment of the company, that he has been identified with or his family has, has probably got equipment there probably fifteen years old and nobody ever objected to it. This is nonsense. A tractor can be fifteen years old and be in good condition.

MR. HICKMAN: One is twenty-five years old.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): All right! All right, it was still operating.

The fact of the matter is that in those fifteen years never before has the highway in Southern Labrador been blocked off for such a length of time - never before has it been blocked off for an abnormal length of time. The reason it was blocked off this time - I am not saying that they should not have more equipment there. God knows that we should have had more equipment in every part of Northern Labrador, in every part of Northern Newfoundland this past winter. Nobody knew that we were going to have such snow conditions as they did have there. But the fact is that never before has the highway in Southern Labrador been closed to the extent that it was this winter. That is the proof, if no other proof were needed, that this past winter was an abnormal winter in Southern Labrador and in Northern Newfoundland. You can ask the hon. member for St. Barbe North or the hon. member for White Bay North, he knows. We had to sweat through it too.

MR. ROWE (F.W.).

Mr. Chairman, there are half a dozen other points I could answer, to repute ...

MR. HICKMAN: Before the hon. minister sits down, does he really think that four bulldozers, two front-end loaders, one truck, one four wheel drive, two trucks, is sufficient equipment..

AN HON. MEMBER: A snow blower.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): You have not named it all. You remember there are sixty miles of road there. For a normal winter - I said the proof of the pudding was in the eating.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If you have to have more than that for every sixty miles of road in this Province, we might as well give up.

MR. HICKMAN: Right! But you do not need as much, say on the Burin Peninsula and the Codroy Valley.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Maybe not but during another winter it might be the Burin Peninsula that might get caught and clobbered with the snow storm. Mr. Chairman, there are other points but I am not going to try to refer to them now.

MR. HICKMAN: We still have not heard from the Minister of Labrador Affairs.

MR. SMALLWOOD: At 11:00 P.M., is it not, there is the game with New York? Houses have been known to go on half an hour longer.

MR. MURPHY: If we did not have so much obstruction from the other side, we might finish these tonight, I do not know.

On motion total subhead 1902 - carried.

MR. MURPHY: How many Labrador resident representatives do we have? Do we have three now?

MR. WINSOR: There are five.

MR. MURPHY: Five, stationed where?

MR. WINSOR: One at Cartwright, one at Northwest River, one at Happy Valley, one in Churchill Falls, one or there will be one in Labrador West..

On motion total subhead 1903 carried.

MR. MURPHY Mr. Chairman on 1904-02 and it deals with air passenger\$: This may be the only chance I can get to speak on this, and that is the

MR. MURPHY: freight rates. I mentioned it last year in the House, pertaining to rates, particularly on fish going into Labrador. They had a special rate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Fish and other Newfoundland products as well.

MR. MURPHY: A special rate, Mr. Chairman. The regular rate is a minimum of \$5.50, no matter what size package. This is air-freight. It is \$.22 a pound, over twenty-five pounds. Last year there was some representations made and they reduced the rate to \$.12 a pound on Friday's. Apparently the question at the time was with reference to fish. People were wanting, which is normal, to have fish on Friday's. It did not leave here until Friday and they could not have it until Saturday. I suppose then they would have the fish-day on Saturday.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did the church do anything about that?

MR. MURPHY: Apparently, they have ..

MR. SMALLWOOD: Could the church switch days?

MR. MURPHY: Oh, yes. There is Mass on Saturdays now. Probably there is now no special Friday rate. I was just wondering, Mr. Chairman, would the minister just give us a little information as to why that special Friday rate was abolished. It seems to be all \$.22 a package.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is for passengers, is it not?

MR. MURPHY: No, passengers do not pay by the pound.

MR. WINSOR: This vote is air subsidy for passengers, not for cargo.

On motion total subhead 1904 carried.

On motion 'Block Provision Canada Pension Plan, carried.

On motion Block Provision Salary Adjustment, carried.

On motion total Department of Labrador Affairs, carried.

On motion that the committee rise report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. HODDER Mr. Speaker the Committee of the Whole on Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have passed estimates of expenditure under the following heads: XI, Labour, all items, XIX, Labrador Affairs, all items and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted

MR. CURTIS: I move, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred and the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Tuesday at 3 p.m.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Experimentally.

MR. CURTIS: Again experimentally. I may say that we have done a little calculating and we figure that at the rate we are going, it will take another twenty-five days to finish the estimates. But if my hon. friends on both sides will restrain the enthusiasm and save their wind, I think we could get along a little more quickly.

MR. JONES: Mr. Speaker, before the motion to adjourn could I have leave to make a statement.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is too late now.

MR. JONES: I am sure Mr. Speaker that all members of the House would be pleased to learn that we have just been advised by Mr. Ted Blanchard, the chief negotiator, that we have reached an agreement with CUPE, representing the Central Newfoundland Hospital, involving some 140 non-medical employees and the union has voted tonight and accepted our most recent proposal and that they are moving on to Corner Brook for the same purpose for tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Tuesday at 3 p.m and that this House do now adjourn.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow Tuesday at 3 p.m.