



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 46

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair:

HON. J.R.SMALLWOOD: (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I wish to express a very warm welcome indeed, to forty more students from St. Augustine's at Littledale from grade VIII. We had a group of them here I think one day last week, and I expressed the cordial welcome of the House to them at that time, and now we have forty more of them from grade VIII, in charge of Sister Mary Eugenio, and this must make about eighty or ninety or something altogether from St. Augustine's, Littledale, in the present session of the House.

I have already told the House, and I suppose I do not need to repeat, that I have a particular personal pleasure in welcoming the students from St. Augustine's, because it happens to be my own old school. When I was a very small boy I lived not very far from Littledale, and Littledale was the nearest, the closest school to me so they sent me off as a small boy, and I would trundle off with my books every day and walk to the school. Now that is not the only school I ever attended, I attended a lot of schools. Somebody said here that I was a dropout in a lot of schools, maybe a dropout from more schools than anyone ever dropped out of in Newfoundland. Well actually the dropping out was largely because of the change of residence. You know, unlike other children, I had to go where my parents went. When they shifted house I had to go with them. They would send me to the nearest school there was, regardless of what school it happened to be, so I went to St. Mary's, at the Southside by the Long Bridge, and I went to Centenary Methodist School upon Gilbert St., off Springdale St., and I went to the Bishop's Hall down by the old tobacco factory which was Anglican, no it was called British Hall, I remember, I went to it, I could remember. British Hall and I ended up in Bishop Field College. So I had a crack at all of them, Methodist, Roman Catholic, Anglican, and I ended up a sort of mixture of the whole lot of them.

Here we are today, these beautiful girls, the most beautiful girls in Newfoundland, except for the girls that were here last week from the same school. They were just as beautiful, but the most beautiful and intelligent

girls in the whole Province. The like of them are not to be seen anywhere else in Newfoundland, and I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to get up and contradict me. He has to agree with me, and if he does not he is in the soup, he is in trouble. He has to agree with me that the most beautiful girls, the most intelligent, and the loveliest girls in the whole Province under their teacher Sister Mary Eugenio, and I would assume that Sister is like themselves a Newfoundlander, certainly very, very warmly welcomed by all of here in this Chamber, including the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources who is just coming in with a big armful of material, and I suspect that we are going to hear a big speech from him today, but I do not know what about.

If the students will stay they will doubtless hear some important work done in the present session, and now if he has the nerve, if he has the nerve to do it, the Leader of the Opposition will get up and disagree with me when I say that these are the most beautiful and intelligent girls we have had here this session except for those that were here from the same school last week.

MR. A.J.MURPHY (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Premier talks about nerves, if he had the nerves I have had these past couple of weeks here, but I would like to join with the Premier very sincerely, with reference to his compliments to the young ladies, there used to be a saying that "I bet you tell that to all the girls," and I think that applies in the Premier's case. We are very happy indeed, to have these young ladies with us this afternoon accompanied by their teacher Sister Mary Eugenio, and I feel that they will enjoy themselves here this afternoon. The only attachment I have to Littledale at the present time is that I used the swimming pool one night and I thought it was beautiful in there, but as far as attending school

MR. SMALLWOOD: (J.R.): Has the hon. Leader of the Opposition ever been as far west as Littledale? I thought he always stayed in the east end.

MR. MURPHY: If the Premier only knew, I am a west ender by birth.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that so, and deserted it?

MR. MURPHY: And deserted it, but Mr. Speaker, quite seriously I join with the Premier and the rest of the House I am sure in welcoming these young ladies

and I trust that they will further their education today, and that the Sister in charge will not regret this visit, and say "that is the last time that you are going to that place."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh no. not while I am here

MR. MURPHY: We are very happy to have them, and kids from all over the Province, and it looks like Littledale is having sort of a monopoly on the visits here. I do not know what it is. Perhaps it is because of the great ex-pupil that they come in here ^{to} admire, and they might have a Joe Smallwood day one of these days, and dear Lord only knows, and perhaps there might be a national holiday every year for the students, where they would observe this day, and I am sure when the monument is erected to the Premier in his retirement they could come fairly regularly and lay some flowers or something on it to pay a tribute to the Premier who served the Province for twenty years and then decided to retire whether, I do not know whether he will have decided to retire, but he will have retired at that time.

I am very happy indeed to welcome these students with Sister Mary Eugenio, and trust that they will have a very enjoyable few hours here in the House with us.

HON. W.J. CALLAHAN (Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I hope no one thinks I am arranging the visits of my neighbours the students at Littledale, but as I said the other day when Littledale students come here in view of the fact my three daughters, and two of my nieces, and if I may say so Mr. Speaker, one of my nieces are in the gallery today. I would not have a very happy home-coming when I arrived home tonight if I did not say a word of welcome to those students. I am not going to make a long speech, I simply want to say that I am very pleased to see them here, and that I hope very soon some of the younger students will come or that I last long enough in this House for my own daughters to get to be older students so that they can come and see that I do a little work when I am not at home which is most of the time.

I certainly have pleasure Mr. Speaker in welcoming them here.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to welcome Sister Mary Eugenio and the girls from Littledale. We trust that they will have an educational

and perhaps hopefully entertaining few minutes or few hours in the House of Assembly.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES:

NOTICE OF MOTION:

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, in reply to question 165, on the Order Paper of March 5th. in the name of the hon. member for Gander, I have to say that in connection with the first part the number is 120 personnel, of whom 118 are salaried, and 2 are paid by the hour. Part two; a total of forty-five personnel of whom fourteen are salaried and thirty-one are hourly. And I ought to add that these figures do not include residents of Bishop's Falls who were able to get employment with contractors or sub-contractors of the commission. They do not include also personnel of the commission, the Power Commission transferred from other areas of the Province and now residing at Bishop's Falls.

Question 221, on the Order Paper of March 10th. in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's West. In reply I have to say that no provision has been made for non-collectable accounts receivable in the financial statements of the power distribution districts for the year ended March 31st. past.

MR. SMALLWOOD: March 31, 1969. And that it was the policies of the districts to reflect the non-collectable accounts receivable in the financial statements when they became bad debts. And that the estimated amounts of non-collectable accounts receivable at March 31, 1969, were as follows: The Power distribution district of Labrador; \$4,400. The power distribution of South Newfoundland; \$1,200. The power distribution district of Northeast Newfoundland; \$250. Question No. (273) on the Order Paper of April 7, in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West. In reply to the first part, I have to say that the amount is \$942,360 to March 31, 1970. The estimated cost of completing all repairs is \$1,100,000. The answer to the second part, that is the amount of revenue lost by the Power Commission as a result of being unable to deliver power to customers due to the damage suffered. As a result of that sleet storm February, the answer is approximately \$136,000. Lost sales, lost income. In reply to the third part of the question, the answer is "no". The answer to the fourth part of the question is that the Commission is insured for sleet damages to its transmission system, in the minimum amount of \$1 million, with \$50,000 deductible. The claim up to the amount of coverage is presently being adjusted and settled with the insurers. In reply to the fifth part of the question. The answer is that all the damage to transmission lines have been rebuilt and restored to service with substantially the same designed criteria as were used in the original design for heavy icing zones. It is economically impractical to erect a transmission system which could withstand such unusually severe sleet storm conditions as those that obtained on the occasion in question. It would be economically possible but impractical and go to the expense of erecting a transmission system which would withstand a storm of the size and nature that occurred in February, that may not occur for another quarter of a century, or even longer.

MR. CROSBIE: May I ask a supplementary question? Now the hon. the Premier said that their sleet damage insurance. That their insurance would cover for example loss in revenue -- would that loss be covered by insurance?

Or was there just actual physical damage?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would be very glad to take that question as notice if the hon. member would put it on the Order Paper.

MR. ROWE: In answer to Question (230) on the Order Paper of April 6, asked by the hon. the leader of the Opposition. Do the school boards present estimates to the Government covering anticipated costs of providing school bus transportation. The answer to that is yes. And I should explain perhaps that in the past and up until now, school boards have not been in a position to submit these estimates in time for the official government estimates. The official government estimates are compiled around the end of the calendar year, and prepared for printing actually early in January, and very often many school boards are not in a position at that time, at least they have not been in the past to anticipate exactly what their transportation needs are going to be the following September. The school boards operate on a year that starts in September, whereas the government operates on a year that starts in April, which means that the Estimates have to be prepared some months ahead of that. Do the school boards in all or most instances enter into contracts for the supply of this service? I think yes, the answer in most cases. I think there are two in Newfoundland - two boards in Newfoundland which owned their own school buses. There is nothing to prevent a school board from buying and owning its own school buses, or from renting or leasing school buses, and operating themselves, but in the great majority of cases, they call for tenders. They call for tenders and they select other things being equal, they select the lowest tender and award the contract to a private operator. And this system is operated I might say, very well, according to all the advice, all the observations that I have been able to make myself in the advice I have received from others. What was the total requested by school boards for the year '69-70? And by what sum if any was the total reduced before inclusion in the Estimates? The total requested on paper was \$3,581,000 just over \$3½ million, and we in our Estimates this was something

just \$3 million. We reduced that by something like \$600,000. Now what was the reason for the reduction if any in presenting the Estimates? Well the reason for the reduction if any; well the reasons could be many fold. It could be in some cases that Boards have over-estimated in the opinion of the competent officials. It could be that and very often it is, of course, the fact that every request for money in the Government service, is usually higher and can be given to that particular thing. Boards would like to have more money for maintenance and Boards would like to have more money for building schools and so on, but they have to be reduced proportionately and transportation requests are treated in this regard, no differently from any other requests. What were the reasons for the increase of \$385,000 authorized by Special Warrant on July 27, 1969 in the Vote for School Bus transportation? This was the fact that a number of Boards, my hon. friend will remember that that was last year that Boards consolidated from something like nearly 300 Boards, they are reduced down until today they are I am speaking from memory now, because the full consolidation has not been affected on the southcoast. But I think there are thirty odd Boards, thirty-seven I think it is in number. And many of the Boards, or at least several of the Boards had to take on commitments that they had not realized were in existence prior to the consolidation. And this is not only true of course with school bus transportation, and in one or two cases, there were genuine emergencies and the government therefore voted this additional money. In actuality it was found that \$200,000 was all that was needed to carry the Boards over this emergency. We have to regard this past year as being in the nature of a very special year, because most Boards were plowing new ground, so to speak, and many of them had taken on responsibilities - the nature, the scope and the magnitude of which a great many of them had been ignorant before they got into the business of consolidation and integration. However, it has worked out very well, and a result of the dedication and the religious work that the Board members, the Chairman and the Churches and all concerned have been able to put into it. I have the answer to another question here also

I believe, on bus transportation asked by the hon.

MR. HICKMAN: Would you permit a supplementary question? For the purpose of clarification, are school buses allowed to be used for any purpose other than the transportation of school pupils?

MR. ROWE: Well this comes from the next question actually. It is No. (449). Incidentally Mr. Chairman, the question just asked by the hon. the member for Burin reminded me of something I meant to say at the beginning of this and it is this: That every member of this House is I am sure, from time to time approached by people, out in the district regarding transportation and help for transporting children from here and there. And complaints regarding the inadequacies of the transportation service, or the complete absence of it. So it struck me just a few minutes ago as I was reviewing these answers here, that perhaps it might be a service to hon. members if I were to get a copy of all the formula, of the transportation and regulations and give to each hon. member for reference. This would sometimes I am sure, facilitate as being able to answer correspondence and other context coming to him from his constituents on this matter.

MR. BURGESS: Question please. Would the hon. minister be in a position to say if a request for a grant for subsidization of school bus transportation was received from Labrador City last year?

HON. F.W. ROWE (Minister of Education): I answered that question Mr. Speaker earlier, probably the hon. member was not here. We had quite a great deal of representation from individuals and groups in Labrador City about the problem of transportation there, and we were forced to tell them as we have told people in every large town in Newfoundland, because I say large town, since that is usually where it comes from of course including St. John's. Our bus transportation policy does not cover internal transportation within a municipality itself. For example, it would not cover, let us take as an example one of the schools nearest to us the Holy Heart of Mary which happens to be the biggest school I believe in Newfoundland. That school has a tremendous transportation system, but it can under our policy, they cannot get any subsidization and subsidy for transporting a student say from the far east end or the far west end of St. John's. It may be two miles, but they cannot get any subsidization for that. They can get and do get subsidy for transporting their children from Logy Bay and from Torbay and from the other end Pouch Cove and even as far away as parts of the Topsail Highway and so on.

I also said in answer to that question that if we were to adopt a policy which would look after that on the present formula of say ninety - ten, or seventy-five - twenty-five it would cost us instead of as it is costing us in the coming year something like going up toward \$4 million, it would cost us \$10 million to do it. This is why of course we have not been able to look at it. We are up against a simple factor of money. It would be nice if we could do that, if we could subsidize the transportation of children within this city or in Grand Falls, or in Corner Brook, or in even the smaller large towns like Lewisporte and Baie Verte and so on, where you have children very often living as much as two or two and one half miles away from the schools. We just cannot do it, it is too rich for Newfoundland's blood.

It is like a lot of other things that we would like to do, and people would like to have us do, but the Province cannot afford it without putting on

unbearable taxation on our people.

Question 449, Mr. Speaker, asked by the hon. member for St. John's West. Does the Government make a financial contribution to school boards of St. John's in connection with the school bus service serving the regional high schools of St. John's, and if so what is the amount of the contribution for the financial year of the Government that ended March 31st. last. The answer is yes, but again of course this is for bringing children into St. John's and the amount of money involved was \$145,209.32. The second part of that question was, under the terms of Government policy covering assistance to school boards who operated school bus service, are the school boards of St. John's permitted to use the said school buses that is assisted for purposes of transporting school pupils resident within the boundaries of St. John's to and from school? Under our policy no, under our formula no, now in some cases my honesty compels me to admit that we have heard and we know of cases where school boards have made some private arrangements of their own and I am not sure that there is anything particularly wrong about it, it does not cost the Government any more money and it is not covered under our transportation policy.

But as I said earlier I think it would be a good idea Mr. Speaker, if I were to send out to the them the book that we have covering all the bus transportation policy and formul and regulations.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker this is a supplementary question. If it came to the attention of your department that the service you were subsidizing was being used to transport pupils within a community, what steps do you take then? Do you instruct them to cease it or what do you do?

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Well Mr. Speaker, that would depend on of course whether or not we were being asked to pay for that. If it was found that we were being asked to pay for that, or to subsidize it, we would of course immediately not suspend the subsidy for that portion, but we, if we had overpaid, then we would of course demand repayment as you would in any overpayment for say a welfare or unemployment insurance case or anything of that sort. We do not cover it under our policy. Boards may sometimes have private arrangements at their own expense, or at the expense of the parents concerned. We do not go interfering

with a thing like that as long as it does not cost the Government any money and as long of course, as it is within the law.

HON. W.N. ROWE (Minister of Social and Community Development): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to question 210, on the Order Paper of March 10th. asked by the hon. member for Humber East.

HON. E.N. DAWE (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in answer to question no. 288, on the Order Paper of Wednesday, April 8th. asked by the hon. member for St. John's Centre. First part of the question, the capital and amount is \$5 million, in answer to the first part of the question, depreciation rates, building two per cent, furniture and equipment ten per cent, period of time three months. In answer to the second part of the question, what was the date of the first occupancy of (a) the apartments the answer is March 1969, commercial space, January 1969. In answer to the question 291, on the Order Paper of Wednesday April 8th. asked by the hon. member for St. John's Centre. In answer to the question, it has always been the policy of St. John's Housing Corporation to provide for depreciation of its fixed assets. A division for depreciation of fixed assets is a currently accepted principal of accounting. That is question 291.

In answer to question 292, on Wednesday's Order Paper April 8th. asked by the hon. member for St. John's Centre. The answer to the question, the capital amount \$4 million, banked demand loans, interest rate eight per cent annual average. Interest cost on bank demand loans charged to operations for 1969, \$85,696. Operatin period three months. Answer to questions 325, asked by the hon. member for Burin, on Thursday's Order Paper April 9th. I table the accounts of St. John's Housing Corporation and the answer why these accounts were not published in the public accounts for that year, is because the report was forwarded to the Department of Finance on February 11th. 1970, and enquiries since that time St. John's Housing Corporation were advised that they were not published with the public accounts for that year ending March 31st. 1969, because they were informed that a cut-off date of February 4th. 1970 had been established for presentation of accounts to the Department of Finance, and

St. John's Housing Corporation was not informed by the Department of Finance of this cut-off date. So therefore, I table the report of St. John's Housing Corporation.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question 484 in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West. On at least one previous occasion, Mr. Speaker, I had a similar question as the one I am about to answer. I do not know exactly what it is the hon. member is trying to get at but because of the time involved in getting this information by the officials in my department I would appreciate it in the future if he would try to ask for the information in one question instead of having to go back over it two or three times.

The answer to part (1) is - , the answer to part (1), Mr. Speaker, -

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order! This is not the same question that was asked earlier and does not request the minister to go over the same grounds.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the information is similar information as far as I can see except the time periods are different. The answer to part (1) is 153 houses. The answer to part (2) is \$190,668.00. The least amount paid was \$300. and the largest amount \$4,500. The answer to part (3) is the title vested in the Minister of Public Works is forty-three. Ownership granted to occupants is 110. The answer to part (4) is the value of the houses where the ownership was granted to the occupant was \$139,211.

MR. KEOUGH: I beg leave to table the answers to the following questions: 309 on the Order Paper of April 8th standing in the name of the hon. member for Burin. 382 on the Order Paper of April 10th standing in the name of the hon. member for St. John's East Extern. 395 on the Order Paper of April 13th standing in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West. Question 358 on the Order Paper of April 10th standing in the name of the hon. member for Burin. Question 464 on the Order Paper of April 17th standing in the name of the hon. member for Bonavista North.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on orders of the day I would like to ask the Minister of Justice a question. Can the Minister of Justice, Sir, inform members on this side of the House what the order of business is going to be at least a day ahead so that we can prepare ourselves? For example, we do not know yet until the leader of the House announces what business is going to be discussed today whether it is estimates or what department, whether it is the budget speech or legislation and unless we can have this information at least twenty-

MR. CROSBIE:

four hours ahead, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to prepare. So my question is could the leader of the House give us an idea at least twenty-four hours ahead what is going to come up particularly with the estimates so that we will know what departments and what the order of business is?

Another question, Mr. Speaker, on orders of the day: could the leader of the House tell us when the Government is going to proceed with motion (2) which is to appoint a select committee to consider the report of the auditor general and it has been on the Order Paper now for some weeks, in fact before we adjourned in March?

MR. CURTIS: As the hon. member knows the Minister of Finance is not in the Island just now but just in a matter of course we will clear this up.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Nomenclature Board Act, 1959", read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Fire Prevention Act, 1954", read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act Respecting Private Investigators And Security Guards", read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Prisons Act, 1969", read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

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

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

On motion, a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Payment Of Bounties On The Construction Of Fishing Ships", read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion, a Bill, " An Act Respecting The Marketing Of Salt Fish",
be now read a third time:

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

On motion carried:

On motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Marketing Of Salt Fish", Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Respecting The Marketing Of Salt Fish"

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, Bill No. (48) which we are now considering was before the House last week and at that time we struck out Section (24). "This Act shall come into force on a date to be proclaimed by Lieutenant-Governor in Council."

It is the intention of the Government to bring in this Bill forthwith, but one section is not ready yet to be brought in. It is the section dealing with the sales of fish, limiting the sale of fish, and it would be most unwise to bring in this section prohibiting the sale of fish until regulations have been made. So I am asking the hon. the Premier if he will move that Section 24 be replaced to read as follows:

" Section 11 shall come into force on a day to be proclaimed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council."

This is the section dealing with the buying and selling of fish. The effect of this amendment will be that the Act will come into force immediately it is proclaimed, and Section 11 will come into force as and when it is proclaimed, and it will be proclaimed when regulations are ready.

MR MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, if I may while we are on this section, I am just wondering, and I think it is very pertinent at this time, as to what will happen to NAFEL and more particularly to twenty-eight employees who have worked for many years with this firm? I was wondering if there was any provision made for these employees or just what the attitude is? This is to do with the buying and selling of the fishing permit, when it ceases and so on and so forth. They are at present in the business of selling fish, when their license ceases to sell fish I am just wondering has there been any provision made between this Salt Cod Fish Marketing Board and NAFEL as to what provision will be made for the twenty-eight employees who have given many years in the business of handling fish sales for Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER (NOEL): I do not think that is material to Section 24 which was simply the coming into force of the Act.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I think that while it is absolutely true that the House itself which is greater than the Committee of the House adopted the

MR. SMALLWOOD:

principal of that clause and we must therefore not debate that clause now. It is not debatable, it has been adopted by the House. It is perhaps proper in considering it to raise the question that my hon. friend has raised. I think that might be considered if the Chair is a little lenient at all. It is not questioning the principal of that clause because the clause is not debatable, it has been adopted by the House but arising out of the proposal now that it shall not presently be proclaimed, shall not presently be formed part of the Act and not formed part of the Act until in fact it is proclaimed. In debating that it might be in order to wonder what was going to happen to certain employees of certain organizations and if Your Honour will allow it then I would proceed to say this -

MR. SMALLWOOD: That the Board has just been constituted in part at any rate, the Chairman of the Board has been appointed, Dr. Ernest Weeks, and the President and Chief Executive has been appointed, Mr. Aiden Maloney. The Board have been in to have a chat with me and I am therefore, familiar with its present status, which is that of the very rudimentary body, recruiting staff and trying to put an organization together. I will give you one example of that, Mr. Richard Crewe who works with this Government as a market specialist has been asked for by the new Salt Cod Fish Association, and they would like to have him on loan, and we have agreed to give him on loan for a number of months, on the grounds that they need him badly and we do not need him now, since marketing has become purely a federal function. Similarly the Board will look for other men and try to recruit them, and I have no doubt whatsoever that they will try to recruit the men in the offices of NAFEL, because there in those offices are some pretty experienced men, when it comes to marketing salt cod fish in the foreign market. In fact you have perhaps more experience there than in any other office in Canada. I do not think that any salt cod fish exporter in Nova Scotia or any other part of Canada has had as much experience as NAFEL has had, or has today as many experienced persons as NAFEL has in its offices. So obviously the Board will endeavour to put men there. But I would utter this word of warning. The cod fishery does not exist for the merchants who are in it. The cod fishery exists if it exists for anyone in particular, surely for the fishermen who produce the fish. The production and the curing of the fish is the great essential part of the cod fishing industry. And therefore, the first purpose of the Board, the marketing Board must surely be the welfare of the fishermen. Now if you have other Newfoundlanders, and they are not less Newfoundlanders because they work in merchant's offices, or on merchant's premises. And if you have other Newfoundlanders who may become redundant in the fishing industry, because the marketing is to be done by one outfit rather than eight or ten or twenty. If you have men, Newfoundlanders who become redundant, it is deeply to be

regretted, but you cannot have an omelet without breaking eggs. And you cannot have a one desk, one single unitary organization to market the whole salt cod fish production of this nation of Canada without some persons becoming redundant in some of the many offices that have existed up to now for the marketing of that same fish. If this marketing is now to be done by one outfit in place of maybe twenty or thirty or forty, then inevitably some men are going to lose their jobs. It is I suppose, a form of rationalization. A form, if you like of automation. A form of a labour saving, and these will not be the first men to fall victims to that kind of progress. Certainly the Salt Cod Fish Corporation and the Salt Cod Fish Marketing Board within that Corporation will endeavour to recruit the best staff they can find in Canada, and I suspect most of them will be here in this Province of Newfoundland where we have had more experience than in any other part of Canada in marketing fish in many countries, in at least three Continents. And that will take care of a number, but there are bound to be some who will have to look for employment elsewhere. Now this is not only in the NAFEL offices, but in the offices of fish merchants, and on the premises of fish merchants, because Sir, if the actual collecting of the fish from the fishermen and the packing of it is to be done by a number of merchants for the Board on commission. And the premises of a number of merchants are to be used, the fact remains that a number of merchants will not be employed and their premises will not be used, and workers employed on those premises will become pretty well redundant in this great operation. Now this is the breaking of the eggs to make the omelet. The first great purpose is to make the fisheries profitable to the primary producers engaged in the Fisheries, and it is their interest that is being considered first and foremost. It is a long answer to my hon. friend, but it was an important question I think, that deserved a very thorough answer.

On Motion, that the Committee rise, report having passed Bill No. (48) with some amendments. Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

On Motion report received and adopted.

On Motion Bill ordered read a third time now by leave.

On Motion, A Bill, "An Act Respecting The Marketing Of Salt Fish,"

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

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I would move that the second reading of this Bill be rescinded, and that the Bill be now read a second time. I might say if the Clerk will circulate the reprint. Since this Bill was passed second reading, we have as the House knows, passed a Bill for the marketing of Salt Codfish. In connection with the Saltcod Fish Bill, there was an expropriation Bill permitting the Minister of Public Works to expropriate property that may be required by the marketing corporation. In order to have our legislation tidy and rather than to have two expropriation Bills the one year, which would be conflicting, I was wondering if the House would rather that we reconsider the second reading of this Bill No. (9) and I circulate it now. The only difference between the new Bill and the old Bill, is that there is an additional section two. As hon. members know the Governor-in-Council may expropriate through the Minister of Public Works for certain purposes, the object of section two is to enlarge those purposes and permit the minister to expropriate when requested by the Salt Codfish Board so to do. And I would therefore, ask hon. members who have destroyed their original copies of Bill (9) that they substitute new Bill (9) reprint, of which I would now ask to move the second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved that Bill (9) be recommitted for second reading.

On Motion, A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Expropriation Act, 1964" read a second time, ordered referred to Committee of the Whole House now by leave. Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Bill No. (9)

On Motion, that the Committee rise, report having passed Bill No. (9) without amendment.

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

MR. CURTIS: Call no. 24 and no. 25, which I believe are minor bills.
Bill no. 24.

Motion, second reading of a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Child Welfare Act of 1964."

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is merely to confirm in legislation a distinction which already exists in practise. When an infant is turned over to the care of the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation, every effort is made to find it adoptive parents. An effort which has been assisted tremendously by the co-operation of the clergy in the children's crusade, Adoption Sunday Program initiated last fall, as well as, through the efforts of television, radio and press media; especially, the continuing series in our Provincial morning paper. While the search for adoptive parents is in progress these infants must be housed and cared for. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, now distinguishes the homes which receive these babies and terms them receiving homes rather than lumping them together with those homes accommodating other Provincial wards under one term foster homes.

This distinction, Mr. Speaker, is more than merely a matter of semantics. Receiving homes and its owners must measure up carefully to set standards both physical and psychological before we entrust an infant to their care and because of the extra burden of work involved as well as the uncertain term of the custodianship, special rates of recompense are set. The term "foster home" Mr. Speaker will in future exclude these foster homes and refer to homes accommodating beyond the infants' stage up to the age of seventeen. As adoptions are much less frequent in this stage range, children placed in foster homes will be there for a much longer period of time, and it is hoped will receive real parental guidance and affection from their foster parents.

May I, Mr. Speaker, in closing my remarks on this Bill pay tribute to our citizens who provide both receiving and foster care to those children

who for one reason or another become wards of this Province.

These provide that care and affection so necessary to the wholesome growth of any youngster and which any other children get from their natural parents. We, as a Province, set up a scale of allowances which tries to provide for the material needs of our wards. We could not ever remotely, Mr. Speaker hope to budget enough dollars to buy the love and parental guidance lavished by so many of the parents in our receiving homes and foster homes on those children who are the direct responsibility of the Government of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, there is just one other point that I would like to mention in reference to this Bill that was raised by the hon. member for Humber East, in error actually, because there was some confusion over the Bills that were under discussion at the time, and he was wondering why we had put in the judge who makes the order, "shall." I think he suggested that we use "may" instead of "shall." I would like to point out, although the hon. member is not in his seat at this moment, but this had to be done, because in about two per cent of the area of Newfoundland, it is absolutely ^{impossible} to get the reports that we ^{need} other than from the courts. I am thinking of places like Black Tickle, Cartwright and these areas. In ninety-eight per cent of the Province, we can get the information we need, in about two per cent of the Province we would not be able to get the information that - only through the magistrates or the courts. I move second reading of the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

On motion a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Child Welfare Act of 1964", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion, second reading of a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Department of Public Welfare Act of 1965."

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in support of this Act, Further To Amend The Department of Public Welfare Act, 1965, may I clarify the philosophy behind the proposed change of name to the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation? This is not just an attempt, Mr. Speaker, to substitute for the unpleasant word, "welfare" a more euphonious expression.

Public Welfare, Sir, is associated in the minds of a great number of our citizens with the rather grudging aid given to maintain on some bare subsistent standard of living; those individuals and families who are unable to earn their own livlihoods through some physical or physiological fault of their own. This number of individuals and families, Mr. Speaker, who are unable to earn their own livlihoods is not going to decrease in the future. We cannot just hide our heads in the sands of time, the great healer, and hope that the monster of poverty will go away. The poor, Mr. Speaker, you will have with you always, and I see this to be true in the future, in the sense that improvements in the technology of production: are going to phase out more and more the use of hands in favor of more and more competent and sophisticated machines. For example, Mr. Speaker, by the year 1985 which is just fifteen years from now, it has been calculated that only two per cent of the work force of the United States will be required to produce all the goods and all the manufactured products; tires, typewriters, toys, cars, computers, cosmetics and so on required by that countries quarter billion plus population.

Even ten years ago, Mr. Speaker, it was prophesied by economists that by the year 2000, only twenty-five per cent of Canadians would be employed, as we understand employment today, and that the other three-quarters of the population would be paid not to work. If we take a good hard look at the employment figures on a cyclical basis, we will see that we are already advanced, Mr. Speaker, into the obsolescence of hands instead of being replaced by machines. So for the future, Sir, we should tend to think of the poor as those who are unemployed, rather than those who are without goods and services, for those who are forced by improved production technology into unemployment are just as important as consumers as those who are decreasing - decreasing the total number of people who will be able to find employment. They have needs and wants to be satisfied, Sir, and if these three-quarters of the consumer market by the year 2000 were somehow cancelled out, just think, Mr. Speaker, of the disastrous impact upon our channels of distribution and industry

itself.

The tremendous cornucopia resulting from technological advance would be halted by a constipation of products and services that would clog up both channels of distribution and production lines, and this could cause a real depression, Mr. Speaker, in the midst of plenty. Well I hope the hon. Leader of the Opposition is paying very strict attention to this.

Mr. Speaker, our Federal Government is currently wrestling with this problem of how to ensure distribution of the fruits of our gross national product and of the gross world, a product to those whom technological advance has robbed of the opportunity to earn it. Until guaranteed minimum income or reverse income tax or social credits or some other solution is worked out, neatly packaged and duly legislated, the only means we have of sharing the fruits of provincial and national productivity with those who cannot earn their way is through present social assistance legislation. The change in name, therefore, Mr. Speaker, in this amendment is a recognition of two basic responsibilities of this Government. 1) The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador through my department is no longer the dispenser of charity to the needy public. It is the trustee in the distribution of a fair share of the proceeds of our gross provincial product and our gross national product to those men, women and children, to those fellow citizens who through mental or physical handicap or economic change are unable to earn their share.

Society, Mr. Speaker, not only in recognition of human rights but out of sense of economic self-preservation is obliged to set up this program of social assistance. Rehabilitation, Sir, must also be an increasingly important focal point for the efforts of my department. Through self-health plans similar to the one we pioneered last spring and summer in my own constituency of Bell Island, through incentives of a wide range of appeal, the supervisory and field staff of my department must set about the morale-rehabilitation of those depressed and demoralized by the dramatic shock of being on welfare.

My department must rehabilitate its clients, Mr. Speaker, or rather help them rehabilitate themselves by counselling in the areas of consumer economics; by motivating them and directing them on methods of improving their standard of living; through better spending of their social assistance dollar; through home gardening; through making themselves what it would presently cost exorbitantly to buy; and through arranging training and skills and attitudes that may enable at least some to return to the workforce.

Mr. Speaker, in introducing this amendment, and asking for the unanimous approval for it in this hon. House, may I conclude by pointing out that the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation, not only provides a better description of its emerging present and future concentrations of effort, but also a better frame work within which to carry out responsibilities which will inevitably be increased from year to year as we progress towards the end of the present century, and when it is predicted that advancing technology will have relieved three-quarters of our population of employment as we know it today. Not only does the proposed amendment, Mr. Speaker, provide this better descriptive frame work but it will also be an important step in achieving a new image for a department whose present name has become equally distasteful both to its clients and to the general public, the results of whose productivity must provide the operating budget of this department.

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support to the Bill, and in doing so I would like to express the hope that this amendment does not become the purpose of just changing the name of the department.

Recently we have heard the hon. minister on various points in connection with the dispersing of welfare. He has come up with some rather interesting ideas, and we would like him to know that we welcome some of them on this side, and possibly we will not agree with all of them, but we certainly agree that there is a need for more emphasis to be placed on rehabilitation. In fact, I should point out that I personally advocated this kind of thing two years ago Mr. Speaker. I can go back further than that. It was not something new that I had come up with, and I can also say Sir, that a great majority of the workers, field staff for many years have emphasised the need for the department to pay more attention to the very important role of the field workers in terms of rehabilitation.

Indeed Sir, it could be said that this amendment we are debating today is about eighteen years too late. I suppose it is never too late to do some good. It is unfortunate though Sir, that it has taken the department so long to recognize that you do not solve an emergency by just dispersing funds. That you defeat the very purpose of the department of welfare as it used to be known when you just dole out money to people who really do not want handouts, who are really asking for help in finding employment and who while on welfare are asking for help in managing their affairs.

It would be a tragedy indeed if by changing the name of the department the very important work of rehabilitation goes by the board. I would hope that more emphasis will be placed by the department on the assisting of recipients to find employment. Assisting recipients in terms of managing in their homes, and as the minister has recently announced, the assisting and the encouraging of the cultivating of gardens and the raising of their own crops and so on. Too many of our people Mr. Speaker, have for some reason or another fallen away from what they were used to and what their fathers were used to in terms of raising their own crops and doing a lot of things for themselves. It is not that they lack the desire to do it, I feel confident that there are very, very

few of our people who lack that desire. They are a very minority group.

I think it is a matter of falling in a rut as it were, and I think all of us and maybe some of our less fortunate citizens who have found themselves on the roles of the Department of Welfare have become a little too modern and probably have fallen in this rut where it is the popular thing to do, to buy vegetables rather than raise them.

And so Sir, it is with pleasure that I add my support to this amendment. I would hope as I said that the department goes further than they have already in assisting those people to become gainfully employed again, and while they are not gainfully employed to make their dollars go further than they have been. From the point of view of rehabilitation it must be remembered, that the whole purpose of our welfare legislation is to alleviate want and distress. The very basis of it, is to alleviate want and distress in an emergency situation. Surely Mr. Speaker, as many of the field workers have indicated down through the years, in report after report. to this department, but apparently it fell on deaf ears, pointing out continuously this very important fact, that while it is based on an emergency a family in need, and I am speaking in terms of the able bodied families, the unemployed. If a person finds his family and himself in a emergency situation once a month for six months or a year that is one thing, but he does not find himself in an emergency Mr. Speaker, once a month for seven years or for ten years, and surely it must be realized by all of us that when that family or the head of a household finds itself in this kind of a situation then obviously there is something wrong with the program.

What has been wrong with the program in the past is that we have used public funds as the stop-gap to poverty. With this thought in mind Sir, I welcome this amendment and I hope that the minister continues to adopt some of our ideas that we have put forward on this side to improve the department and it is good to know that the suggestions by the field staff are not now falling on deaf ears where they have fallen for so long in the past. Now he smiles at me, but, I know that he is aware that I am not joking when I say that the very thing that he is doing a lot it at least, and I am not taking any credit away from him because I think he has done more in the department since he has been in it, than

has been done in this connection for a hell of a long time. I am certainly prepared to publicly give him credit for that. The fact remains Mr. Speaker, that the bulk of those suggestions were continuously made to the department and were not acted upon, and it is for this reason that I commend him for acting upon them.

It is not important that my suggestions be adopted, although a lot of those same ideas were put forward two years ago, and it is with regret Sir, that I say today that if we had adopted my resolution two years ago to enquire into welfare, not only would we have this amendment, but we would have many others, and I would not have laboured and brought forth a mouse as a certain individual stated in this House. I do not think Mr. Speaker, he meant that because, I think that hon. gentleman knew well what I was talking about, and I think he knew well that there was a lot to what I was saying. It just might have been a little embarrassing if we had gone into it. Sir, I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Mr. Speaker, I will not detain the House, but it may be the only opportunity I will get in this session to express publicly a word of my appreciation of the devoted and skillful and efficient service that the present minister is giving to the department over which he presides at my invitation, really at the invitation of the Governor at my request.

I do not know that we have ever had a Minister of Welfare in Newfoundland who devoted himself so loyally and indefatigably as this minister has done to understanding, and then operating the work of the department. In addition to that he has done something else, he has brought a fresh mind and fresh ideas to the job, and then in addition to that he has brought to the job what a man of his background would be expected to bring. That is the common touch, a common, quick, understanding and a natural and instinctive understanding of the poor and the unfortunate.

Now we are changing the name at his request, and at his suggestion from the Department of Welfare to that of Social Services and Rehabilitation which is I think

MR. SMALLWOOD:

far more explanatory of the purposes of the department than the simple word Welfare. Welfare in any case had come to have a connotation of charity, about it and not charity in a sense of Faith, Hope and Charity. But charity in the sense of handouts and helping people and generally a sort of benevolence of a benvolent government to the down and out. And therefore the word Welfare has really ceased to be the right word to explain what this department is for. The department is for the worthy purpose indeed. I ask myself sometimes would we hope, would we dare hope that the day would come when there would be no need of such a department. And you can answer yes, to that only if you think of adults in their good health and strength. What we used to call in the old days in Newfoundland the able-bodied unemployed. Those on able-bodied relief, that is to say men in their good health and strength who were down and out who lacked jobs and could earn nothing because no one would give them the chance to earn, no one would give them employment. And therefore, though able-bodied men in their good health and strength they became penniless, and had to have some help.

Now I can imagine a state of society, a form of society, in which there will be no need of this department for able-bodied men because I can well imagine a state of society in which able-bodied men in their health and strength and able to work will not need any kind of social services. I can imagine that kind of society, For example: If the Government of Canada in the last ten years under three different Prime Ministers had been willing to listen to my proposals and to accept, then you would have a different situation altogether, now today. I suggested under the administration of Mr. Diefenbaker, at a Federal Provincial Conference that the Government of Canada and all the governments of all the provinces wipe out able-bodied relief. Do away with it and have it as though it never existed, do away with it completely; and have no able-bodied man or woman in Canada or any province of Canada be entitled to get any kind of relief when unemployed. But that they should be entitled as of right to a job. Today they are entitled to welfare that we call Social Assistance

that is to say if a man or woman able-bodied in good health and strength today cannot find a job from private enterprise then that person has the right under the law to come to the Government of this Province or her Province and say I have no work, I have no employment, I am earning no money, I have no money will you help me? In that case he or she is entitled to help in the form of Social Assistance.

The Government of the Province pays this money to them and then at the end of the month sends a bill to Ottawa and Ottawa reimburses the Government of the Province one half of what the Province has paid out. Now this is a right that exists to day. I said ten years ago and I say today let us wipe that right out, let us abolish it, the right that exists today for an able-bodied man or woman in good health and strength to get Social Assistance. Let us abolish it, do away with it completely. And have instead the right to a job. the right to a job, the right to a job at going rates of pay. Whatever the going rates are, the going rates of pay, the going conditions of work, the normal trade union rates in the different parts of the nation.

So that, if a man or woman gets to be unemployed, if private enterprise if private industries says, sorry, sorry, sorry no job for you. I do not want you, I do not need you. I am not going to have you, there is no job for you, I am not giving you any job. I am not giving you any chance to earn a dollar. If private enterprise says that to any Canadian citizen then that citizen instead of having what he has today, the right to go and get Social Assistance in the form of cheques, in the form of payments from the Government would have instead the right to go to the Government and say private enterprise does not want me will not give me a job, will not pay me any wages what are you going to do about it. And have the right to get a job from the Government. And that job would be of right, that person, that citizen would get that job for no better reason, no better reason than the fact that he cannot get a job from private enterprise. He should not need any better reason. That is sufficient reason. Now, it is true that he should be obliged to show the Government that he has tried faithfully and failed to get a job from private enterprise. This he should be required to show so that the Government does

not have unnecessarily many men piled up into what you might call Government jobs.

Now these jobs that the Government would provide would have to be socially useful jobs. Jobs the performance of which would result in making society a better place. And you can think of hundreds of things at which the Government could put men to work, hundreds of things. I would like for example, to see a corps of a thousand or two thousand young men recruited and put under a sort of semi-military organization. Even perhaps with some kind of uniform, and put to work from St. John's to Port aux Basques the entire length of the Trans-Canada Highway; beautifying it, planting trees, grassing the banks, removing borders and stumps and generally making our Trans-Canada Highway a veritable lovers lane from end to end. Now this would cost money, but the money is being spent now. It is being spent to subsidize men in idleness. This would cost more, it would cost more to pay men going rates of pay with trade union conditions of work. It would cost more to employ them in that way than it costs now to give them Social Assistance. But look Mr. Speaker, look at the difference there would be. Men would be working, they have all the satisfaction that comes from working, from doing honest work, from doing useful work. They would be useful members of society. They would not be receiving handouts. They would not be receiving charity. They would not be getting something for nothing. They would be working doing honest-to-God work, doing honest jobs, performing useful service to mankind and to society. And they could have a sense of self-respect, and their families could have a sense of self-respect.

But, Sir, this is impossible. The Newfoundland Government, the Government of no province, dare give any unemployed man a job at going rates of pay because if they do when the month is over and they send the bill to the Canadian Government for half the cost, the Canadian Government would only laugh at that provincial government. They would say, no, no, no, no we do not give any money for work we only give it for idleness. We only give work for men who are unemployed and idle and doing nothing. We will subsidize idleness but we will not subsidize work. Now I have been trying

for ten years to get three different administrations of the Canadian Government to accept that viewpoint. The first time I brought it there a couple of premiers disagreed violently with me. The next conference that was held only one disagreed. The next conference that was held nobody disagreed, the next conference a couple of premiers spoke up in favour of it. The next conference three or four premiers spoke up in favour of it. And gradually I am making some headway. But it began with an unfortunate misunderstanding. The misunderstanding was some clown, some ignoramus, ^{be} some, or may/somebody, yes perhaps some stupid ignoramus described my proposal as making men work for their relief, which is the last thing in this world I would advocate. I never have done and I never shall.

What I am advocating is, that we do away with relief altogether. Do away with it. what we used to call dole, then we called relief, now we call social assistance. Do away with that for the able-bodied people of Canada and in place of it introduce the right to a job. And Mr. Speaker, is that so revolutionary? Is it really a revolutionary demand of any man that he should have a job? Can a man ask for anything less? What is there that a man can ask for less than a chance of a job to work an honest work. That is not asking much of society. That is not asking for the right to become a rich man. That is not asking for the right to become a millionaire. That is not asking for the right to become a member of the House of Assembly. That is not asking for the right to be one of the legislators of the land or one of the members of the Government. That is not asking for any great or extravagant privilege. Asking just for the right of a job to earn a living is about as little as a man can demand. And giving that right in the place of the present right, the right to get relief, giving that right would be a great forward step in our modern canadian society. So when I ask myself the question in changing the name of this department from Department of Welfare to Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation and I ask myself can the day come, can we help to bring the day when there will be no need of such a department for able-bodied men and women, I have to answer

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sir, that I do not foresee that day, that the Department will be needed in any case, in any case the department will be needed for the old, the aged, the very young, the sick, the crippled, the incapacitated, the helpless, there will always be needed for help them. Then with regards to the abledbodied I would like to see the department concern itself with the problem of providing jobs, instead of welfare.

Mr. Speaker, if we keep pounding away at this, I believe, that we will eventually win out, and if we win out, it will be a glorious victory for common sense in Newfoundland. The greatest curse in Newfoundland is the lack of jobs. And the second greatest curse in Newfoundland is the fact, that those abledbodied men who have not got jobs, who are forced to take relief has brought about a state of affairs in our Province today were you have men ~~who~~ had been on relief for many, many years, lie around, loaf around in their homes, and are raising a second generation of people on relief. I wonder are there many cases like this, Mr. Speaker, of a third generation, of a man today with a family of children and those children being raised up on relief, that the father is receiving, and that father is the son of a man, who himself was on relief. I wonder if there are cases of the third generation? There probably are some. Can you imagine a greater tragedy? Can you imagine a greater social tragedy than that, than that you should have a third generation of young children coming up today not trained or taught to be ashamed of relief. But to accept it, as a norm, as a normal thing, as a perfectly right and normal thing. This is a terrible indictment of our modern private enterprise system, our capitalist system of society. It is one of the great points at which it has colapsed, it has not yet found a solution to it. And do not let us for one moment, imagine that the solution is founded when there is welfare. Do not imagine that is only putting sauve on it, that is not answering it, that is not meeting it face to face. Do not think that with social security, for abledbodied men that society is meeting that problem head on, it is not. It is dodging it, it is escaping it, and will continue to dodge it until wociety is willing to face the matter squarely and fairly in the face, and have the courage and the wit to provide the solution.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I heartedly endorse the Bill, which will change the name because Mr. Speaker, it is not quite so simple as merely a change in the name. It is a change in the orientation, it is a change in the way we state the purpose of the Bill. It is a change in that, it is a change for the better, it is an improvement. It is an indication of a new direction that my colleague, the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation is trying to introduce into his department, with the cordially support of everyone of his colleagues in the Cabinet.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to lend my support to the change of name, we have got to be very careful with this, that we do not put a "U" in front of the deviation of the initials, because we will have USSR, and we have got to be very careful of that. But, Mr. Speaker, we can say all we like about changing the name, it is a very nice name, but I do not think we can judge a book by its cover. And I believe, this is a step forward perhaps removing the word "welfare" which has become a stigma attached to it in certain areas.

But, Mr. Speaker, when I think, and particularly the Premier's words there, how many generations of Newfoundlanders have inherited welfare? I am wondering what Government has done with cronic welfare people, with all the jobs that have been created over the past few years, like Churchill Falls, so on and so forth? Is there an index, a roster, a list of these people kept, so when these things come up, we would have close co-operation with the Department of Manpower, and our department here in St. John's? At least of give some of these people a chance to work, has this been accomplished I wonder? Has it ever been accomplished? Where a man can go on for two, three, four or five years a regular visitor perhaps to Harvey Road or to some other welfare office? Has anybody in their heart taken pity on that man, and said, in heaven's name.

I had a man in my office the other day, after tramping this town over and over and over, he is on unemployment insurance, getting \$62 a fortnight, his wife and two children. And that is all he could get. I have gone to the department, they told me the situation. This was all this man could get, \$62 a fortnight. Thirty-one dollars a week, for his wife, himself and two children. But this is what we allow, and it is all we can afford possibly

under this tremendous Bill of Welfare to allow. What do we do about it? But that man to me, as I understood from his story, I had no reason to disbelieve it, he has worked hard all of his life, truly he has never had what you might call a permanent job, he just did not have the education, and I think we will find a great number of our welfare clients in the same position, that have not had steady jobs. But he is available for work, he wants to work. You will hear people say that, "oh! they do not want to work, they would rather stay home and watch television, than work." But, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that applies to a great, great, number of our Newfoundlanders, they want an opportunity and that is why I ask, Mr. Speaker, this House today, this Government, is there a list kept of people who over the years who unfortunately perhaps did not have a bit of pull here and there, and I am referring here now to Government at this time. But some one knows a friend, that gets you a job on a construction, because I think everybody is aware what is happening on construction jobs, the foreman knows someone that worked with him before, so if there is a job starts up, I strike it in City Hall here in St. John's, where I started inquiring about employment for different people. But a man comes in, he has been working on the job perhaps he just finished the Grace Hospital or St. Clare's or something else, he has got his own bunch of labourers, and these are the men who get the job all the time. What about that guy, that chronic welfare recipient, who has been three or four or perhaps, I do not know how long, but just the world is down on him. And he just cannot fit in. Is it possible to compute a list of these people, and confer with Manpower, and say, "look we believe, that this man is now entitled to a job." Now I am not saying, that if he is a electrician, that you shovel labour or something else into it, no, all things been equal. If employment is that scarce, let us stagger the benefits, the same as we do anything else.

If that man earned, I do not know how much he earned, and I pleaded

MR. SMALLWOOD: Stagger what benefits?

MR. MURPHY: Benefits of employment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Then you would have to get employers willing to do that.

MR. MURPHY: Well, I am talking about projects, for example, Churchill Falls, I do not see any reason in the world why this Government should not be in consultation with Churchill Falls, we are going to have 1500 men at Come-by-Chance very shortly, there is going to be another 1000 or something working out of it. Now what does this Government do in this case? I have heard, and I have nothing against the people at Placentia or Argentinia, I have nothing at all against them, the first big headline, I do not know if it is political, that the people laid off at Argentinia and Placentia should get the first chance of jobs at Come-by-Chance. Now I have nothing at all against

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no, if the hon. gentleman will allow me, I know he wants to have the facts right. It was the Government of Canada in announcing their decision to finance a wharf, \$16 million to \$18 million, who said when they made the announcement that this would help to relieve the unemployment situation at Argentinia, and area, arising out of the phasing down of the American Base. This was a statement made by the Government of Canada in relation to the public wharf, that they are building or that they are paying for, and the phase down at Argentinia. This was not a statement made with regard to the whole of Come-by-Chance.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MURPHY: But, again as I say, the Minister must have a catalogue of names of people who have been trying valiantly to get some type of work, and just have not been successful and I am sure of that, and I am talking about Rehabilitation at this time. I mean after two, three years a man has been out of work, I would hate to think what an ordinary man must feel like with frustration and perhaps a decay from inside, well, when you feel the world is against you, and there is no chance to get ahead, I feel that it must have a great effect to on your mental attitude towards life. That is my feeling on Rehabilitation that we can get much deeper into find^{ing} jobs, not extra jobs, but perhaps a sharing of jobs for people, when people are looking, for employers whatever type are looking for workers to go with them. I do not know, just how much a man can earn perhaps I should, I do not know what his maximum earning is, if he earns \$20 in a week does that cut him off from his welfare, I am not sure on this, I do not know if there is a sort of established income where, it is like the people I spoke of

MR. SMALLWOOD: The answer is you cannot earn anything,

MR. MURPHY: Will the hon. gentleman answer it, without closing the debate.

MR. NEARY: All right, okay.

MR. MURPHY: Inform, you know I would just like the information. But I am thinking, Mr. Spekaer, and here again, is another avenue that only the day before yesterday we were in conversation about employment in this town. Now this concerns women, or ladies if you like, and there was a bunch of mixed group of people there, and the great worry or the great discussion was on, so many people looking for people to do housework. Now I am not talking about getting down on their knees and scrubbing like they had to do years ago or any of this stuff. But, so many people today trying to get a lady to come in for two or three hours a day, perhaps it might come under the babysitting category too, and the feeling there was that these ladies that went out to work, who were on welfare unfortunately, and earned \$5, \$10, \$15 or \$20, they would not then be able to obtain their welfare.

Now these are some of the things, I feel if we are talking about

Rehabilitation. I think we have got to establish some kind of a minimum that people can live on properly, I do know that the department have established their rules, but they are governed by, I notice this year, our vote is \$44 million, now this is not all for abledbodied, there are many other areas that entered into it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman acknowledging that statement, because you hear so often about such a tremendous portion of our people being on relief, well that is absolutely not true.

MR. MURPHY: I know it is true Mr. Speaker, a tremendous amount of our people are, but not \$44 millions worth.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No exactly, and not 80,000.

MR. MURPHY: It never was, but there was a tremendous number of people in this Province on welfare, I know.

MR. NEARY: About seventy-seven heads of household as of the end of March.

MR. MURPHY: Seventy-seven heads of households?

MR. NEARY: About seventy-seven hundred heads of households as of the end of March.

MR. MURPHY: That is approximately 40,000 people?

MR. NEARY: No, no, 35,000 or 36,000 people.

MR. MURPHY: That is one-fifth, no, I am sorry not that. Twelve percent, ten percent of the population. There are so many things to be done, and not out in the labouring field for the ordinary man who wants to do a bit of labouring work, or even today, we call about labourers. Take our trades men today, we talk about having a trade, a electrician, I know some young friends of mind, I am very familiar with them, electrician, working in New Brunswick today, they had just to get out of Newfoundland, the work is not there for them. We can talk about it all we like, the great stress has been on education, to educate them. You have got an awful lot of young educated men today who cannot find employment. As a matter of fact it was only today, I was asked by a gentleman here, outside the House, his son is coming home from University after two years, some kind of a chemist trying to find jobs, he cannot get them. He can go to work, he said,

MR. MURPHY: at Woolco, for the summer at a \$1.10 an hour, you know which is the minimum wage, but

MR. EDWARDS: What is he studying Biochemistry?

MR. MURPHY: Not biochemistry, some kind of chemistry like you use in a plant like Long Harbour.

MR. ROVE: Industrial chemistry.

MR. MURPHY: Industrial chemistry. Well, he just cannot do it, I mean there are many people like them. He only wants a part-time job, well this is another matter, of course he is only two years university. But, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased with the change of name, but as I say changing the name will not move a magic wand over our problems, and on Rehabilitation I feel that housing, environment has an awful lot to do to with rehabilitating a person. There are people who through no fault of their own, and perhaps through no fault of Government, are living in homes today that you know an ordinary person that likes his pet dog, or feeling his sheep would not put in. These are facts that we have to face, I do not know what the situation is with welfare, they pay rent.

This morning I had a case to phone St. John's Housing Authority, a family burned out in my district on Friday night, a man and his wife and two children, they are living with different people, just cannot find any place to put them, even temporarily. You know these are some of the problems we are up against, and with rehabilitation again, we have a long ways to go I think yet, and I might be unjustified in saying this, but I think we just, when the money was on the go, let her go and that was it. The Premier says, that he brought up the matter of working for wages to try to provide work. Some ten years ago, I can go back to the very first speech I made in this House 1962, and I compare what President Roosevelt had to do back in the thirties, when he created the CCC up there. He took a bunch of younger people particularly and brought them into the country, so on and so forth planting trees. There are so many things in this Province of ours, so many things to be done if we look; it was only last year I had the first chance to cover a great part of the Island, and we see the Municipalities trying to set up with the great need for

MR. MURPHY: money, and we just have not got the money to give them for for launching. When you see a bunch of kids, just hanging around the road with not a field of any kind to play on, not a field of any kind, and here we have men I think that would be only too happy, to get out and work at these things. The Premier mentioned the Trans-Canada Highway, I think it is a wonderful thing, as you drive through the park, and then leave the park and go to another area, you are in a different world altogether. You think of all our lovely ponds and everything else that could be cleaned out, some of the old, everything else you know and this type of thing, and here we are spending millions of dollars on welfare. I cannot see quite honestly for the thinking of any government, and I presume it is, there is no presuming at all, there is the Federal Government that are standing in the way of this, no one wants a man to go out and work forty hours and when he comes in give him a chit on Ayre and Sons, or one of the supermarkets to go down and get something, no we want to pay him at the going rate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Cash?

MR. MURPHY: And what he is producing then, and the Premier uses his multiplier, and I think we could use it in this case, and put 2,000 or 3,000 men to work. They are going to create jobs for clerks, and everything else in the stores.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased indeed to endorse and support this Bill.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. gentleman closes, would he let

MR. MURPHY: Go ahead, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I sent a man to Washington, and gathered together all the data that they had up there on their CCC, Civilian Conservation Corp of Young Men, because I am ready, if ever I can get Ottawa to agree to pay half the wages, instead of half the relief. I have got plans, we can take several thousand young men and put them at magnificent work, that will do them good out in the wholesome fresh air, and doing good things for Newfoundland. But Ottawa has to pay half the cost, she is now paying half the cost of the relief.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Spekaer, I was planning to, as a matter of fact

MR. MURPHY: I have some of the data, but if the Premier gets it all, I would like to get it,

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have it all, years ago.

MR. MURPHY: So long as it is passed over to us, after the next election so as we can carry it out,

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman,

MR. MURPHY: But,

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right. He is making such a nice speech I will not spoil it.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, no we will not bring politics into this, no.

But I will just urge again, the Minister perhaps to set up, if he could, this thought of a rooster of people who have been for a long time on welfare- and try to fit them into jobs, work with the Department of Manpower down here, and I do not see nay reason why we cannot, so Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in supporting the principal of this Bill.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, I think, I expect when my colleague arises to close the debate, will probably inform the House that one of the requirements of an applicant for short-term relief before he receives assistance is that he be registered with Canada Manpower, registered for employment, I think that is so.

Well that is one aspect of what the Leader of the Opposition was talking about, Mr. Speaker, but it is a fact that when a man comes looking for short-term assistance, he must before he can receive it, must have registered with Canada Manpower for employment. Realistically I think the second thing the man must have done if he is to get the employment for which he is registered, and the reason he does not get it, I think in most cases and has to come looking for assistance, very simply is the fact , that if he has not attained a level of education or training, that will enable him to compete successfully in the job market, he will not in fact get employment and this principally, I think, I know is why he winds up seeking assistance in lieu of employment.

MR. CALLAHAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned these figures in this House, I think this is the third year, and I do not know whether I have made the point very clear. But I think, until we realize in this Province fully, I mean everyone, that there is a correlation, a very definite correlation between the successful pursuit of a job, and one's educational standing, we are not really getting at the base of the problem and we are not really go to lick it. And I think the story has got to be told, and told, and told again, so it gets through, not only to members of this House, Mr. Speaker, but to young people particularly in school, and the parents of young people in school. Because I know, all to many parents who have the problem of a son, for example, who is nineteen or twenty, or twenty-one years of age who is sitting around his parents house with nothing to do because he cannot get a job by virtue of his educational level

and who very often goes off and gets married as well and then starts his own family and his condition does not very much improve. So there are two sides to the problem Mr. Speaker, it is not just a matter of the man registering for employment it is whether he will be successful and be able to avoid having to go to the welfare office for help.

MR.MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister permit a question.

MR.CALLAHAN : Yes, Mr. Speaker,

MR.MURPHY: Of all our unemployed now, if everyone of them had grade XI, instead of Grade VI, V, IV. would they find jobs to day?

MR.CALLAHAN: These are the figures Mr. Speaker, I refer to and I repeat them to the House again.

MR.MURPHY: Say we have 100 per cent grade XI here in Newfoundland today.

MR.CALLAHAN: The figures and I do not know what the latest report of the Department of Welfare will show Mr. Speaker, but perhaps my colleague can enlighten the House on this too when he closes the debate. But last year's report and the report for the year before broke down the heads of families receiving short-term assistance as to educational qualification. I assume they did it every other year prior to that. But being a member of the House three years ago and two years ago and last year I had occasion a very special reason obviously to be concerned about it.

The figures Mr. Speaker are these, and I think they probably are valid this year as valid as last. It is very simple, one can look at the figures and see that of all the heads of families who receive short-term assistance last year. Fifty per cent claimed to have and I say that advisedly (claimed to have) between grade I and grade IV education. Five out of every ten men who went looking for short-term relief, heads of families, said that they had perhaps grade IV they might have had grade II, or they might have had grade I or they might have never been in school at all.

MR.MURPHY: If all these had grade XI they would all be working.

MR.CALLAHAN? Well let me complete the statistics Mr. Speaker.

MR.MURPHY: I am saying according to the statistics.

MR. CALLAHAN: The second group who were forty per cent of the total, the second group who made up forty per cent of the total number of heads of families receiving short-term assistance claim to have between grade V and grade 111V education and again I say claim to have because I think when a man goes into a welfare office if he has even seen the door of a grade 111V classroom as he walked by twenty years ago he might well claim to have grade 111V rather than say grade V or grade 11 or grade 1.

So that Mr. Speaker, fifty per cent with grade 1 to grade 1V; forty per cent grade V to grade 111V which leaves one out of ten who claim to have any high school whatsoever, who claim ever to have walked inside a grade 1X classroom or grade X or grade X1, and these figures are usually broken down as well. With the result that to take the most startling statistics the one that really sticks in one's mind Mr. Speaker, with the result that nine out of ten men heads of families, receiving short-term assistance claim, volunteered the information that they had never been in a high school. Which means that nine out of ten recipients of short-term assistance have less than high school and can be anywhere from grade 111V down to grade 1 or none at all, no schooling at all. Only one out of every ten, or ten per cent had any high school and that could be as I have said a day in grade 1X or it could be a failure in grade 1X or it could have been grade X or it could have been grade X1. And the last figures I recall showed I think forty-eight who said they had grade X1, or whether they completed or not is another question, they might have dropped out the first day and I remember, I am not sure Mr. Speaker, of last year or the year before and I am subject to correction but I think the figure was the statistics showed that there had been one who had grade X11. Now it might have been that it , you know something happened, in that situation that even with the grade X11 he had a problem. Obviously he did. But I think it is a pretty revealing statistic and I think that the obvious answer had to be education and training.

MR. MURPHY: Here again now the hon. minister says now if all these people had grade X1.

MR. CALLAHAN:- I think if all these people had grade XI, I am not sure what would happen if they all had grade XI I am not prepared to speculate on that Mr. Speaker but let me say this that if any of them had high school they would have an eighty per cent better chance. The point is that any man who has high school education in this Province today has a ninety per cent of a chance of a job compared with the man who has not high school who has a ten per cent chance. Now I know that is simplifying the figures, but that is what it means. Now, the answer Mr. Speaker, very obviously is to make available to people to ensure that they do not fall into that category that ninety per cent the answer is to make sure that facilities are available aside from the normal day school where you are going to have dropout problems and no one claims the system is perfect, no one claims that the lack of counselling throughout the system is a good thing but we are making some progress there. Quite aside from that Mr. Speaker, we have obviously thousands of men in this Province today who are well beyond high school well beyond school leaving age who have very little steady job opportunity because of this problem.

Now, there are other factors, the rise in short-term assistance obviously occurs during the month when the construction season slacks off, when the fishing season in many areas closes down and this is when the figures go up. And a large number of those people working in primary industries where there never has been the need for a high level of education particularly high at least, and where even if they had it probably would still ~~that~~ be that seasonal bulge. But there are a great many also Mr. Speaker, who could have a job during that period of the year if they had the necessary minimum educational or training qualifications.

The attack on this problem began four years ago. I have said before in this House and I say again Mr. Speaker, it has been, I do not think ignored in terms of deliberately ignored, but I think so far as the media are concerned and I mean all the media, there is a fantastic success story Mr. Speaker, building up and has been building up for the past three or four

years in terms of what these very people we are talking about are doing about their problem. I think the night school concept of Adult Education goes back to about I think 1935. I think Dr. Vince Burke and Dr. O'Neil and others were the instigators of it. And we continued on with night school classes which were not the easiest things in the world for a working man to manage. But four years ago there was signed an agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland under the O.T.A the Occupational Training for Adults Act of the Government of Canada which is administered by the department of Manpower and Immigration. And there was created the first adult centre, it was created at Stephenville with I might recollection tells me Mr. Speaker about 300 persons in the first year . And these people started off to school five days a week

to
MR. CALLAHAN: but these people started out school five days a week, ten months of the year, being paid an allowance, particularly if they were married men away from home with families to keep. This is what made the thing work, otherwise men could not leave home to go to school in Stephenville or anywhere else. If men from all over this Province were enabled because of the allowances which ranged up to I think eighty-six dollars a week, the original maximum. Because of that men were able to leave home and to go into that special school environment where grades mean much less than levels of achievement, and some of them in a couple of years go from perhaps a rated grade three or grade four up to a grade eight or nine or ten equivalent level, thereby become enabled and eligible to get into a Trade school, learn a trade, or indeed to find a job.

Now Mr. Speaker, this has been going on and the numbers have been growing, and at Stephenville at this moment, there somewhere between 1,000 and 1,100 people. And some of these "success stories" I like to call them that have come out of that school are just fantastic. Beyond belief. I think of one and I know that this is possibly unique. But I think of one man who has worked all his life in the woods, in the lumber industry, the pulpwood industry as a cook, and married rather late, and at age fifty-seven, with children still in school, realizing that he was getting a little old for work in the woods -- that he had to find something else, but only had perhaps a Grade Four, applied for and was admitted to the Stephenville Center.

And that man Mr. Speaker, in his late fifties undertook two years back to school, which I think is quite an achievement for a man who had been away from school for about a half century. And in the two years got himself to a point where he could go back to Vocational School, do a year's basic electronics and set himself up in his own little business, repairing appliances in his particular community. And he has a good business. He is supporting his family and his children are getting through because of this. Now Mr. Speaker, his option was that if he could not work in the woods anymore, his option was to go home and lie around and receive welfare. I do not know what other choice he would have had. Instead of that he went to school, he got an allowance while he was going. He

achieved his grades. He got his vocation course and at the age fifty-eight or nine, I forget which, went back in his own community and set himself up in business. Now I agree perhaps that is a unique and an unusual case, but it indicates I think the kinds of things that are happening through this occupational training progress. The drop-out rate in the Stephenville center, I do not know about the others, has been fantastically low. I think out a thousand people last year there were only two or three dozen people who did not actually finish the year. But the importance of it Mr. Speaker, I think, is seen from the story I have related, namely that there is a choice for people. They do not have to stay on providing they can get into a school. They do not have to stay on assistance or look forward to a long existence on short-term assistance for several months of the year. The remedy is now there for them. And last Fall to indicate the attitude of my colleague the minister, because I think that he could not very well say this himself. He and I travelled around the Province for two or three days, and called into numbers of district welfare offices, and talked with people. And in every office as we would arrive and sit down and talk with the welfare officer. The first questions were, how many people do you have on short-term assistance? Are you referring them to Canada Manpower? Are you telling them that they can have an opportunity to go back to school and solve their basic problem, which is their educational problems. And for my money Mr. Speaker, this is an indication of the philosophy and the humanistic approach of my colleague the minister has taken towards this whole problem, and indeed towards the whole question of Social Services and Rehabilitation. And his requests to the House in the form of this legislation to change the name of his department to the new name, new designation of Social Services and Rehabilitation. I can assure the House it is a very very good reflection of his attitude towards his responsibility in that department.

Mr. Speaker, I have very great pleasure in supporting the Bill now before the House.

MR. CROSBIE: I have certainly no objection in changing the name of this department, as the word rehabilitation is of course one that we often apply to the hon. minister in the House here. But changing the name of the department

I hope that when the name of the department is changed, the name of the game is going to be changed also as the minister indicates. I do not know Mr. Speaker, whether the Department of Social Services I think, is an appropriate name, but whether or not Rehabilitation is the appropriate name, because rehabilitation is associated in many people's minds with other forms of activity such as the Rehabilitation Center which is the rehabilitation trained people who have physical disability, and it is associated in many people's minds with that kind of activity, which is not an activity of the present Department of Welfare. I realize that the School for the Deaf that blind children do come under the department, but I think that there is a danger of mixing up the main function of the department, which is not that kind of activity with physical rehabilitation. I do not know whether it might have been better to have it a department of Social Services and Job Placement, or Job Retraining. Because Mr. Speaker, I think that one of the weaknesses in the present government is that we are leaving to the Government of Canada the field of Manpower, or employment. Everything is referred to the Department of Manpower. For example Mr. Speaker, there was a question asked today and answered today on asking: what numbers of people were working in this Province as of April 1, 1970 who are being paid wages based on a minimum wage level as established by provincial legislation. The answer to the question was that the Department of Labour has no statistical research division, consequently cannot provide the information. Nor does the department know of any agent which might have it. Now Mr. Speaker, if that kind of information - surely any provincial government should have. How many people have we got employed in the Province now being paid on the minimum wage level? And a further part of that question asked by the member for Bonavista North was, what if any steps were being taken by the government to assist students within the Province to find summer employment during 1970? And the answer was, that this function falls within the scope of the Department of Manpower and Immigration of the Government of Canada, which has a program to assist students to find summer employment.

I do not whether in this Province Mr. Speaker, that is enough because our problem of unemployment in this Province is so much greater than it is in most others. I noticed last year the Government of Ontario had a program of special assistance to help University students find summer employment. And I think that it would be well worth this Province having some special program of that nature, and giving some additional assistance, not leaving it to the Government of Canada alone, but providing some special assistance here in Newfoundland with respect to job placement in finding jobs for summer students and people who are not even students.

Mr. Speaker, there was an interesting article I thought in the Toronto "Globe and Mail" of February 27, 1970, the minister may have seen - where it is reported the Department of National Health and Welfare was giving evidence to the Senate Committee on poverty. They were given certain statistics. The statistics, the article says, based on the maximum public assistance for a family of four, show that annual income for such families on welfare in Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, top the income level, where the family depended solely on wages of a breadwinner at the provincial minimum rate. In other words, in these five provinces, the annual income for a family of four, if they were on welfare, was greater than the income level where a family of four were depending on a breadwinner who was being paid the minimum wage.

On the other hand in British Columbia, Saskatchewan, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, the annual income at the minimum wage rate was higher than the provincial assistance total if they had been receiving welfare. The article says "minimum rates were calculated on the basis of a full forty-hour week, fifty-two weeks. Welfare aid was pegged to basic rates, and the department noted that all provinces provided extra and special circumstances. So apparently Mr. Speaker,

MR. CROSBIE: Unless the minister has other statistics which indicated differently. They do not specify whether they are short-term or long-term rates. If that is the case one might tend to think that this would tend to encourage people to stay on the welfare assistance if the only employment they could obtain was going to be at the minimum wage level, and that would be particularly true for unskilled people of course, people who can only do labour work.

Now the answer of course Mr. Speaker, would not be reducing the welfare assistance, it would be increasing the minimum wage level which I think the Government should do, and should certainly fully consider doing. The article pointed out that the total Provincial assistance for a family of four on welfare roles ranges from \$2,100 a year in Nova Scotia to \$2,950. in Manitoba. Ontario is second to Manitoba with an annual amount of \$2,940. So Newfoundland is somewhere in between the \$2,100. and the \$2,940.

Then the article pointed out the minimum wages rates range from \$1.10 in Newfoundland to \$1.35 in Quebec and \$1.40 in Alberta. In Ontario it is \$1.30 for adults in general industry and \$1.55 in construction work and so on.

However, I would like to go on and point this out, that Dr. Willar the Deputy Minister of National Health and Welfare said that in his opinion that is, this is the question of whether the fact that the welfare assistance was a bit higher than the minimum wage that you would earn if you were on the minimum wage scale, he thought that was a relatively minor problem in the total picture and he went on to give some figures. He said a survey in Calgary showed that only five per cent of those on assistance roles were in an employable category. An Alberta survey showed the number as 6.5 per cent. Dr. Willar (this is an interesting point) noted that this incentive to work is inherent in any system which reduces welfare payments by the full amount of any part-time earnings.

Now I think the minister said that in Newfoundland you are not allowed if you are receiving welfare assistance to, short-term assistance to receive any, to make any part-time earnings, and Mr. Speaker, perhaps he is

going to comment on this when he closes debate today. But certainly that does not sound like a very wise provision, and I would like the minister to say why that is the regulation in Newfoundland. It seems to me that certainly no one on welfare assistance is living high off the hog, you know, they are just living at some minimum level of existence. Income enough to get food so that they are not going to starve, and they will have some clothing and so on.

Now, I cannot see any reason why they cannot have some part-time earnings, and Dr. Willar suggested the remedy, he said it was to make some income exempt from such reductions, and to apply a progressive rate of reduction for the balance to encourage part-time employment among welfare recipients. Perhaps the minister is contemplating changing this, certainly I do not think that we should discourage people receiving either short-term or long-term welfare assistance from part-time earnings. I think that we should allow them to make part-time earnings certainly up to some particular level as Dr. Willar suggests.

The Leader of the Opposition was discussing the position with reference to people who work as charwomen and maids and so on, and many of them are discouraged from doing any work by this very rule, and as a matter of fact I heard of a case of a charwoman the other day who told her employer that she was going to have to cease working for I think it was two or three hours a week because she was afraid she was going to lose her social assistance. I would like the minister to tell us Mr. Speaker, whether he is contemplating any change in that provision or is he is not, or if the hon. member is not, why not and what is the reason for having that provision?

I agree with some of the other speakers Mr. Speaker, that the hon. minister certainly appears to be making some desirable changes in the department. We notice from the Budget Speech, and what brings this to mind Mr. Speaker, is that I had a call today from a lady who is on social assistance and she said she gathered from the Budget that there was going to be no increase in the social assistance rates which I gather is the case. The change of the name of the department is not going to have any effect on

social assistance rates at least this year.

I wonder when the minister replies could he say a word about blind allowances. What the situation is there, because, I was also contacted by a woman who is receiving a blind allowance which I think she said is only seventy-five dollars a month, which does not seem to be much to carry a totally blind person. I know that this is some arrangement with the Government of Canada, but if the minister could touch on that one when he replies, on what the situation with respect to allowances to the blind it would be a help.

The minister is working of self-help plans he says, but I wonder Mr. Speaker, whether he should not have in his department some personnel whose job is to supplement the work of the Canada Manpower Office with respect to people who are on short-term assistance, or who are unemployable but are receiving welfare assistance. Because, although there is a Canada Manpower Office Mr. Speaker, it just does not seem to be satisfactory if the number of people who contact members are any indication. If they are right in what they say, it just does not seem to be performing its function. Now most of these people unfortunately are unskilled labourers, this is where most of the trouble seems to be.

I had a call from another man today who is an unskilled labourer who has been two years looking for work, and he complains that everybody he knows in his area down in St. Mary's Bay is going up to Churchill Falls doing labour work, but that he had his name down, and he has been in to town seven or eight times but he cannot get employment. Now obviously there is no deliberate discrimination against him but, there appears to be that the problem of the minister's department, which I am sure is primarily with untrained people, that these are the people who are on short-term assistance, are the ones who are certainly less able to get jobs at Canada Manpower, and it would be of some help if the minister had several people whose job was to find employment for these even though Canada Manpower is supposed to have that responsibility.

There is another point I think should be considered when we are considering a general topic of this department. The minister in reply to a question today, and the number of the question was 484, told us that the Government had purchased for those people who are receiving welfare assistance, in the period from April 1st, 1965 to March 31st, 1968, during three years 153 homes for needy persons. Now there is nothing wrong with that because, these are people who if these homes were not bought for them would be out without a roof over their heads at all. But only forty-three of them had title to the home vested in the minister's name, and 110 had title in the home vested in the welfare recipient, and these homes ranged in price from \$300. to \$4,500.

Now Mr. Speaker, it seems peculiar, I know there must be some reason for this, but it seems very peculiar that a Government would pay out, and the total paid in that period for homes registered in the names of the welfare recipient was \$139,211. Now it seems to me that there is something peculiar about this, about a Government assisted by the Government of Canada purchasing homes for needy people and with the taxpayers money, but putting title to the property in the name of the welfare recipient. I can see letting them live in these places rent free, but it definitely appears to be peculiar for the Government say to pay \$3,000. for a property for somebody to live in who is on long-term assistance, and then giving them title to the property. What is to stop them from selling it? For example.....

MR. CROSBIE:

for example, Now I believe the minister said, the other day or several weeks ago that this policy was being changed. So that from now on I think title is, remain always with the government or an agency in the government. But if he could explain why this has happened and are there any restrictions or can the welfare person who has been assisted on welfare can he sell that property after the title is vested in his name or what conditions apply would certainly be interesting, because it does seem a bit peculiar.

The minister mentioned that his department is engaged now in a programme of advising welfare recipients on how best to spend their money which also reminds us that consumer protection is a matter that needs a lot more effort in this Province. Therefore it is disappointing to find Mr. Speaker that the Government has not established yet the division of consumers affairs. (I have not had the chance to really go over the estimates to see if there is any money voted for this year) But whether on or off welfare it is certainly essential now for there to be more protection given to the consumers of Newfoundland and for there to be an active division of consumer affairs with adequate personnel and active programmes to help the consumer to check misleading advertising and the rest of it.

The Hon. the Premier Mr. Speaker, has mentioned is urging the Government of Canada over the years to allow the Government here to employ, to use the money that is spent on, to pay to employable people on welfare to have them working to share the cost of it which they refuse to do. And he suggested the Government of Canada only subsidizes idleness. I am delighted to find Mr. Speaker, that I am not the only one who is being critical of the Government of Canada in the past several days but even the hon. the Premier is occasionally critical of the Government of Canada. And I notice that some clown or some stupid ignoramus up in the Government of Canada has not accepted this proposal of the Premier's and suggested that this is really making people work for their relief, and I am also delighted to notice that there are stupid ignoramuses and clowns in Ottawa as well as on this side of the House Mr. Speaker. But I wonder if the Government of Canada have

not accepted this proposal which sounds on the surface to be so sensible. If they have not there must be some valid reason for it. I do not know what the reasons may be but I can see certain problems, suppose you do have a programme where the employable person who is on, who is receiving welfare assistance because he has not got a job. If he is to be put to work and the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland has to pay his wages at what rates is he to go to work at? On welfare he is getting a certain amount, facet on a family of four. But now the Government says. Does the Government say you must go to work now to receive this assistance, you must go along the Trans-Canada Highway and help beautify it or whatever it is. for the same money, or would these two governments say we now give you an opportunity to go to work if you wish, at a greater income than you would make if you just stay on welfare assistance and leave it up to the welfare recipient. The hon. minister says they will have a choice. If they are going to have a choice then they will certainly have to receive higher income working than they would be getting welfare assistance.

MR.SMALLWOOD: Trade union rates.

MR.CROSBIE: Trade union rates, the hon. the Premier mentioned trade union rates. But of course one can see that perhaps an objection of the Government of Canada that it would cost some considerably more money than the present scheme, that might be one reason why they have not accepted it. But a feature of this proposal is up to the person concerned so if it is up to the person concerned obviously there is going to have to be a carrot, because the person receiving public assistance in Newfoundland today apparently can make a higher income than the minimum wage rates would give him. So this would have to be employment at a greater rate than the minimum wage rates now in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. And whether there are other objections to this scheme, to this suggested scheme I do not know. I do not know whether it would be workable. Certainly it would be worth trying on an experimental basis somewhere, to see just how effective it was, and what work was accomplished.

It would be interesting to have, I think the minister said 7700 heads of

households roughly on welfare assistance. And no doubt while I have seen the figures before and how many of them have got grade 1 and grade 2 and grade 111, and so on. But the problem in Newfoundland Mr. Speaker, is certainly with the uneducated and the untrained and unfortunately those people that we are dealing with are not basically capable of retraining. I think the hon. minister may agree or disagree with that. But if you are a man of forty-five or fifty and only had grade 111, what good do all these retraining programmes do you, obviously they do not do you any good. But you have not had sufficient education to be eligible for those retraining programme. So it is a problem that only education of his children in training of the younger people is going to cure in the long run. The minister might comment on that one when he closes the debate. So Mr. Speaker, I agree with the change of the name, I agree with what the minister is trying to do and hope that he will, he is changing the name of the game or the game itself as well as the name, and I would be interested in hearing his comments on some of these points, as to whether he thinks that perhaps the Government of Newfoundland should not put more effort itself into helping these people and other find employment I do not think that the Canada Manpower office is enough here in Newfoundland.

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few brief words in support of this Bill, to change the name of the department and I would also in accordance with what the hon. member for St. John's West said a few moments ago. I would like to sincerely congratulate the minister on doing a reasonably good job for the department despite the fact they were at each others throats once in a while, at least things are happening in that department since he has taken over, particularly in the field of Child Adoption. I think he is to be complemented on that. Now emphasis by all the previous speakers has been laid on the fact that while there would be nobody essentially to be rehabilitated or on welfare if there were sufficient jobs to go around. I am in complete accordance with the hon. the Premier when he said that all the emphasis should be made it is the biggest burden that this Province has to bear in the chance that there are not enough jobs

to go around. Now the only way that jobs can be provided would be by the attraction of industry. Now the attraction of industry in order to employ our people is fine if it is going to go out in a practical fashion and not in the same manner as we have seen the amount of jobs that will accrue by the Come by Chance operation for the amount of money that we have to invest. Now if you cannot attract enough industry to employ these people well then obviously you have got to employ a great percentage of them yourself and this is essentially what is happening when we think in terms of all of the people of this Province who are employed by Government. The people

MR. BURGESS:

and the people, the civil servants of this Province and also the fire fighters, policemen and hospital workers. Now the carrot as referred to by the hon. member from St. John's West would be that in order to attract them into the employ of the Government you have to give them an incentive in that they would be receiving essentially more than they would receive on welfare. Well, unfortunately when we think of the fact that you have policemen, you have fire fighters and I think I mentioned in this hon. House on a previous occasion where you have fire fighters working 49½ hours a week and being on call, on stand-by for another 49½ we can say that is pretty close to 100 hours a week I would say that if you divide the amount of hours into the amount of money they are making they do not even compare with the minimum wages, the minimum wage laws that we are talking about. I think that there has been a completely unrealistic attitude adopted by this Government particularly in the last Budget towards the people who are employed by the Government because the people who have brought about this new job classification and taken into consideration the earnings of these people, fire fighters and policemen, I feel that it has been completely unrealistic in that they have started from a gate, a wire, that was way below the minimum standard anyway.

The proportionate increases that have been awarded to the various job classifications maybe on a proportionate scale, they may be right, but I think the thing that has to be considered is that these people are way below the minimum anyway in relation to the services that they are provided or have provided, the very essential services that they have provided. With that in mind I have heard constant references to the fact of the idea of the Government to bring about a minimum wage standard, a minimum wage law, and I would say that they have reached that goal already because this is essentially what they are providing, a minimum wage.

The hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources was very profound in what he said in that the people who have the greatest opportunity of finding employment in this Province are the people who are well educated but in the fire-fighters and policemen some of these people have grade eleven and higher yet they

MR. BURGESS:

are not receiving remuneration. I have no doubt, I am attending a meeting of these people tonight and tomorrow morning and I am sure that I may see some of them on welfare tomorrow because they just do not see any advantage in staying in with the wage structure that they presently have. When we talk about the change of the name there is a certain social stigma attached to applying for welfare and I am in complete accord with the changing of the name, it is a sophisticated name even though it means the same thing but this change has been brought about in other Provinces anyway and I heartily endorse the change of the name and the work presently being done by the minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, just a few words in support of this Bill. But we first join other hon. members in congratulating the hon. Minister of Welfare for the new approach that he has been taking in dealing with this very specious problem. To my knowledge he has made very few mistakes. He made one mistake but that can be rectified, it is not an irretrievable error on his part. He stated today in introducing the Bill that many people become depressed and demoralized by the traumatic experience of finding themselves on welfare. This, Mr. Speaker, is a pretty fair statement, a fact in so far as many Newfoundlanders are concerned.

Most of the Newfoundlanders who are receiving social assistance when they are able to work are there through no fault of their own. They did not wish to find themselves in that position and they are quite embarrassed by it. This applies with equal if not more force to people who through illness, through personal family problems and that sort of thing again find that they too had to apply for social assistance.

The only thing that I can take issue with the hon. the minister on is his philosophy that welfare recipients should be almost put on public parade and I say, Mr. Speaker, that this philosophy will not work. The philosophy of having curling teams made up of welfare recipients just will not work. It is something that the welfare people find repugnant, they do not like it and they find it very embarrassing. The hon. minister knows what I am referring to, I am referring to that decision that was made by someone in his department, it may

MR. HICKMAN:

not have been the hon. minister but unfortunately for him he has to bear the blame of closing out the welfare office in Burin and assisting Mr. Lundrigan with his rent by moving it into a shopping centre.

I was there again this past week and they have a very fine group of welfare officers working on the Burin Peninsula. The town of Burin was the first place I believe to have a female welfare officer. It was tried about three years ago as an experiment and it is working exceptionally well. We have two on the peninsula now and they are very understanding people and very hard working ladies.

MR. F.W. ROWE: I understood my hon. friend to say that the town of Burin was the first to have a female welfare officer three years ago.

MR. HICKMAN: Well it was when the hon. the present Minister of Health was Minister of Welfare.

MR. ROWE: The first female welfare officer was appointed when I was Deputy Minister of Welfare and there were several after that.

MR. HICKMAN: I knew it, I knew it, Mr. Speaker. I knew it that if something original can come out of that department -

MR. ROWE: The hon. gentleman may be interested in knowing for the record that the first female welfare officer was appointed to the town of Grand Falls. Her name was Miss Moore.

MR. HICKMAN: Well there again you are in trouble Mr. Minister. You cannot win, you cannot take credit for anything. Everytime you do something new the hon. the Minister of Education thought of it twenty years ago but I suppose that is the hazard of public life. But may I, and I am going to do this everytime we talk about welfare, once again remind the hon. minister that this present practise he has of using a shopping centre for an office for welfare recipients is not working nor is it, there is nothing wrong with having a central office for administrative work but the day to day operation and function of a welfare office should not be carried on under these circumstances. I do know this that it is imposing undue hardship on the people of Burin, the town of Burin, the area to be served, that part of the district of Burin. It is all very well to

MR. HICKMAN:

say that the office is open on one or two days a week and that the hours may even be the same but the simple fact is that in cases of emergency, in cases of illness, in cases of need, dire need that cannot be anticipated then the welfare recipient is faced with two choices: one trying to find the money which obviously they cannot find to drive by taxi to Marystown and return or alternatively doing without some of the essentials until the welfare officer finds that she can then go back to Burin. This was never contemplated, this surely was not contemplated as part of the centralization program and I will volunteer to go to work with the hon. the Minister of Welfare to see if we can find another suitable tenant for Mr. Lundrigan because I just do not want Lundrigan's to lose money, that would be unforgiveable.

The two young ladies, I have to confess I did not get an opportunity to go and look at the trailer but they do assure me that they have great affection for the town of Burin and that they were very happy and that they wish they were back there now.

Well, Mr. Speaker, apart altogether from the very necessary and commendable work that has to be done under the heading of Welfare there are many other facets of opportunity or obligation imposed on any minister and on this department that we are talking about. Mention has been made, Mr. Speaker, of the

made, Mr. Speaker of the adoption procedures or the attempt that is now being made to find homes for children who are up for adoption. That, Mr. Speaker, is a very good approach. It is an approach, I think, that has opened the eyes of many people in Newfoundland and their hearts, and I think that the conscience of some people have been bothered a bit, when they realize they can make and provide a home for some poor, unfortunate child, who is ready for adoption.

Mr. Speaker that program is good. No one can fault it, but I do suggest to the hon. minister that the adoption laws of this Province of this Province are in need of revision and that comes squarely under his department. The last two years ago or before that, Dr. Raymond Gushue was appointed to do a very intensive study in certain aspects of family law and one report that he prepared and it was a very good one was a report on adoption project (3). This was made public over a year ago and some very excellent recommendations were made, not shattering recommendations, but recommendations were made to bring the adoption laws more in line with the social needs and the social demands of the day and in line with the philosophy that prevails in other provinces. One which is a troublesome one in Newfoundland is not one that comes to the courts very often, but one is the lack of limitation, upon actions that can be taken to revoke an adoption order. In many jurisdictions now, there is no provision at all. Other jurisdictions were a bit more cautious and to take care of some real unforeseen crisis that might arise, put in a limitation of one year, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that recommendation which is contained in the Gushue report can be and should be implemented in this session of the Legislature. There is another recommendation that adoption orders in other jurisdictions, other provinces should be recognized within this Province. These are not far-reaching changes but changes that will eliminate some hardships, some unnecessary hardships that occur from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, there is the provision in many jurisdictions now that permit and something which I understand is not permissible in Newfoundland and

something which is very, very desirable and that is the right to permit private adoptions. It happens on occasion that a child loses his or her mother and it is the consensus of opinion within the family that that infant will be raised by say an uncle and aunt. The uncle and aunt become very, very attached to this child and I know of a case quite recently on the south coast, I think that is close enough to indentify it, where an uncle and aunt had raised a child from infancy to five, six, seven years of age and then suddenly there was a bit of a family row and the mother who had been near the child and who was practically unknown to the child walked in one day - it was her legal right to do it and took the child away. This caused tremendous heartbreak to the child. The child has been disturbed ever since and the adopting parents are in a state of absolute heartbreak and concern.

Now the recommendations of the Gushue report again suggest that we follow what is now the standard practice in most jurisdictions of permitting and legalizing private adoptions. The last part of the report dealt with a rather ticklish subject and that is the subject of the religious faith of the child to be adopted and I think that recommendation no. (1) is the one that almost covers it in a nutshell, when it says, "the child's welfare if the paramount consideration." It does not recommend that we depart from the practice of insisting that the child be adopted by a person of the religious persuasion of say the mother, in the case of an illegitimate child. Again I know that the minister is aware of many, unfortunate situations of children who could not and did not find excellent homes, because of this restriction, but it does recommend though that where a child is old enough to form and has formed firm religious convictions, that nothing but nothing should ever happen to try and dissuade the child or change that conviction. If it is a child, an infant who is unable to decide for himself, then obviously the practice of trying to put that child in the home of parents who are of the same religious faith say as the mother, has a great deal to commend it. But again it would be wrong, absolutely wrong to deprive a child of the right of adoption simply on these grounds. Surely in this day of ecumenical spirit and the days when differences have disappeared, that legislation

that tries to maintain any of these differences has no place on our Statute Books. I do hope that the Minister is giving serious consideration to the bringing before the House, at this session, because we cannot put off these things much longer. They have a habit, if you wait until the crisis occurs, then the legislation that is brought in, in my opinion, is never the right type of legislation that can be brought in anticipation of what might happen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while I am on this too and on the Gushue report, there was a very excellent report that followed the divorce resolution of this House. Report no. (2), I think it was on family guidance. Again there has been some difference of opinion, and I think the Gushue report recommended that the legislation should come under the Minister of Justice. I know that the hon. Minister of Health thought that it was more properly under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Welfare, but regardless of which minister should be responsible for it, the fact is that we have a divorce law in Newfoundland today that places great emphasis on family guidance. It imposes upon the judge sitting in a divorce case, an obligation to try and reconcile the differences of the petitioning parties if that is possible. In most cases, it is not. But if the presiding judge decided that this was a case where family guidance was necessary, we do not have in this Province, any place, any person to whom that petitioner or petitioners responded and co-responded can be directed.

There was in that project no. (2), I think, a draft Bill, and I think that the hon. minister will find that the Bill has been drafted for over a year in final form ready for presentation to this Legislature. I believe it is most regrettable that these projects, these recommendations have not been implemented; particularly, without anything more now than for either the hon. the Minister of Justice or the Minister of Welfare to stand in

the House and give notice of first reading, that Bill is ready to be brought before the House without any further changes.

Mr. Speaker, there is not much point in having great studies done, studies in law reform or commissions on anything, if they are going to gather dust on the shelves of some department of Government after they have been worked on for a long time by competent people. May I say that this adoption report and the report on family guidance has caught the imagination of social leaders in our Province. I know family guidance was prepared in closest co-operation with the churches and the social wings of the churches and has unanimous approval and they have been making inquiries as to why this legislation has not come before the House, and there are several others, as the hon. minister is aware. All of which would were completed, I think anywhere from nine months to two years ago.

There is an indication in the Speech from the Throne that there is a new Marriage Act coming in. I do hope that that Marriage Act will again be in line with the Gushue recommendation which was prepared very carefully and at the same time, in the closest consultation with the people who were involved in these social problems. So these great words of wisdom, I commend this Act to the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. minister speaks now, he can close the debate.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all....

MR. SPEAKER: It is just beyond 6 p.m. and we can call it 6: p.m. and he can continue his remarks, when we resume sitting at 8 pm.

I now call it 6 p.m. and I leave the Chair until 8 pm.



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 47

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House resumes at 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair:

HON. S.A. NEARY (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, when Your Honour called it six o'clock, we were discussing an Act further to amend the Department of Public Welfare Act, 1965, a proposal to change the name of the department to the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation.

Mr. Speaker, may I thank all hon. members who supported this Bill in such glowing terms. The last eleven months Sir, have been packed ones for me in this department, and if in some small measure I have been able to make life a little more pleasant for some of our fellow Newfoundlanders who are less fortunate than ourselves, then I think I could say in all conscience that I have enjoyed every moment of doing it.

You see Mr. Speaker, my department bring me into daily contact with just about every phase of society. I just could not find words Sir, to express the feeling of deep satisfaction that I get out of helping many of those people who have to come to us, and not always Mr. Speaker, for assistance, but sometime just for a word of advice or a word of encouragement, or sometimes maybe just to get something off their chest.

I do not think that there is another department of Government Sir, that really offers such an excellent opportunity to help people, and I was most pleased this afternoon to hear hon. members who spoke in support of this Bill, share in my concern for the needy people of our Province.

Mr. Speaker, when we speak of needy people in this Province, at least when I speak of needy people in this Province, my remarks are not necessarily confined to those people who come to us for emergency assistance, but also include what I like to term the working poor. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the person who is really caught in the squeeze of today's inflationary society is the person in the lower-income bracket and those earning below subsistence income.

Now Sir, you ask the question; how can you define those in the lower income bracket? Well I think personally Mr. Speaker that anybody earning \$5,000. to \$6,000. a year today would be considered to be in the lower-income

bracket. These are the people Mr. Speaker, who are footing the bills. These are the people who are paying their own way, and the ones who are contributing most to society today, and yet, these are the ones who are hardest hit Sir.

You know Mr. Speaker, I was amazed recently when I heard a high ranking politician in Ottawa say that people earning \$7,000. and \$8,000. a year would never own their own homes. Now Mr. Speaker, if that hon. gentleman was living in a Province where we have the lowest personal income in Canada, and the highest rate of unemployment what would he have said.

He is talking as my hon. colleague reminds me Mr. Speaker, about eighty-five per cent of Newfoundlanders who will never own their own home, and this is a pretty sad situation. I think when we talk about needy people Sir, that we should include the working poor.

MR. MURPHY: Would the hon. minister tell us what he considered the subsistence income and the lower income, would he specify. In the opinion of our department here in Newfoundland, what would be

MR. NEARY: In my opinion anybody earning below \$3,500. or \$3,600. a year is earning below subsistence income, and I think the latest D.B.S. figures show us that the average personal income in Newfoundland in 1969 I think it was or 1968, I am not sure which year it was - was roughly slightly below \$1,700.

Well Mr. Speaker, there were some questions raised by the hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House this afternoon, and I will try to deal with a few of them. I think it was the hon. member for St. John's West that asked about the housing situation. He wanted to know why in some instances the houses that were purchased for needy people by my department in some cases the title was vested in the minister and in other cases it was given to the occupant. Well the reason for that Mr. Speaker, was before the Canada Assistance Plan came into being, we had to pay 100 per cent of the cost of the purchase of these houses. When the Canada Assistance Plan came into effect if the houses that we purchased, if the title was vested in the minister then the minister more or less became a landlord and the house could be rented to the client and we could recover fifty per cent of the cost of renting that house from the Canada Assistance Plan. In cases where the houses

were vested in the name of the occupant I think that you will find that this only happened before the coming of the Canada Assistance Plan.

That whole situation has been changed now Mr. Speaker, and the Newfoundland - Labrador Housing Corporation are now purchasing the houses and the client rents the house from the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation and we recover fifty per cent of the cost of the rent from the Canada Assistance Plan. I hope that answers the hon. gentleman's question.

Now Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Burin who is not in his seat at the moment, compared the clients of my department who go to our office in Marystown, as something like goldfish in a goldfish bowl. Now Sir, the philosophy I have adopted since I became minister of this department is that I try to make life as pleasant as I can for the people who come to us through no fault of their own, and I do not think Mr. Speaker, that these people should be forced to sneak in the back door, or receive assistance under the table. I think clients that come to my department Sir, are entitled to have a little comfort while they are waiting to see one of our social welfare councillors, I do not think that they should have to go around the back of the building, sneak in, they are entitled to this assistance by law Mr. Speaker, a law which was made in this House.

MR. MURPHY: The hon. minister will agree the set-up up in the only shopping area in the place a lot of people are self conscious about it eh?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I agree with setting up offices and I do not care where they are, if they are on the moon, that are comfortable for the clients of my department, because, may I point out to hon. members Mr. Speaker, that not all the clients that come to this department come looking for assistance. We have people, clients who come enquiring about adoptions, and all the other services that are provided by this department. Should we ask these people Mr. Speaker, to sneak in the back door? Or put them in a dive, or in a shack Mr. Speaker? Then the hon. member for Burin poked fun at a remark that I made recently, that I did not see why the doors of the curling clubs in Newfoundland were not thrown open to welfare recipients. Well why not Mr. Speaker,

MR. MURPHY: Not with uniforms on them

MR. NEARY: Because you see Mr. Speaker, one of the great problems of the future is how people are going to spend their leisure time. Why should not the doors of the curling clubs and the stadium, and all the other recreational facilities that we have in Newfoundland be thrown open to recipients of social assistance and their sons and daughters. Why not Mr. Speaker? Is it because those people who sit down behind the glass puffing on their cigar, drinking their glass of scotch do not want to rub shoulders with these people? Is that beneath their dignity Mr. Speaker?

MR. MURPHY: The hon. member did not mean that, he did not want to put a uniform on them saying I am a welfare recipient. I think, you know, do not put a wrong light on it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member who made that remark this afternoon, made it with tongue in cheek.

Mr. Speaker, since I made an announcement in this House that food orders were on the way out and that short-term assistance would be paid by cheque in future, I have heard some people who feel that this will now open up short-term assistance for abuse. I would like to take a moment Mr. Speaker to set the minds of these people at ease. I am sure that no hon. members of this House think that this is going to make welfare easier, or it is going to cause abuse, because, the requirements are exactly the same Mr. Speaker. The only thing now is, instead of giving a welfare recipient a little white piece of paper you give him a cheque. But the requirements are the same, and upon the basis of the Fogo Island experiment Sir, we had no reports at all of abuse of the system of paying.....

HON. STEPHEN NEARY (Minister of Welfare): was paying temporary social assistance by cash instead of by voucher. But anyway Mr. Speaker, let us assume that there will be a small amount of abuse. If we receive any reports of abuses, then I can assure this hon. House Mr. Speaker, that they will be thoroughly investigated and possibly if it is proven that there is abuse but a change could be made in the name of the person receiving the cheque, probably put in the name of the wife instead of the husband. But if neither pair is capable Sir, we can always find a trustee, perhaps a clergyman, or some other responsible person in the community, to handle their cheque for them and dole out the amounts to them. The third recourse Sir that we could take, would be to give them their allowance a week at a time, and of course if none of these work, or appears feasible, we can always return a particular case to payment by voucher and maintain this until they are able to demonstrate their ability to handle money themselves. So I hope Mr. Speaker, that will clear up any doubt that may have been in anybody's mind as to how we can deal with abuses of cash versus food order.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say for the interest of hon. members, that on May 1, I propose to visit Ottawa to join with the other Atlantic Provinces in presenting a brief to the hon. John Monroe, Federal Minister of Health and Welfare, a more equitable cost-sharing formula under the Canada Assistance Plan. Now Mr. Speaker, this may not look like a very big document, but there is almost a year's work put into this brief. Actually I only received a copy this afternoon - it has the Coats-of-Arms of the four Atlantic Provinces, and I have been the one Mr. Speaker, who has been chosen to present this brief on behalf of the Atlantic Provinces, which I consider a very honour.

But my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House this afternoon asked a couple of very interesting questions. One dealing with allowable income. I think it was the hon. member for St. John's West again, who wanted to know why we deducted one hundred percent of the earnings of people

on short term assistance. Well he is quite correct Mr. Speaker. At the moment that is the procedure that is used. But I would like to point out to one new innovation that has been made in the last few months regarding earnings by recipients of short-term assistance. And that is Mr. Speaker, that now their entitlement is based on their net income, whereas previously it was based on gross income. In other words Sir, recipients of short-term assistance are now allowed legitimate expenses, such as transportation, uniforms, eating out and so forth.

Now Mr. Speaker, this is really just an infant step into the reforms that we have in the back of our minds. And at this point Sir, may I also point out that we supplement a large number of people who are employed, but earning below what their entitlement would be from this department. So we supplement their income. So really Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse. If a person has an opportunity not to go to work because if he does not earn, you see this will just prove the lie, the myth, the fallacy in the argument that "well a person is better off on welfare," because really Mr. Speaker, he really is not better off on welfare, because if he went to work and he did not earn the equivalent of his entitlement from this department, and we would supplement his income.

MR. MURPHY: Just to get it straight Mr. Speaker, if I may. In other words, the case I referred to of thirty-one dollars a week. Well say that person earned twenty dollars, he would be supplemented another eleven dollars right?

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. MURPHY: So he would be no better off by earning the twenty than if he stayed home in bed or watched Television and got thirty-one basically, as far as money-wise is concerned.

MR. NEARY: That is right. His entitlement would be exactly the same, but the only thing is that he would be doing something productive. Now the hon. the Leader of the Opposition just raised the point that I am about to come to. Mr. Speaker, I might say that nothing is free in this world. You know, with all the reforms and all the innovations that we would like

to make in this department, they cost money. And honestly Mr. Speaker, I really do not know where the money can come from to make all the changes that we would like to make. I do not think the tax-payers of Newfoundland can provide anymore of the budget of this department. So that is why Mr. Speaker, that I will be going to Ottawa to join with the other Atlantic Provinces on May 1, to present this brief. This brief outlines a new formula for the Canada Assistance Plan to help the Atlantic Provinces in carrying out their welfare programs.

If this new formula is accepted by the Government of Canada Sir, it would mean that instead of Newfoundland getting dollar for dollar, or fifty percent of the cost of welfare programs in the Province, that we would get a dollar forty-one for every dollar that we would spend.

I do not think I would be letting the cat out of the bag Sir, when I say that in dollars and cents, what this would mean for Newfoundland, if it were accepted by the Government of Canada, it would mean \$ 8 million additional assistance to look after needy people in this Province.

MR. MURPHY: But only for the purpose of welfare payments. We are still not getting away from you know providing of what we spoke about today.

MR. NEARY: The question has been asked Mr. Speaker; what it would mean for the other three provinces? The factor that would be used in this new formula by the way would be personal income for a person in the province over labour force participation rate in the province, as compared to the Canadian Labour Forces participation rate. So in Newfoundland, as I said, it would mean an extra forty-one cents per dollar. Or a dollar forty-one for every dollar that we spend. Prince Edward Island, it would mean a dollar forty-seven. Nova Scotia, a dollar seventeen, so they would get seventeen cents more for every dollar spent. New Brunswick a dollar twenty-six. Quebec, a dollar and nine Mr. Speaker, believe it or not. Right now, members must understand that right across Canada, the Canada Assistance Plan pays fifty percent straight across the Board, which means that rich Ontario and wealthy British Columbia can better look after their needy people

than we can here in Newfoundland. And this why that we claim - Ontario? well, they would just remain at fifty percent. They would not go below fifty percent. You can over. This would mean Mr. Speaker, that if we can get Ottawa to accept this new formula, then there is no reason why we cannot carry out the reforms that the hon. members raised this afternoon, because they are going to cost a substantial amount of money.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier raised a very interesting point this afternoon, and I must say I could not agree with him more, when he spoke about substituting work for welfare. Now for a moment, Mr. Speaker, I thought he had been peeping over my shoulder, because six days after I present this brief to the hon. Mr. Munro. I will be presenting another brief on May 7th. to the present Senate Committee on Poverty, which will be submitted by my department on behalf of the Province. There is almost six pages in the brief, Mr. Speaker, and deals with exactly with the situation which the Premier outlined this afternoon. And I am hoping that as a result of this brief, that at least we will be able to get support for his proposal in the Upper House.

Mr. Speaker, some hon. gentleman wanted to know this afternoon, how many heads of households were on short-term assistance, so I brought the figures along this evening and I am very happy to say that they are slightly less than I indicated this afternoon. At this moment, our Provincial Welfare list are just over seven and a-half thousand, the actual figure is 7523 heads of households who are classified as employable. These men have about 37,000 dependents, that is wives and children.

I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that a large number of those will find employment at seasonal work. But those who may not be so fortunate in my opinion would be well advised now, to start thinking about what they can do, while they are depending on social assistance finances. And in that regard, Sir, some hon. gentlemen were very complementary this afternoon about our program of counseling and consumer economics. And I am very happy to say, Sir, that in a matter of a few days, that I hope to be able to distribute a consumer economic handbook throughout the Province to those people who are on both, long and short term assistance. And if anybody else requires a copy, I will be glad to supply it for twenty-five cents.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what does this handbook provide? Well, it is a handbook that is meant to help people on social assistance stretch their

MR. NEARY: dollar. The self-help booklet and it looks to me like, it will really help people to improve their standard of living, by not having to spend more money, Mr. Speaker, by doing self-help projects. There is some good solid information in it on the growing of vegetables, forest types, fertilizers, tools, seeds, soil cultivation, garden layouts, there is also a section, Sir, dealing with preserving and canning. How to preserve blueberries, and patridgeberries, and bakeapples, and raspberries and the like. There is knitting and sewing instructions, Sir, and also the name of the vocational schools in the Province where sewing classes are held, in the event that some of these people may want to register in these classes. There are tips on hunting and fishing, Sir. And a very, very important section on food budgeting, combining nutritions, Mr. Speaker, with shopping tip value.

I am sure, Sir, that all citizens, not only those on social assistance will be interested in this publication.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon also, I think it was the Leader of the Opposition that raised the point about some families in St. John's being unable to secure the services of, what he called, I think, a domestic or a maid. Well, now Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition might have heard rumbling from my department recently of a program that I am hoping to undertake in the foreseeable future to train, what I would like to term family aids. I think we have to get away from this, there is almost a stigma attached to domestic or maid, as there is to welfare, so I would like to get away from this. Now I agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, there must be hundreds and hundreds of young girls, and old girls, and middle aged girls in small communities scattered throughout Newfoundland that are just sitting home all day long living off of their parents, sometimes the parents just not working, but receiving social assistance. And I agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, that there has been a considerable demand in Newfoundland and

MR. NEARY: in Labrador, and not only in this Province, but right across Canada for family aid. Requests come to my desk repeatedly, Sir, for this type of help. And right at this moment, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition will be interested in this, that our Director of Training and Research is listing the number of girls beyond compulsory school age limit, who are unemployed, and living at home in relative idleness, and with no real prospects for the future. Most of these, Mr. Speaker, I think we all agree are unsuited for office work. When we have this report Sir, the next step then will be to find out how many middle class homes in this Province could benefit by having a trained family aid, and the kind of training they would want her to have.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we forecast the supply of family aid then I think our next move is to sell the girls on this occupation, as a career which has good opportunities and has tremendous transfer value from rural centres to urban centres. Now, Sir, the type of training that I am talking about for these family aids, I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that they need Latin, but I am sure the hon. Minister of Education will take note now of what I am going to say. I would like to see resource people who can give these girls some practical experience and learn them how to use all types of appliances to be found in modern homes, and how to keep a home, how to keep the food and clothing in good condition, learn how to shop, you know some training in consumer economics, and shop for children clothing etc. Training in child handicrafts, in the supervision of pre-school child activities, and the care of feeding infants. And I think, Mr. Speaker that

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, you might also call in people like the Y.W.C.A. to teach the girls how to spend their leisure time. Because a lot of these girls when they come in to the city are dazzled by the bright lights, and for a while it is romantic and exciting, but then life becomes a little bit boring. So I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is very important that they be trained in how to spend their leisure time. I think the resource people that we need to give this type of training could come from hospitals, from the Federal Government Department, and the College of Trades and Technology from the vocational schools etc.

Now, Sir, as I have said, I do not think we need give these girls lessons in French, or Latin. I think they should get a certificate when they graduate, but I am one of these people Mr. Speaker, who believes that certification is becoming a bit of a racket. But you are not recognized today, unless you have a certificate. So I think probably upon successful completion of such training the girls would be rewarded by a certificate, as I said earlier, as a family aid.

I think, then, Mr. Speaker, ~~where~~ you have two people working out of a ~~house~~ in St. John's, and they desperately need this type of help, or where the lady of the House is handicapped or sick and they need an family aid, the girl then would just go and present her certificate, and she would not have to be running around looking for references and all this sort of thing. It would be a dignified profession, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to dignify it. Otherwise the girls just will not be interested. And I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that the people who employ these girls should make slaves out of them. These girls, I think, should have a fair wage, they should have their time off, and they must not be shuffled down in the basement or put in the backroom somewhere when guests come around. I think, I said their hours of work should be regulated. And I think in that way, Mr. Speaker, that the problem that the hon. gentleman raised could be very easily overcome. And we will be presuing matter over the weeks ahead.

MR. NEARY: I think, Mr. Speaker, I pretty well answered all the questions that came from the other side of the House this afternoon. Oh, yes there is one question that arose regarding Canada Manpower, about the relationship between my department and Canada Manpower. I want to say this Mr. Speaker, that we work very, very closely with Canada Manpower. And as my colleague the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources pointed out this afternoon, one of the requirements for qualifying for short-term assistance is that the applicant has to be registered with Canada Manpower. And we co-operate, whenever possible, Mr. Speaker, with Canada Manpower, especially around the Labrador Coast. We have gone out of our way to take applications both for employment and for training at the upgrading centres in the vocational schools, our social worker who travels the Labrador Coast has taken these applications along with him, and distributed them to the people in the area, not necessarily clients of ours, Mr. Speaker, but anybody that was interested in one of these applications. And we in turn get excellent co-operation from the Canada Manpower Centre, but I am sorry to say, I mean Canada Manpower, Mr. Speaker, are almost as frustrated as we are ourselves in the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation. If the jobs are not there, they just cannot wave a magic wand, and pick the jobs out of mid-air. The only jobs that I know that they have been able to find, Mr. Speaker, in the last few years are actually in their own offices. Sometimes, I wonder if they should not throw away the desks, instead of adding to their staff, they should not just throw away and get out in the field and start digging around for employment. But as far as I can see Sir, these are the only new jobs that they have been able to come up with, actually in their own offices. But I know they have their problems, it is a frustrating business

MR. ROWE, F.W.: That is not all they do.

MR. NEARY: No, as my hon. colleague points out that is not all they do, they are heavily involved in training and retraining.

MR HICKMAN:..... Office space in Marystown.

MR. NEARY: My hon. friend is terribly worried about that office space in Marystown, but let me point out that, the hon. member for Burin, Mr. Speaker, that I have yet to receive one complaint, a single complaint from a welfare recipient on the Burin Peninsula about that office in Marystown. I have had complaints from merchants, I have had complaints from aristocrats, but I have get to receive a complaint from a welfare recipient.

MR. HICKMAN: You should read the Burin Post.

MR. NEARY: And I know who the editor of the Burin Post is too,

Mr. SMALLWOOD: The Burin what?

MR. HICKMAN: The Burin Post.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is that?

MR. NEARY: Now then Sir,

MR. HICKMAN: That is the Burin Peninsula's acts to the Government Bulletin.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I hope that I have entirely answered at least some of the questions that were put to me this afternoon. Once again Sir, I want to thank all hon. members of this House who supported this Bill to change the name of the department. I sincerely believe, Sir, that the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation is more truly descriptive of what the department is doing, and should be doing and lays an assays Mr. Speaker, upon certain positive aspects of the department's work that should be more acceptable in the future, both to the client and taxpayer.

On Motion & Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Department Of Public Welfare Act, 1965". Read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order 12. Second reading of a Bill, " An Act Further To Amend The Department of Education Act, 1968". (Bill No. 23)

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, as I remember I believe I was suppose to speak

Mr. MURPHY: on this Bill when the House adjourned last Wednesday or Thursday, I have just listen to an excellent discourse by the hon. the Premier, one of his finest addresses, and when he finished up, he wanted to know what Bill he was speaking on? Now, I am much the same, I do not know what I can say on the Bill, it is just a change of name and I would like to have a few words on it. And that is with respect to bringing in the Department of Youth, particularly with regard to Physical Fitness into the Department of Education. When I heard it announced over the radio, a few weeks ago, I was rather astounded that this was happening, because quite honestly in my opinion the way the Department of Health is going now, I doubt if anybody in it knows just what they are doing, or where they are going or what their actual duties are, and that is possibly not their fault, but it is the fault of the new legislations being brought in. Even the other-day the hon. Minister of Education submitted I think five or six new appoints to the department, and the department is in a state of being re-organized.

Now my reason for speaking on this Bill, and I think the hon. member for Burin spoke with some lenght on this Bill,

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, forty-five minutes.

MR. MURPHY: Forty-five minutes. Is that fact that Physical Fitness as such and Recreation for Youth has been very much over looked in this Government in past years, and I grant to the

MR. MURPHY:

estimates here for this year and I am sorry to say that the actual grant to recreational organizations and what not is down again this year. I mentioned a few weeks ago or a few days ago, I believe it was when I was speaking on the address in reply, of the very small percentage of our dollar that it being spent on recreation for our youth. I was rather surprised, I think it was Thursday night or Friday night, when the hon. Donald Jamieson addressed the Board of Trade where he came up with a figure that sixty-per-cent of our population is under the age of twenty-four. That is quite a high percentage of young people and I think it is all the more reason why this Government, this House should pay perhaps a little more attention and give a little more assistance to youth movements.

It used to be an old saying that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure and I think this applies in this area particularly at this time in our lives where we have a growing mass of juvenile delinquency and a lot of cases disrespect for law and order and unless we are prepared now to invest in programs that would try to set these younger people on the right path when they are early I am afraid it is going to cost us many many more dollars in later life in corrections, penitentiaries and so forth. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the department as such when it was in Provincial Affairs, and all due respects to the hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs is not in his seat tonight, that it is not one of the most important departments and I felt that the gentleman who was in charge of physical fitness at the time had a bit more leeway to work there. I know I visited him on many occasions as did many others and I do not think the same freedom would be available in the Department of Education because again I say of the preponderance of different areas of administration within that great large department.

Mr. Speaker, going through some time ago some members on this side of the House we were trying to evaluate the Government as it is with the various departments as they are and if we had the same obligation what would we do to make Government more effective? There is one department of Government which in our opinion is sort of all embracing in many respects and that is the Department

MR. MURPHY:

of Social and Community Development and our thoughts would be that that would embrace municipal affairs and recreation and youth because the very name I think signifies the development of the community, the development of the social life of that community whereas today in Government we have some eighteen cabinet ministers and I believe, and this is my opinion, that many of them are working perhaps for the same object but going different ways and our feeling was that with a smaller number of cabinet ministers and with a greater concentration of policy that the Cabinet, the Government would be a far more effective organization to do jobs they set out to do. That is why I feel at this time that it would be a great mistake to put youth in the Department of Education, I know there are areas in education that look after our youth but I think that it is mainly through school boards that this administration is done.

I am thinking of not when a young man is in school because I believe at that time that he is occupied with his studies, our schools have I think in most cases an excellent program of recreation within the school, but the great tragedy with our younger people is when the schools close their doors whether it be at 4:00 o'clock in the afternoon or whatever time it is when our young people are more or less let out to fend for themselves and find something to occupy themselves and tragically in too many cases what they find to occupy themselves with is not always in the best interest of themselves and perhaps a lot of other people who are affected by their actions.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, and I have spoken on this I think everytime I stood in the House and perhaps I have been wasting my sweetness on the desert air, but it is time long past the time where someone and the logical people to do it are the Government, we cannot do it on this side, to come together and discuss the youth of our Province with respect to providing recreation, healthy recreation. We have made a start and I am sort of repeating myself but for the purpose of stating my objection to this Bill I will state it again, we have had two or three great announcements regarding great youth programs in this Province and they have ended up in just a bubble that burst after a certain event had passed. I am sure that the deal has been consummated now and we can-

MR. MURPHY:

not as I see it make a change in this set-up as it is but I would just like to point out again that in my opinion it is a very grave mistake, a very grave mistake that we are de-emphasizing one very very important area dealing with our youth and that is recreation. I feel quite sincerely that by putting this phase of activity into the Department of Education will not in any way improve the situation of giving our younger folks, boys and girls, something to occupy themselves with.

At this particular time of year summer sports and those connected with them are getting ready now to submit their budgets to the physical fitness department of activities that will take place in the summer months and after all the summer months are the important months as schools are closed and kids do not have the supervision that they would in fall and winter. I know that the softball league with a tremendous number of young people taking part in it, we have the soccer league which I think is pretty well Province wide and then we have, and I am speaking of leagues now, the baseball league which is one on a Province wide plan. In addition you have your tennis which is now attracting a tremendous number of people.

Facilities in a great many areas of the province are not available. I think in soccer we have a pretty fair representation in the Burin Peninsula, St. John's area, Grand Falls and the West Coast. The hon. member for Burin tells me that the Burin Peninsula's league is the best in the Province and I take his word for it, I do not argue. I think there is a slight bit of bias there but I would not elaborate on it at this time.

I know that I had a meeting yesterday, a short meeting, with some of my executives and I referred to baseball but we feel that to properly do the job and look after the 1500 or 1,600 kids that will be taking part, and I am speaking of the minor leagues now, will require money and I say we will be lucky if we will get twenty-per-cent of it this year. We have tried over the years to sort of bring our kids on an equal footing with the rest of Canada through national competition but with the grants that were available to us this has been almost an impossibility. We have managed it somehow but only through extra curricula

MR. MURPHY:

activities which are well known to the Justice Department and that would be a famous game and a few little tickets in envelopes and this sort of thing and we have had to break the law to get the money.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, just how long your provincial associations can carry on but we owe a great debt of gratitude to an awful lot of young people who have dedicated themselves and 99.9 per-cent of these have worked for nothing, they do not get any pay as a matter of fact in a lot of cases they attend meetings and they pay for their expenses out of their own pockets.

MR. MURPHY: But of all I have talked about, and all I am trying to say, I am just trying to emphasize the great, great need Mr. Speaker, for this emphasis on the training of our youth. We are, I had a letter from one of the towns only yesterday, who were hoping to bring in a professional to look after their young kids. I think they something like 700 or 800 kids occupied morning and afternoon, to try to bring our kids up to a grade or a standard. They need \$5,000 to do the job properly, and he would of course, hire other people with him. But I am afraid I have referred the matter to Mr. Snow, but I know that his funds are very limited, and it is doubtful - and this is only one of the six towns that are participating in this particular area that I mentioned. I believe if we had a very active department with sufficient funds, not millions, but sufficient funds that could go out to the province, work with the various municipalities. We have some good recreation groups in Grand Falls and Gander, Corner Brook, but they still need dollars to carry out their work, particularly when they get down to the seven, eight, nine ten, twelve year olds to provide equipment to keep playing facilities up to scratch. I think myself that it is time now that we set up properly, an administration, a division within the Department of Physical Fitness, where we had perhaps three or four active young men, experienced in athletics who would serve different areas of the Province, would work along with the local people right through, winter for hockey possibly, basketball - there are so many areas they could be active in. But I am just scared of what I have seen in the Estimates so far. We will be lucky if we have enough to finance a rousing game of hopscotch or perhaps two or three games of marbles. That is to do it as I think it should be done, because I feel now Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, that with this setup here, we are rather than improving the lot of our youth, and I am speaking of recreation - I am not speaking of actual education in schools or anything else. But I speak of recreation, rather than improving a lot of youth and helping us get together in some kind of a province-wide organization that this is going to submerge such a teeny

activity in the opinion of the Government when we hear the millions and millions being spent on the University, on High Schools, on buses and everything else. So I can just see a group of us going to fight with the Minister of Education looking for a few extra dollars to provide recreation for the young people.

So Mr. Speaker, quite frankly I would think that we are going to have a Deputy Minister of Education on youth, Associate Deputy Minister of Education on Youth, and an Officer called the Assistant Deputy Minister of Education on Youth. Now I will be looking forward to see who these gentlemen will be. They are already appointed are they? For years? I see, well I am way behind on this thing. Perhaps I might get the names of them. The only one I ever had any dealings with as far as Youth, was Mr. Graham Snow. This is why I am talking about physical fitness, rather than - I am worried about this Education and Youth, where they are all academics, you know, rather than actual people have been engaged in perhaps just as important an area of youth in the Recreation area. So I just glanced through the thing and when I saw this I said, well at least they are going to get some action. But if they had been appointed for some years or for some months or something like that, I could see they were not appointed because of the fitness, the physical fitness part of it. I say it is the Education part - we just added youth on to the education I presume. This is the change we made. So we will be looking forward Mr. Speaker, I know I will in the next few days when we submit our budget for our activities of the season, just what we will get and I will be in touch with the other provincial bodies, and I will get their opinions on just what benefit, this change will be to the work of so many people throughout the Province. But I can only say Sir, in conclusion that I regret that the emphasis on the Department of Physical Fitness and have it submerged in one of our largest departments, instead of leaving it where it was. I do not know what is left in Provincial Affairs. I do not know if it is the idea to phase the idea out altogether because I did not see much else

it was, except with due deference again to the minister. I think they handle the insurance end of it and they send out invitations for the opening of the House of Assembly, and they look after a few historic sites, and the Arts and Culture Centers, but basically what else happens in the department I do not know. But I have my own ideas on it and what should happen to it - the department, and I just look forward to sometimes Sir, to make a suggestion to the powers that be, that will listen to me as just how the thing in my opinion should be set up.

MR. JOHN NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to speak at all on this matter until I heard from the hon. Leader of the Opposition. There are two or three points that ^{he} made that I would like to comment on. One is his reference to the fact that physical fitness should not be in the Department of Education, but to remain in the Department of Provincial Affairs. I was under the impression perhaps my hon. friend had read the Report of the Royal Commission on Education and Youth. If I am not mistaken I believe it was recommended there that recreation should be in the Department of Education. I am entitled to my opinion as well as you are to yours. That is item one. The other thing is that he could see no reason why recreation should be in the same department as education. Not that to my mind at least, is something I cannot understand, because there is no more appropriate department, because you cannot separate recreation from education. If you are going to have a truly good recreational program, then it has to start in the schools. And therefore, unless you have a separate department of youth, and I would recommend that it should be in the first instance, in the Department of Education to see what happens and how it develops from there. The other matter that I would like to mention is that he did make reference to the fact that perhaps it should, please correct me if I am wrong on this, perhaps in the Department of Community and Social Development, and Municipal Affairs should be in Community and Social Development, this, that and the other thing. Now he says that in one mouthful Mr. Speaker. And then in the other, he says,

the hon. member says, that recreation should not be in a great huge department, like the Department of Education. So what he wants to do in fact, is to lead into perhaps a smaller department, or to put it into Community and Social Development which surely has enough to do and enough problems under the DREE program and re-settlement and so on to handle right now. So I think there is a contradiction right there, in your reference to Community and Social Development Sir. I could not agree more with the transfer of Physical Fitness to the Department of Education, I think it is an excellent idea, and I heartily support, and I do believe that you are really going to see some programs along the lines that the hon. member talked here. The hon. leader of the Opposition.

MR. MURPHY: Experience is a great teacher.

MR. NOLAN: Yes, I agree that experience is the only thing, but you know the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is not the fount of all knowledge of recreation in the Province.

Now the other matter that I would like to mention, and I do believe the hon. Leader of the Opposition and I may agree on this. That is that the gentleman that he referred to previously in this House, and again tonight, Mr. Graham Snow, has done I believe, a superb job in many ways, with many handicaps, some of which the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has mentioned, and I agree with the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, that we have to do more in this way, financially and otherwise, because it is my opinion that all too often we have, in the case of the gentleman that has been referred to, and like the hon. gentleman - the leader of the Opposition, I have also had some association with him in one area or another in recreation. And to me, under severe handicaps at times, sometimes even physical for example, I remember when he was very, very sick a few years ago, he still carried on and did a remarkable job. I am not sure that the job he has done has been fully appreciated in many areas. I think to a large extent perhaps, he has gone unrecognized to a large degree. And I am very pleased to hear the hon. Leader of the Opposition previously, and

again this evening make mention of the fact that the job that Mr. Snow has done and is doing. There is another matter that I am very, very concerned about, and this happens not only in recreation, but also in many other instances in our dealings with the Federal Government and it is this. And that is where we start out on some program or other, or some project, and the Federal Government comes on with a great foofaraw, and then after a year or two they decide that they will out, and they leave the Province holding the bag. And I suggest to some degree this is also going to happen, or has happened perhaps in recreation. The Federal Government this year I believe, and I am certainly open to correction by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition on this, and I would appreciate it if he would do so.. I believe the Federal Government this year, maybe spending somewhere in the vicinity of \$50 million in recreation. I think if you check the figures Sir, this might be reasonably accurate. But you will find that very, very little of this money Mr. Speaker, is coming into this Province, and this is because we need certain types of organizations, if you have read the programs as I have. And I am certainly the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has, and I would be more than happy to provide any information I have on it to him if he would like to have it.

But you will find that various organizations, Ski organizations, badminton, tennis and God knows what across this country. You can see the figures broken down where they are going into Ontario, British Columbia and all over the Square. Now I have nothing against the Province's concerned because obviously they have the young people where they need to do the job that is so necessary just as we do. But I do think we have to take a good hard look at what we are doing in recreation, and I think that Mr. Snow is one of the people under my hon. colleague who will certainly be taking a deeper look at this. And I think you will find in the final analysis, that having discussed the matter with Mr. Snow as I have many many times, that it would be his opinion for example that recreation should indeed be located and under the guidance of my hon. colleague, the Minister of Education. I just thought I would

MR. NOLAN: I would mention these few things because I thought they might be worth while and I am as anxious and indeed as enthusiastic I believe as my hon. friend opposite, and if we could get a few dollars, perhaps certainly much more than we have gotten from the Federal Government on this in the past, and apparently they are quite mad about projects on the Federal scene. We should come up with a few good recreational projects, which I think can be of tremendous benefit here in this Province.

I know that Mr. Snaow has gone out into many, many municipalities and we have as the hon. Leader of the Opposition has indicated a great number of people who are carrying on ^{on} a volunteer basis. They have been doing this since I was a boy, and they have been going on and continuing to do so, and up to this day. Now, they are not going to be able to go on forever.

The other great need of course in the many communities is leadership. I know of instances, in this Province today where you have large recreational facilities provided by the Government which are used perhaps thirty or forty times a year. They do not even turn the lights off at night, and it is a scandalous waste of money. I am thinking in this instance of a large, huge structure, I do not want to go into specifics Sir, that was provided by the Government and I know it is not being used, and there is the great danger. It is not enough to provide facilities and having it lying there dormant, unless you have the leadership within the community who will get the young boys, and the young girls involved, and the utilization of this thing.

Now the other item that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition mentioned and I could not be in greater agreement than I am in this particular matter, and that is this business of closing up all of the school gymnasiums, Auditoriums, and so on when the school year is finished, weekends and the like when you have so many young people on the streets with nowhere to go, and often times with nothing to do. I know that many prominent educators are giving a lot of attention and consideration to this, and I have no doubt that we have seen and will continue to see a greater expansion on this and the doors opening up in the future. But it something I know that many young people worry about as does the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and I agree with him, and I have

heard my hon. colleague mention it from time to time in this regard.

These are a few of the things that I thought I would mention if we could get some of that \$50 million out of the Federal Government. Perhaps we might be able to get a few dollars for water skiing or something so that the hon. Leader of the Opposition and I could go skiing on Topsail Pond with some sort of a financial grant this summer. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Mr. Speaker, if no other hon. member wishes to speak, I have a few comments to make. First of all I must confess to my surprise that this Bill, this innocuous, what I considered an innocuous, formal Bill, should have elicited so much comment here, so much debate. There have been at least five speeches on it which occupied not least than one half hour each, and this is a good thing. I am not complaining although I thought perhaps if this would happen later on we have ten education Bills on the Order Paper.

Two of them, three of them perhaps, but certainly two of them are pretty heavy and pretty substantial Bills. One is the schools Act, and the other is the one dealing with taxation. For the benefit of hon. members I would draw their attention to them now. One is no. 29 on the Order Paper, and the other is no. 39. These are fairly heavy Bills, and will I am sure occasion considerable debate. I had intended, in fact I still intend to make fairly lengthy statements when those two Bills are introduced. Also perhaps in the debate on the budget I will have something to say on education as I indicated in the Throne Speech that I gave here.

This Bill itself is a formal Bill which does two or three things. It renames the Department of Education from that name to the Department of Education and Youth, and it also takes cognizance of the fact that there are in the Department of Education now, two Deputy Ministers as well as an assistant Deputy Minister. The Two Deputy Ministers, and I think perhaps there was an unfortunate phrase used by ^{my} hon. friend from St. John's West just now, I think perhaps if he had it back he would not have said it in the way he did. I do not think that the hon. member meant to be derogatory, but it was better for him not to have used the phrase that he did use.

The associate Deputy Minister for the information of my hon. friend

the Leader of the Opposition is one of Newfoundland's very young and most distinguished and most highly regarded educators in the person of Mr. Cecil Roebathan. My hon. friend knows that Mr. P.J.Hanley has had the impossible task as did our hon. colleague in Provincial Affairs for many years, the impossible task of trying to be Deputy Minister of the largest department in the Government and one which placed an intolerable burden on the shoulders of each deputy in turn. It is almost correct to say that both men, and I am referring now to the Minister of Provincial Affairs when he was Deputy Minister and the present senior Deputy Minister.

Both men were almost literally worked to death. We are very fortunate that we do have in the person Mr. Roebathan a new, a younger, and a highly intelligent, and a highly capable Deputy Minister. We also have now other senior men as well. This is one of the great merits of reorganizing the Department of Education. The Department of Education up to now, and this is not too derogate the work of the department in the past. But the department could never fulfill the function that a department is supposed to fulfill and that is to give leadership in education to the entire Province. To the 6,000 or 7,000 teachers, to the hundreds of board members, and until now the several hundred Boards of Education, and to the 160,000 pupils at the present time, and to the university. We must not forget this University is a state university. It is a Government university. It does not belong to a group of private citizens, it is a state university owned by the people of Newfoundland. It was established by this Government and supported by this legislature, and therefore, the responsibility of the Department of Education, as are all our great vocational schools and the technical college over here as well.

As I said this was set out to recognize some aspects of the reorganization. There is nothing new in this at all, nothing at all. There will be new things when we come to examine the amendment to the schools Act. There will be new things when we come to examine the amendment to the school tax Act, but this here is nothing new. Nevertheless, I am very happy that it draw forth. These, you might say, philosophical and ideological discussions

and in particular comments regarding the physical education and recreational aspects of education. I am going to be guilty of heresy Mr. Speaker, in reply to some of the comments made by my hon. friend. First may I say this, when I announced Mr. Snow's appointment in the Department of Education only Friday past, I gave a fairly lengthy discription of the kind of work and the responsibilities that he would assume, and one reason for the transfer from Provincial Affairs to Edcuation is that, this particular division might be able to do a far wider, and a far more comprehensive job of physical education in the true sense of the word.

This is part of the heresy, and I say this, I should perhaps say in order to protect myself without boasting, that I do not think any hon. member in this House has participated more in athletics than I have. I do not think any hon. member has enjoyed it more. I am not a good spectator at all, I would not be bothered watching a game of soccer or a game of hockey, because I was captain of a football team, a league team for many years, and I played tennis and still play it. I had the satisfaction of beating one of my sons on Saturday past, at least part. I still enjoy swimming a couple of miles a day. I can go on and repeat that, and one of the most stupid things I ever did in my life at the age of forty, was giving up badminton singles which I enjoyed so much, and I gave it up on the advice of a doctor not now practicing in Newfoundland who said that no man at forty should play badminton singles. Now I found when I got to be fifty, that this is what I should have been doing, if I wanted to keep a good heart.

Seriously Mr. Speaker, we must get over this rather nieve belief that physical education consists of playing hockey or kicking a ball about.....

MR. ROWE, F.W.: It is far more than that, as far as the hersey, that I said I was going to be guilty of. It is far more than that.

And the second thing is this, we must get over the equal age in my view, equally naive assumption that you will only get a good program of athletics in our communities and in our schools, if the Government backs it up financially. My feeling is if you are going to have a real program, and this has been demonstrated many times, hundreds of times over, in almost every town in the United States, I was reading an article only tonight, while we were home to dinner, in one of the magazines regarding the Mid-Western States of the United States and what has happened to us, in this current issue where Humphrey,

MR. MURPHY: Ron?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Was it Ron?

MR. ROWE, F.W.: The recent contendor for the Presidential Race?

MR. MURPHY: Hubert Humphrey is it?

MR. ROWE, F.W. Huber Humphrey, describes conditions as he sees them back in Minnesota, and other mid-western states. And the progress that they have made in things like recreation and physical education, were not achieved by grants from Washington or by grants from the state government. It was achieved largely by local efforts.

However, I do not intend to go into that, and I am not going into it right now. But I would like to say this, there is one statement made by the hon. gentleman, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I was not sure I got him correctly, but I was rather amazed to hear him say it, and that was that schools in most cases have excellent programs of physical education in our Province. Did I understand my hon. friend to say that? In most cases our schools have excellent programs of physical education in the Province? I thought he said it, but if he did I hope he does not really believe it. Because most of our schools do not have excellent

MR. ROWE, F.W.: programs of physical education. And many of our schools have no programs in physical education at all. None at all. And I repeat physical education is not training a few elite athletes who will make up a team. I know, I went through this, I know. I know how many of us, I should not say this, when I was at college here in St. John's, I know how many of us really got physical education. There was a dozen or so of us, who were capable and confident enough to play on the collegiate football team, or the collegiate's hockey team, or in my case there were also when the collegiate had Inter-collegiate rugby, a rugby team. These were the ones who got the training and the great mass in most of our schools in Newfoundland, in the St. John's then, this is not true today, I am glad to say, certainly not so true as it was, the great mass of the children at all ages were ignored. They had no physical education no training, not even any recreation, unless they happened to have an yen to get on a football team, or to get on a hockey team.

MR. MURPHY: The hon. minister said, the Federal Government they gave \$200,000 to the Canadian National Hockey Team, twenty-four individuals. Right? No, you said the millions they are spending, you know, like a half a million they are going to give to Winnipeg for the World Hockey.

MR. ROWE: On of the things we hope to do, and are trying to do in the field of reading, and I said this on Friday, when I announced the appointment of all these specialists, at very substantial salaries, in otherwords at fairly substantial expense to the public of Newfoundland, specialists in reading, specialists in mathematics, specialists in music, in art, in social study, and now of course, in physical education as well. What is the primary objection? What is the real purpose, the fundamental purpose of that? It is to provide Leadership to our schools, to out teachers, to give them an opportunity to consult, enable them to makeup programs. We have for example, let me illustrate, Mr. Speaker, a few years ago, this Government introduced a system of library grants to school boards, now they were not very large, but they were library grants. And they were grants which in some cases would come to a good many hundred dollars a year,

MR. ROWE: F.W. and in school after school, and board after board, no advantage whatever was taken of that, because they did not really know how to use it. But we hope that will not be true in the future, because among other things we have set up a library division in the Department of Education, and that library division will be in touch with every school, and will be travelling around, people from there will be travelling around and meeting with teachers and with administrators and superintendents and with board leader and so on. And will be able to assist them in formulating library programs, which should be of course, and which must be if you are going to have a proper system of education, a library must be the very nucleus of the school program. And so I repeat, the giving of a small grant of money or a big grant of money, enough to buy some hockey sticks, or a few footballs or basketballs and things of that kind, that is not physical education. And it may even defeat its own purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I need to say any more at this point, before I intent some major aspect of education later on, I hope in this session. I was reminded when my hon. friend was speaking and I appreciate his sincerity and his very deep interest.

MR. MURPHY: That is one thing I object to major aspects of education, not the minor things, not worrying about the little kids that are looking for something to do.

MR. ROWE F.W. I regard physical education and recreation as one of the major aspects of education.

MR. MURPHY: That is right.

MR. ROWE, F.W.: I do regard that. My whole record, as a matter of fact, my whole record, my hon. friend is not perhaps not familiar with my record in actual administration in school, if he were he must know that my whole record was

MR. MURPHY: I read the hon. minister's book.

MR. ROWE, F.W. Well, he must know I am speaking of my actual record, he must know that it was a manifestation of acceptance of that principal of

MR. ROWE, F.W. physical education and the related disciplines must be an intergal part of the education of every child. And any person for that matter, young or old.

I perhpas, could best end up with debate on second reading, Mr. Speaker, by saying that it is a healthy sign, and so many hon. members must take even about the philosophical aspects of education as happened in this debate. I am reminded again, I go back to it, some hon. members perhaps may have heard me refer to this before, there have all the countless number of books, and articles and essays that have been written on education, there is still nothing that excels the one that was written 2400 years ago, by Plato. And he ended up, that essay with these words, which are just as real today, as they were then, and which we must I think keep in our minds at all times, and that is, " that while we may quarrel, in the name of education, we are all agreed on one thing, and that is that education is a good thing, and that it is the duty of every man, Plato said, every citizen to foster education as long as he lives."

I move second reading, Mr. Speaker.

On motion that this Bill, "An Act Futher: To Amend The Department of Education Act, 1968." Read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Memorial University Act." (Bill No. 18)

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, this is another one of the formal, and when I use the word "formal", in reference to a piece of legislation, I hope no one thinks that I am regarding this as of no consequence or negligible or unimportant, the fact is an amend to a Bill, no matter how formal, no matter how small it might be, may still be very important. This Amendment is designed to remove an anomaly that most of us did not know including the Vice-President, I think, of the University, did not know existed. At least if we did know it, nobody thought about it. We always assume that the Vice-President, who has the House knows is Dr. M.O. Morgan, we always

MR. ROWE, F.W. assumed that the Vice-President was automatically a member of the Board of Regents. And he of course always attended meetings anyway. Last year

last year it was discovered that he was not officially a member of the board, and it was represented to the Government that this oversight should be corrected so we appointed him, as we had the authority to do; the executive Government, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council appointed Professor Morgan, Dean Morgan to the Board of Regents only to find afterwards that there was a Clause in the Memorial legislation which prohibited anyone who was a teacher or a professor or on the staff of the University from sitting on the Board of Regents. That prohibition, of course, did not apply to the president and vice-chancellor, and so we have brought in this amendment to the Memorial University Act to make it possible for the vice-president to sit on the Board of Regents, and I am sure that this measure will enjoy the support of every hon. member in this House.

I move second reading.

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

Motion, second reading of a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Education Teachers' Pension Act, 1962." (Bill no.21).

MR. FRED ROWE: Mr. Speaker, this again is another one of the more formal amendments and it has been necessitated by the fact that we have had other major legislation passed and the very passing of those other pieces of legislation necessitates complementary action in the case of the other education legislation that we have on our Statutes.

The explanatory notes on the inside of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, indicates the reason for this. The principal amendment here is to require that boards of examiners who are appointed under the main legislation that they shall have constitutions for their guidance. Other formal changes which had to be made with references to the denominational education committees which were not, of course, into being until last year.

I do not think that there is anything else in this Bill which needs to have attention drawn to it. I would, therefore, move second reading.

MR. CROSBIE : Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to teachers' pensions and I just wish to reiterate something that concerns many of the teachers in..

MR. ROWE (F.W.) Mr. Speaker, I wonder, if my hon. friend will permit a correction. I am afraid that I have introduced the wrong Bill. The one I introduced was the "Act To Amend The Education (Teacher Training) Act, 1968." (Bill no. 22). What I said, Mr. Speaker is entirely correct with regard to the Bill. I believe his Honour called Bill no. 21.

MR. SPEAKER: I called order (14) (Bill no. 21).

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Yes.

Motion second reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend the Education (Teacher Training) Act, 1968."

On Motion a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Education (Teacher Training) Act, 1968", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion, second reading of a Bill, "An Act To Provide For The Appointment Of A Parliamentary Commissioner To Investigate Administrative Decisions And Acts Of Officials Of The Government Of The Province And Its Agencies And To Define The Parliamentary Commissioner's Powers, Duties And Functions." (Bill no. 8).

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move second reading of this Bill, it is something that has been discussed in this House for sometime and members of the House will recall that a couple of years ago, a select committee of the House was appointed to bring in a recommendation on the advisability or otherwise of providing an ombudsman or parliamentary commissioner for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and on that committee we had, as the House knows, at least in this instance one member of the Opposition the hon. member for St. John's East (Extern); the member for Burin, who at that time was the Minister of Justice; and other members of the House, of course, and we did bring in our report and it is based on that report and

worked on since, of course, that we bring this Bill before the House at this time.

I think you will understand, when I say, Sir, that this is an extremely happy moment for me, because it is a piece of legislation that I have had considerable concern for for sometime and it could be, I believe, one of the most important pieces of legislation ever brought before this House. I have worked for sometime, not just with members of the Government, but also, as I indicated with people throughout the Province, and people such as Professor Rowat, Carlton University and have received reports from many parts of the world in connection with this Bill, and I think that I should point out in the first instance that it is based primarily on the New Zealand legislation and also the ombudsman or the parliamentary commissioner legislation for the Province of Alberta.

I remember, when I first started to talk publicly before any association directly in Government some years ago, it was my hope at that time, at least, to have an ombudsman appointed for Newfoundland and if we had been successful in doing so, then we would have been the first province in Canada. What has happened in fact is that we have a parliamentary commissioner in the province of New Brunswick, T. Ross Flemington who is a former Newfoundlander, incidentally and a man who is doing a very fine job. We now have a parliamentary commissioner or ombudsman in Alberta; also one in Manitoba appointed just the other day and also an ombudsman appointed for the province of Quebec.

There is one item that I would like to point out in connection with this legislation, because it is something that has been a source of fear to some extent in other countries and other provinces and that is: for example, when they bring in an ombudsman many people are under the impression that this is brought in because of an efficient civil service and this is not so. There were some objections

MR. NOLAN:

objections I have recalled to the Ombudsman Legislation in New Zealand when it was first brought in but from periodicals that I have read and so on I now find that indeed the Civil Service in New Zealand as has happened in other areas support the Ombudsman Office not that the need has an reflection on the competency or fair play of the Public Service of this Province for I do believe as has been indicated earlier by other members most sincerely and firmly that our Public Servants are as efficient and fair-minded and are as aware of their responsibilities to the people as the best to be found anywhere in Canada.

But, Mr. Speaker, Government is now getting to be bigger and bigger, affecting more and more of our every day existence, influencing our lives and ways that rightly or wrongly threaten to submerge individual identities. In this great sprawling complexity of Government the individual may become lost and confused and often times I have noticed that there is tremendous need for someone to whom he can go and pour out his troubles with the assurance that something will be done and that something I think will be done in full sympathy for the complainant.

As was mentioned at one time by W.T. Ross Flemington in New Brunswick when he commented in a recent reference to his duties, (I quote) "I have adopted for myself the dictum of the New Zealand Ombudsman. The complainant is deemed right until proved wrong."

Mr. Speaker, the Ombudsman is even more than just a sounding board for aggrieved individuals. The Ombudsman acts as a bridge between the individual citizens of a state and the people within the Government to take administrative action which affects those individuals. On one side the Ombudsman is a means by which citizens who have been subjected to administrative abuses are able to present their grievances to an influential functionary who is in power to investigate the procedure which gave rise to the grievance and who may make recommendations to the department concerned. Now on the other side the Ombudsman serves the Government by indicating areas in administration which are in need of improvement, areas where the administrative machinery is not functioning properly in its dealings with citizens. Furthermore his reports made to the department concerned, I honestly believe as has been the experiences

MR. NOLAN:

in other provinces and countries, will be based on a more objective and sophisticated analysis of the problem than would a report made by perhaps an aggrieved citizen.

The need for a device such as the Ombudsman is directly related to the increase in scope and the complexity of Government and this need is not a reflection of a particularly poor quality of administration but rather it arises from the fact that its Government increases in scope, it touches on the lives of the citizens in a greater number of ways in a more complex manner. Besides simple errors that may be made by administrative employees the machinery set up to handle the task may have unforeseeing snags as new and different cases arise to break the rule.

Complaints that an Ombudsman receives would deal with such matters as the misuse of an official position, delay in sensitivity, unjust action and many many other things. The possibility of flawless administration of course is somewhat of a dream. There are too many areas for error, maladministration often times is bound to occur but again the areas where such maladministration may occur have increased because of the increased complexity of Government.

The Ombudsman in his role is able to give the citizens a means to communicate his complaint to those in charge. The Ombudsman is able to look at individual special cases rather than working by rules which apply to general cases. There is one item presently on the market (which I believe I did purchase a number of copies of, for the select committee when it was in being) by Professor Anderson on the Ombudsman in Canada and the Ombudsman explosion. He says, "From its home in Scandinavia the office has spread to and been implemented in New Zealand and Great Britian." On this continent there are now Ombudsman in the Provinces of Alberta, New Brunswick and public protector, as they call it, in Quebec and, as was not mentioned at that time but as I indicated earlier, there is also one now, appointed just the other day in the Province of Manitoba.

He went on to point out that proposals abound throughout the world as well as all levels of American Government, local, federal and state.

One of the fears I have of course about the Ombudsman and that is it could be a case sometimes of oversell and that is that in the setting up of the

MR. NOLAN:

Ombudsman people might feel that he is going to be the great protector of all and to settle all complaints and perhaps too much might be expected of one man, as has happened in other cases as we know, and this is something that I would certainly caution the House and citizens generally to be aware of. Of course it is also provided in the Legislation that the Ombudsman obviously would be furnished with personell to assist him in the job that he has to do.

In the case, for example, of the Ombudsman in New Brunswick, in the report that he published recently, I noticed although there is no federal Ombudsman I am convinced that there will be one one of those days. That the Provincial Ombudsman has in fact, although with no jurisdiction or authority to do so, has contacted various federal officials from time to time because one of the great complaints with citizens that I have always found is the lack of information. Although you have people like McClune talking about the global village often times I discover the people cannot communicate within two stories of each other, often times, because they get bogged down with red tape or some such thing somewhere.

Many legislatures throughout the world are considering the appointment of an Ombudsman, as I said. Some like Sweden, Quebec and Alberta already have done so. Governments and Bureaucracies have grown bigger year after year and the result is that there is a growing suspicion often well founded that large impersonal Government tramples on individual rights and freedom and Canada is no exception. From time to time individual citizens, members of Parliament and various associations have called for just such a public watchdog, an officer to receive and investigate complaints from citizens against unfair administrative action. Invariably basic individual rights have been withheld because an otherwise excellent official has knowingly or unwittingly exercised discretion which was not his or failed to exercise discretion which was his.

The best drafted legislation often leaves glaring loopholes, as we know, whereby the individual citizen is hopelessly unprotected.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that Professor Rowat, who has visited this Province a number of times and appeared, as a matter of fact I had the opportunity to participate in a Human Rights Conference a year or so ago and

MR. NOLAN:

also to meet with him privately during his visit to the Province. He stated that the argument for the Ombudsman scheme derives from the fact that all democratic countries in the twentieth century had experienced a shift from laissez faire to a positive state. The accompanying tremendous growth in the range and complexity of Government activities has brought with it the need to grant increasing powers of discretion to the executive side of Government and as has been warned, wherever there is discretion there is room for arbitrariness. It

It is quite possible nowadays, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest for a citizens rights to be accidentally crushed by the vast juggernaut of the Government's administrative machine. In this age of the welfare state thousands of administrative decisions are made each year by Governments or their agencies and they are spreading all the time, many of them by officials perhaps well down the scale and if some of these decisions are arbitrary or unjustified there is no easy way for the ordinary citizens to gain redress. In the past, to go back over the years to courts perhaps, to some could be considered the bulwark of individual rights but to me the common law has lost much of its flexibility and is no longer an effective instrument for remedying the wrongs of modern administrative action. The courts are often times too costly, cumbersome and slow and the extent of their power review is not at all clear though certainly it is severely limited. Generally they will review a decision only on a question of legality and refuse to review its content, wisdom or even reasonableness. For these reasons a number of special administrative appeal bodies have been created to which an aggrieved citizen may take his case but these bodies cover only a small portion of the total field of administrative action and the vast majority of the administrative decisions carry no formal right of appeal.

I do remember a few years ago when we were studying this and the hon. member for Burin may recall that one of the matters we discussed was that a Federal M.P. sent out questionnaires concerning complaints that they had received in the year which was as I recall 1964. He received replies from seventy M.P.'s and the results of the study gave a more concrete indication of the possible need in Canada for a scheme such as an Ombudsman to act as a bridge between the individual citizens and the administrators.

MR. NOLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the average number of complaints received by forty-four M.P.'s. who replied to this particular question was fifteen. If you were to extend this average to all the members of Parliament it would mean that a total of 4,000 complaints would be received each month or nearly 50,000 complaints each year. If you were to extend the same average to members perhaps of this House it could mean that all of us would get on the average a total of 630 complaints each month or over 7,500 a year.

I think that the need for an Ombudsman is clear but at the same time it should be made just as clear, as I mentioned earlier, that the Ombudsman or Parliamentary commissioner is not the end-all, know-all, the great liberator in the final say.

creation of the Ombudsman while it is a very important addition to the armoury of democratic government is not the entire solution by any manner of means. After a year in office for example, T. Ross Flemmington, the New Brunswick Ombudsman felt compelled to point out that as he put it, too many who write to me feel that I have the power to overrule present laws. I am merely the ombudsman, who has been given the confidential powers to investigate and make recommendations. I like the statement of the New Zealand ombudsman, the ombudsman himself can never state that what has been done has been done in requirement with the law, he has to go further and satisfy himself that the law is fair and just.

The ombudsman in New Brunswick in his discretion for example, may refuse to investigate a grievance for the same reasons as apply in Alberta and as we have outlined in our legislation that there is an adequate remedy or right of appeal available already, that is where we already have appeal boards of one form or another established Mr. Speaker, that it is trivial or frivolous, having regard to all the circumstances of the case further investigation is unnecessary and that it relates to any decision recommendations, act or omission which a petitioner had knowledge of for more than one year before petitioning.

That the petitioner has not sufficient personal interest in the subject matter of the grievance or that upon a balance of convenience between the public interest or the person aggrieved the ombudsman is of the opinion that the grievance should not be investigated. But Mr. Speaker, so well, did this scheme operate in New Brunswick that a recent official report commented all in all the appointment of a provincial ombudsman has been well proven to be a highly progressive step on the legislative scene. And may I present the view on this matter outlined just a short time ago in a monthly publication of Wesley Church in St. John's.

The publication is called "The Journal". And in the issue of April 1, 1970 it says: (Quote) "Within the Christian concepts is the belief that people are important and any effort to make this actually happen is the

concern for Christians. We are the voice that moves our elected representatives to act. The support of the establishment of the office of the ombudsman is something in which we should be involved. We can speak for all those and need someone to be their voice. We must insure that in the Government's concern for mills and plants and electric power, this proposal will do a great deal for the individual rights and that they will not be overlooked. The appointment could be one of the most important pieces of legislation undertaken by the House of Assembly this session. Let your representative know what you think."

That is the quote as I indicated Mr. Speaker from the Journal, a publication of Wesley United Church in St. John's. I think that it sums up very well, I think that the hope and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador will see in the Bill that I have the honour to bring before the House. I would also suggest that one of the things we must do because the ombudsman is really a foreign office, in Sweden, Denmark and many other originally of course started in the Scandanavian countries as I am sure all hon. members will know. There is one provision in the legislation that I think that I should mention that is somewhat different from other Acts I believe in all of Canada. That is and I have actual ads which I have discussed with the hon. member for Burin from time to time. In fact I believe he might have a copy. That the ombudsman ad when looking for a qualified person to serve as a parliamentary commissioner in other provinces indicated that it should be a Canadian citizen. Our legislation also of course provides that it be a Canadian citizen but you will notice within the legislation that it also provides that one must be a resident in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador for ten years and I think this is something that you will not find in other similar legislation in any other province of Canada. I am not quite sure of that. I am sure you will not find it in the Alberta legislation, for example, for I did, I do have a copy of it here with me as a matter of fact, if any member would like to have it, from I think the Montraal Gazette, because they advertise nationally when looking for an ombudsman. It is my hope, of course, as I have

indicated often times earlier that if it were possible I would like to have a Newfoundlander in with the provision in the legislation that one must be resident in the Province for ten years I think that that will look after that power for us.

The other matter is that I would like to mention is that and although it is not provided within the legislation and I would be, I would certainly welcome the comments and recommendations of hon. members on this. In New Brunswick and I would think in the other provinces they do have with the ombudsman someone with some legal ability or a lawyer indeed on his staff if the ombudsman in fact himself is not a lawyer and of course he is not in many provinces, and in other countries for that matter. This is something I am sure that along with many other clauses that members might want to comment on. But the one thing that I do feel is necessary, if and when we get this legislation through this House Mr. Speaker, is that we let the people know what the office is supposed to do, and designated to do. So that people will not be in awe or feel that the ombudsman or parliamentary commissioners we will call them is something that is foreign and not to be used by them.

Another requirement in legislation in many provinces and I believe in New Zealand is, that when a complainant brings or writes or sends the complaint to an ombudsman he is required to pay a fee, may be a dollar, two dollars, two-fifty or something like that. We discussed this as I recall in committee and also in meeting since then and we have decided that no such fee should be required in this Province. One thing that is required in every province and that is that it be in writing. Now the immediate objection I could see to this of course is that if someone who feels that he has been grieved and he wants to put in a complaint and it so happens he cannot write, that is the one thing that occurred to me why should he for example be debarred because of that and this is something I am sure hon. members would consider what I think should be, the case is we have got to have, or the ombudsman for his own record, will have to have something on record and in this way what could happen for example is the ombudsman could have the person concerned

make his complaint and have a secretary if you like take down the complaint and the person concerned would sign it or make his mark or whatever is necessary. But I think it is important for the record if you like that we do have something on paper but I would certainly strongly object to have to force a person anywhere if they were not in a position so that they could not write, that they should be barred from the parliamentary commissioners office. I am sure that most members will agree with this which is in existence incidentally in many other provinces.

I also have Bills on hand from the legislative House of Assembly in Alberta and also for New Brunswick and if I can be of any help to other members providing such information which incidentally much of it was provided to the committee members formally and I am sorry to see that the hon. member for St. John's East Extern is not here tonight and also the minister for Provincial Affairs who was also on that committee is not present because they were deeply involved in this and together with the hon. member for Burin we spent some hours and days indeed from time to time going over the legislation that is presently before this House and I would certainly hope that in the discussion that one no doubt ensues the result of the legislation before you that we will be successful in coming up with the type of a Bill to empower us to bring in the ombudsman who will be appointed recommended by the Lieutenant Governor in Council as it says and appointed by the House of Assembly.

Also important to remember that the ombudsman while he is a servant of the House can also only be rejected if you like, by the House of Assembly, and the members. It is a matter of record of course that within the legislation this is something we will no doubt want to study when we go into committee on this is the fact that the ombudsman can decide just exactly what is frivolous because we have got to provide some protection for the man or woman if you like whoever is appointed. Because otherwise he could be bombarded with people from all sides and perhaps taking up time when you have got to give them some power of decision and I think also he has got to have the respect of the community, because unless he has that he will never get off the ground as we will know.

MR. NOLAN: This is a Bill that I have given some considerable thought to and some work I believe, and I do hope that the members of this House Mr. Speaker, will take a good hard look at all of the clauses. There are those who may feel that it does not go far enough, but you will find that it a Bill comparable to that presently in use in New Zealand and secondly in other provinces of Canada, and it is based on this that we worked on the legislation that is now before this House.

MR. CROSBIE: I would like to congratulate the hon. minister for detailed outline of his Bill, which is to provide for Newfoundland what the hon. minister calls an ombudsman, or is called in a Bill, a Parliamentary Commissioner. Now Mr. Speaker, this kind of appointment has been made in several provinces and some other states, but I am afraid as I read this piece of legislation, I do not anticipate that it is going to create any great conditions for the upholding of civil rights or maintenance of anyone's rights in this Province. As I see it, the Parliamentary Commissioner that will be appointed under this Act, is going to be cribbed, cabined and confined by the terms of this legislation or Bill. As I see it we will be far better off, we will be helping people in Newfoundland who need help far more effectively, if the money that would be spent under this Bill, was spent in some other service. First of all Mr. Speaker, the salary of this Parliamentary Commissioner is going to \$20,000 a year. He is going to have to have a staff. He is going to have to have an office. The whole operation is going to cost \$30,000 or \$40,000 a year. Yet, Mr. Speaker, this House is voting each year towards a legal aid scheme, I believe, the sum of \$10,000. And I think in this Province Mr. Speaker, we need to concentrate our efforts in these matters. What is the good of having a legal aid scheme under finance to the tune of \$10,000 a year? If we are going to have a legal aid scheme, free legal aid for those who need it, then we have to devote the resources to making that a satisfactory and adequate one. What is the point in having a legal aid scheme for example for \$10,000 a year that helps a few people in St. John's and perhaps in Corner Brook, but is not really satisfactory? And then making a great fuss

in appointing a Parliamentary commissioner who is going to cost us three or four times that amount. I know they are two different things, but they are all a part of the same kind of reform to help people who need help, who cannot otherwise afford it, or cannot have it brought it to the forefront. But it a weakness, or this kind of approach.

Now Mr. Speaker, it is going to be - this legislation is presumably going to pass the House, and I am not saying that I am going to vote against it, because at least it is some kind of a step forward - in some cases it might produce some good, but it is all going to depend on who is going to be the ombudsman. The person appointed a parliamentary commissioner must absolutely fair. not afraid of a fuss with the Government, the type who just will not give a damn. He is going to press on irregardless. He has got to be that type of person. It is not good in bringing in some person who is ready for retirement from public life, or ready for retirement from anything. He has got to be the crusty unreasonable type who gets his teeth into something and will never let it go - that will go right for the Government's jugular as soon as he finds a case of injustice, and he will find lots of them. He will find lots of them in this Province. Then he has got to be the type that goes right for the throat and not care if he is going to be bumped out by the House of Assembly. Or dismissed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council a few months later. That is the type that you have to have if this Bill is going to be any good at all Mr. Speaker.

And Mr. Speaker, I would like to have someone's assurance, I think it is covered, that agencies such as the Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Commission come under the jurisdiction of this parliamentary commissioner. Because that is one of the areas where the people of this country who are up against government agencies are absolutely powerless. The point has been mentioned in this House before, but bears constant repetition. In situations like the Newfoundland and Labrador Commission which under

the Alcoholic Liquor's Act has the right to grant a licence or can refuse a licence, or can suspend your licence once it is granted, or revoke your licence, without one word, without one reason, without any right of appeal. That is where this ombudsman is needed. And if he is going to do any good for the people of Newfoundland, that is one area he will jump right into immediately. The control of liquor licences, beer distributorship, beer agents licences and so on by the Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Commission.

Now Section 2 (a) It says agency means any agency of Her Majesty or of Her Majesty's Government, and includes the Workmen's Compensation Board. It specifically refers to the Workmen's Compensation Board, which makes me nervous Mr. Speaker, that this may not apply to the Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Commission. And I would like the minister, or the legal officers of the Crown to give us an assurance that this legislation will apply to the Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Commission, which has one of the greatest potentialities for injustice of any government agency in the province. And certainly the area where you hear the most stories about, and many of them verifiable.

Now Mr. Speaker, the jurisdiction of this parliamentary commissioner is contained in Section (14), and I do not much like it. I do not know if this is the same clause, because I have not had time to check other acts. But the principle duty and function of a commissioner shall be to investigate any decision or recommendation made, including any recommendation made to a minister, or any act done or omitted related to a matter of administration, and affecting any person or body of persons in his or its personal capacity, in or by any department or agencies, or by any officer, employee or member thereof in the exercise of any power function conferred on him by any enactment. It is awfully wishy-washy. It seems to be awfully weak. It is to investigate what is being done by Civil Servants in the recommendations made to ministers, or acts done or omitted by them. It does not seem to be broad enough Mr. Speaker. It should be. It should include to investigate the actions of the Government. The action of the Cabinet.

The Government. The people who control the Government. Not just the actions of servants and employees of departments, and what recommendations they make the ministers. Bureaucratic ineptitude is one thing, but the greatest injustices are done from the top Mr. Speaker. And I do not see in this Section (14) that the parliamentary commissioner is in power to investigate them. Not only that, but there are clauses here that just take away his power entirely to find out the truth. Section (23) Mr. Speaker, subject to Sub-section (4). A person who is bound by any Act to maintain secrecy in relation to or not disclose any matter is not required to supply any information to or answer any question put by the commissioner in relation to that matter or produce any document. If compliance with that requirement would be in breach of the obligation of secrecy or non-disclosure. What is all that about Mr. Speaker? Section (23) Everywhere this parliamentary commissioner turns he is going to be told there is a Civil Service oath of secrecy. We cannot disclose this, that or the other thing. Civil Service oath of secrecy, or some act required. I mean he feels impeded immediately by the terms of this Act, as soon as he starts.

MR. CROSBIE: You can depend on it Mr. Speaker, when he gets close to any thing that is political embarrassing to anyone, whambo! the old oath of secrecy will go wild. He will not get any where near it.

Section 21, where the Minister of Justice certifies that the giving of any information or the answering of any questions, or the production of any document or paper or thing might involve the disclosure of the deliberations, of the Executive Council, for proceedings of the Executive Council or committee thereof relating to matters of a secret or confidential nature, and would be injurious to the public interest, the commissioners shall not require the information nor answer to be given or receive the document.

He is not going to get very close to the Executive Council Mr. Speaker. The Executive Council is the Cabinet. The members of the Cabinet meet in Executive Council.

HON. J.A.NOLAN (Minister of Supply): But in no Province do you have Executive Council minutes turned over to the "Ombudsman" or anyone else.

MR. CROSBIE: I agree with the hon. minister that this may be the situation in the other Provinces too, but if so, it is a weakness there also. Because, so much is made of this great "Ombudsman" people get the impression, oh we have an "Ombudsman" now if there is any injustice to do with Government we have this "Ombudsman" who can look into it and report on it, and bring the facts out to the public, whereas in natural fact Mr. Speaker, we have no such thing.

We have an official with very limited powers who can go around looking into the acts of civil servants, and that is about all he can do. I do not think that this "Ombudsman" system is effective. It may help in certain numbers of limited cases.

Now Mr. Speaker, the person is not to be appointed commissioner unless he has resided in this Province for ten years. Why this restriction? Why is there this restriction? What great virtue does it give a person, what great qualification does it give him to be a parliamentary commissioner, that he must reside in this Province for ten years. That just does not seem reasonable to me. I do not know why that is there. I cannot understand it, unless there is somebody in mind who has lived here for ten years, and someone wants to eliminate

everybody else who might be eligible who has not lived here for the last ten years. It is an inexplicable - Mr. Speaker, I do not want to interrupt anyone.

MR. SPEAKER (Noel): Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: Another section I do not like Mr. Speaker, is section 7, where the Lieutenant Governor in Council is given powers to suspend the commissioner from his office for disability, neglect of duty, misconduct or bankruptcy, proved to their satisfaction. There has to be some better way to do it if this official is to be independent.

MR. NOLAN: But the suspension cannot go you will notice

MR. CROSBIE: Right

MR. NOLAN: Beyond the end of the next conciliatory session of the Legislature

MR. CROSBIE: It has to come before the House the next session, but still, you see, here is an official who is supposed to be fearlessly investigating the acts of the executive branch of Government and the Lieutenant Governor in Council can suspend him at any time until the House opens again for disability, neglect of duty, misconduct or bankruptcy. Misconduct; what kind of misconduct? being rude, ruling officials, bothering the Government by trying to force them to bring out the answers? That kind of clause is unsatisfactory. There must be some better way, there should be some other official. You know, if a judge is satisfied that such and such, not the Lieutenant Governor in Council. He is being appointed to investigate acts for which they are responsible, and how can he feel independent when they can suspend him? I do not care if the House of Assembly six months later says "You should have not suspended him," the Government has a majority in the House of Assembly anyway. Do you think that the Government is going to allow a majority of the members of the House to repudiate the Government and insist that the man be reinstated?

In this day and age we have to face the facts Mr. Speaker. Houses of Assembly are controlled by the Governments. Governments have a majority of the members of the House of Assembly

AN HON. MEMBER: Not only in this day, that is why they are the Government

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, well particularly in the last seventy or eighty years. It is not true down in the U.S., they are all independent, they all have the party

system that we have and the House is not dissolved if there is a defeat in the House and so on. But, you have to face the facts. Now Mr. Speaker, there is no way in the world that a Government that if the poor old "Ombudsman" is suspended by the Government the House is going to repudiate it. There is just no way, so he is at the mercy of the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

They tell him he has a disability, you know, he is mentally incompetent. "You have a disability" they will tell him. The commissioner gets suspended and he comes before the House and the whole House, or not the whole House, but all but the Opposition confirms that he is a bit weak in the head. Who wants to expose themselves to that. That is another weakness of the legislation as I see it.

MR. NOLAN: That is world-wide that one.

MR. CROSBIE: Most of what I am saying is applicable I would say to wherever this is in operation, it just does not apply here.

He is to be paid \$20,000. and he is going to get under section 9, Mr. Speaker, such travelling allowances and expenses as maybe prescribed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. But we have already seen in this Province Mr. Speaker, a somewhat similar official, the Auditor General who is not quite au fait with the Government. He submits reports in this House and the Government thinks they are, does not agree with them. He claims that he does not have enough staff and the Treasury Board will not appoint the staff that he needs. Or here is another, the "Ombuddy" is going to be coming into this House if he has any guts and he is going to report that he has not been given enough travelling allowances. They have given him \$25.50 for the year. He made one trip down to Bay Bulls, and that used up his travelling expenses. Because they are going to be prescribed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Now, if you get on, if you are a good fellow, if you are a good Parliamentary Commissioner, and not too troublesome to the Government wowie! you have enough money to travel around the world every year. But, if you are a crusty "Ombudsman" doing your duty, your travelling expenses are cut down next to nothing and this can happen. None of this is satisfactory. Can you see an "Ombudsman" year after, who is giving the Government trouble, uncovering this case, the man refused

a liquor license because he was not a Government supporter, or because in a leadership convention he did such and such, uncovering a few cases like that every year.

MR. HICKMAN: He went to Gander

MR. CROSBIE: And delving into other recesses of the Government's operations. Headlines, and reports on it. And the Government taking it all, giving him the travelling expenses he wants, not taking any measures against him. It will never happen Mr. Speaker.

There is no use to expect much from this Legislation. The number of people he can employ under section 11, and different functions going to be determined by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. See, the Bill is a contradiction. It is definitely Mr. Speaker a contradiction and to be just about it I think it is in the other Provinces if this follows their legislation. Because, it is not human nature, it is not human nature for any of us if we are taking a drubbing or licking from someone not to do something about it if we can. And if this man does his job, what ever Government is in power is going to quickly unjob him. And if he does not do his job, there is no point in having him in the first place.

Just take an incident that accured to someone not far from me now. I wonder would the "Ombudsman" have the right to investigate a complaint from an hon. member of the House who was once a member of a Government Agency, the Power Commission in this case, and removed from it, from his function as a member of that commission when he took certain action in the House. Would that be a matter for the "Ombudsman" to investigate? And if he did investigate it, reported that the member was unjustly dismissed, would the

MR. MURPHY: Would he be rehired?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes would the Government rehire him I wonder? And how would he determine the issue? If someone is appointed to something and not expected to do any work in any event in connection with it, but is dismissed, what would the position be under this Act? I do not know, I do not think he could do anything about it under this Act, I do not think it would come within the scope of this Act, because, that would be an action taken by the Lieutenant Governor

in Council and not by the minister or somebody down in the department.

It would not have ^{helped} the hon. member from Labrador West at all.

MR. BRUGESS: Who needs help?

MR. CROSBIE: We can all do with help. Anybody wants to help me they are welcome to come over.

Now Mr. Speaker,

MR. ROWE(F.W.): You mean go over and be leader?

MR. CROSBIE: Pardon

MR. ROWE: Go over and be leader

MR. CROSBIE: Well I am already chief. Mr. Speaker, another section here, section 17, the commissioner can refuse, he is given a discretion to investigate a matter if it relates to something of which the complainant has had knowledge for more than twelve months before the complaint is received by the commissioner. Well I say "why?" Why should he, I mean somebody may have had this knowledge or had this complaint for several years but were afraid to bring it forward. Well why, if he finally gets the courage to be "Ombudsman" be given any discretion not to look into the matter? It does not make any sense to me, why should he be given that discretion?

An even greater weakness Mr. Speaker, is in section 34, this is choice section 34. The Commissioner shall not make an investigation into any act or omission that occurred before the day of the coming into force of this Act. In other words, he cannot investigate nothing Mr. Speaker, that relates to any events that have occurred before this Act is signed some time in May or June.

Now how could you keep politics I wonder out of a House of Assembly? Is there a House of Assembly or Legislature or Parliament on earth where there is no politics involved in it? Every piece of legislation brought in here is politics. The Government.....

would not be bringing it in, if they did not think it was good politics. The commissioner cannot investigate anything that happened before this Act was passed. Why not? Those in the Government feel that there may have been injustices that have occurred before this Act was passed. I do not understand why that should be.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I know what happened in 1883. Why should ^{not} we go back to that. Why not? In 1883.

MR. CROSBIE: Now the hon. the Premier..

MR. SMALLWOOD: There were all kinds of things..

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. the Premier makes

MR. SMALLWOOD: How far back do you go?

MR. CROSBIE: I do not want to interrupt the hon. the Premier, but I will suggest to him how far back he should go. He could at least go back five years or ten years...

MR. SMALLWOOD: Go back to Western Bay, for instance.

MR. CROSBIE: That is an excellent suggestion.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Western Bay.

MR. HICKMAN: I am lost, Mr. Speaker, but I am sure that the hon. gentlemen know what they are talking about.

MR. CROSBIE: The Premier is on his way around the Bay.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I know what I am talking about.

MR. CROSBIE: The Premier is on his way around the Bay.

Mr. Speaker, why not go back, at least, five or ten years?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Or eleven or twelve or seven or eight?

MR. CROSBIE: That is very sensible.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. CROSBIE: That is as sensible as going back to 1833.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Think it over.

MR. CROSBIE: There is no reason why, Mr. Speaker, that the commissioner should not be allowed to investigate at least something within recent memory.

Now he is giving a discretion, if it goes back beyond twelve months, not to bother. So let us take twelve months. Twelve months is mentioned in the Bill. Why cannot the commissioner be empowered to look into things that have happened in the last twelve months. We do not need to go to ridiculous extremes suggested by the hon. the Premier in 1833. The witnesses might be dead, I suppose. Something that happened in 1833, but they will be around if it happened in the last year or five years or ten. But to say that he cannot investigate anything that occurred before the Act was passed, well he is going to be sitting in his office quite a long time, is he not, this ombudsman? The first day he is not going to have much to investigate, very little I would say. How many injustices would occur the first day, the second day, the second week?

MR. NOLAN: Most of the complaints received by an ombudsman are not injustices at all.

MR. CROSBIE: Well whatever they are.

MR. NOLAN: If he feels that there are, he is the one who assists them in finding out whether they are or they are not.

MR. CROSBIE: Well I can think of some injustices that he will come to a pretty quick conclusion on. I do not see why, if he is going to be appointed, why he should not get into things that happened in the last twelve months, in any event, to give him something really to start doing, in his first couple of months in office?

Now what does he do when he has investigated, if he gets at the facts, what can he do? All these investigations are conducted in private by the way, Section (19). Well after he has made his investigation under Section (23), I think, and he is of the opinion that the matter should be referred to an authority to consider or an omission should be rectified or a decision cancelled or varied or a practice altered or a law reconsidered or reasons should have been given for the decision or any other steps should be taken; he reports his opinion and his reasons, therefore, to the appropriate minister and to the department or agency, and then makes such

recommendations as he things fit. He may request that they notify him what they do about his recommendation, so he can do that. He can report to the minister in the department. Then if after a reasonable time, no report is made to him, he can in his discretion send a copy of the report to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and may thereafter make such report to the Legislature on the matter that he thinks fit. These are his only powers Mr. Speaker. These are his only powers to make recommendations; first to the department or agency of the minister; then if he hears nothing back from them or is not satisfied ^{with} the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and then if he stills hears nothing, he may, if he thinks fit, make such report to the Legislature on the matter, as he thinks fit. So clearly, Mr. Speaker, his only power really is that he can bring certain matters to the attention of the House of Assembly, which really means to the attention of the public, to the attention of the newspapers, to the media. That is his only power. He can inform the complainant of his recommendation and makes such comments on the matter, as he thinks fit.

So this is his only power, Mr. Speaker. Now if he is not a strong individual, if he is a type that really does not want controversy and trouble, well how many of these reports is he likely to make? It is all important who the Government appoint or who the House of Assembly appoint to this position, and even then, really, his only power is his power of publicity. So, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that legislation like this should not arouse high expectations, because it is an official, with weak powers that we are appointing, and is going to have a lot of problems, if he is a type that really digs into things, and who is cribbed and confined by the Act, by requirements of secrecy about the Executive Council and otherwise. And his powers are not just all that wide. He does not have sufficient independence. No I would not vote against it, because it is just possible that a good man will be appointed and he may get on to the affairs that need to be rectified and accomplish something and the Government is bringing it before the House and presumably they are going to do this, so I do not see any point in voting against it. But I just think that the weaknesses of it

should be pointed out and the fact should be pointed out that there are other avenues of social reform where a lot more, I think, can be accomplished, with the right effort made, and I just mentioned legal aid is one of those areas, where it is a pity more is not done.

It is not clear in the Act - I have some notes here that were prepared for me also. It is not clear in the Act whether the ombudsman will have the authority to see any file or files that concern a particular complaint. Apparently the ombudsman in New Brunswick and Quebec do have such authority, but there is nothing mentioned in our Act.

I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that one of the departments in the Alberta government is challenging the jurisdiction of their ombudsman and he is now considering whether he will have to resort to the courts or a decision as to whether he has jurisdiction in this particular case. I do not know if the minister knows what that dispute is about. He can go into premises, apparently, Section (27). Section (27) says that he can enter upon any premises occupied by any department and inspect the premises and carry out any investigation that is within his jurisdiction. It does not mention, but I know premises includes the files.

There is another question that this gentleman suggests. He wants to know whether the ombudsman will be able to make suggestions on the organizational procedures of the Government departments? I presume that he can, when he makes his report and if he finds that something is unsatisfactory, he can suggest how procedures should be changed, and approved. There is another note there I will not quote, although it is quite good. He quotes the Quebec ombudsman. His name is Louis Marceau, I think, and he says: "the idea is to ensure certain sanity in the relationship between the administration and the people." This gentleman adds "impossible with the present Newfoundland Government."

MR. NEARY: What gentleman is that?

MR. CROSBIE: I am not going to give the author's name. I have to take responsibility for what he is saying.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that the minister - somebody asked me to keep

going for two minutes. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the minister is to be congratulated for his interest in this subject in bringing this forward, as a result of his labours. And, as I say, I am not familiar with how this legislation is in other provinces, but in the context of our own Province, I do not think we can expect very much from our parliamentary commissioner, as he has not got the powers to do very much, and it is too easy for him to come under pressure from the very executive whose actions he is looking into. It may not be the executive's direct action, but actions for which they are responsible, and it is not human nature for a person who dwells too much on these kinds of things and embarrasses the Government politically, to survive.

So I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot really vote for this Bill with any great enthusiasm. It may be impossible to correct these matters, because of constitutional position and all the rest of it. I do not know how the legislation reads in New Zealand, but it is sad to say that I do not think that this is any great step forward in the field of civil liberties in Newfoundland.

MR. NOEL: Mr. Speaker, I think that the difficulty that my learned and hon. friend has in being enthusiastic about this legislation is that he appears to have a misconception of the function of the ombudsman. The hon. member would like to have an ombudsman who would spend his time digging out scandal and fighting with the Government. The duty of the ombudsman is to help the citizens and just as members of the legal fraternity help countless citizens without very much publicity, the duty of the ombudsman is to do exactly the same thing. People do not want their problems spread to the four winds. The ombudsman's duty, as I see it, would be to act quietly with mature judgment to assist citizens

MR. NOEL: this citizen to have their right under the Law. The duty is not to supervise Government, or to substitute the discretion of the ombudsman for the discretion which this House of Assembly has placed in others. As I say, the duty of the ombudsman is to assist the citizen, now my hon. friend said, that the ombudsman did not seem to have much power. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this Act gives the ombudsman ample power, great power, sufficient power, to do the job which the ombudsman has to do. It is not the ombudsman's job to enforce the Law, it is not the ombudsman's job to inflict punishment, it is the ombudsman's job to get information, and the Act gives ample power for that purpose. The ombudsman must act within the Law. Every citizen must act within the Law. This House makes the Law. If this House gives discretion to persons, then obviously the ombudsman cannot over rule the discretion which has been given by this House to some other officer. The ombudsman can simply point out where he feels that in his opinion, a discretion was improperly used, that is all. It is for the House then to take whatever action it needs. The greatest weapon that the ombudsman has is his ability to report to the House, and also there is a section in the Act there which enables him to make an investigation public, not the investigation itself public, but the results or the case that he is investigating public.

So, that I feel, that in the context of our parliamentary system the parliamentary commissioner will have a very useful function performed. You will not read much about him in the papers, you will not see many headlines. But, if he does his job properly, and we hope he will, that there will in the course of a year, probably be several hundred citizens of the Province who will thank this House for having erected the office. As one of those who had a small part to play on the committee appointed to investigate the feasibility or otherwise an ombudsman, I am happy to see that the Government has acted upon the report of the committee and have instituted this legislation.

MR. NOEL: As I said before, I believe that opposition to the proposed legislation is due to a misconception of the duties of the ombudsman, and that there is really very little fault define in this Act, and that undoubtedly, as the ombudsman reports to this House from time to time, having seen the Act in practice the ombudsman will make recommendation in his report as to any amendments in the legislation that he feels might be properly considered by the House.

I am certainly going to vote for the legislation, and with much more enthusiasm, than my hon. friend from St. John's West.

MR. SMALLWOOD: An ombudsman, it is so easily to fall into the trap, as my hon. friend who just spoke has told us of misunderstanding and misunderstanding pretty completely what an ombudsman is, or is supposed to be. Let us see some of the things an ombudsman is not: an ombudsman is not the Opposition, he is not to take the place of the Opposition. He is not to be in Opposition. That is one thing he is not to be. An ombudsman is not to be a Cabinet Minister. He is not to be a member of the Government. He is not to have the functions of a Cabinet Minister. He is not to have the authority or the purpose of a Cabinet Minister. He is not to be a police force. He is not to be a policeman. He is not to be a detective. He is not to be a judge on the bench. He is not to be a legislator. So he does not make laws, he does not write them. He does not suggest them. He does not suggest remedies or amendments to the laws. So these are the things an ombudsman is not.

Now what is an ombudsman? My hon. friend, the Minister of Supply and Services who introduced this Bill, and introduced it of course because he introduced the whole idea to this House last year. And persuaded this House to appoint a Select Committee to look at the whole subject of an ombudsman. That same hon. gentleman has introduced his Bill and in doing so, he has told us what the purposes of the Ombudsman are, and ought to be. There is not any doubt at all that Government, even in so small a Province, as Newfoundland and Labrador, Government has become fairly big, this year we are going to spend the best part of \$400

MR. SMALLWOOD: million. And we now have a Civil Service of 10,000, 10,000, this is a tremendous, an absolutely tremendous number of men and women. A Cabinet sits in a room around a table and they decide on this or that, or the other policy. But who carries out the policy, the 10,000 civil servants. And these 10,000 civil servants will be found here in this building and in buildings all around the Island. And they are doing their work day in and day out, in tens of thousands of individual transactions. Tens of thousands of transactions every month. I suppose they run into millions of transactions every year. And you would have to have archangels, you would have to have perfect men, as civil servants, if you are not to have any injustice, any wrongdoings, if you are not to have any citizen getting a raw deal. It may be only being treated discourteously, it may only be a civil servant who just refused to look up from his desk, when some citizen comes in, his real master, the citizen comes into the office, the injustice may consist of so simply a thing as being ignored, treated discourteously. Or it may be a much worse, it may be some poor woman looking for welfare, and not getting what she thinks she is entitled to get under the Law. It may be just that. It may be anyone of a hundred or thousand things cropping up in the course of a year, at the hands of 10,000 men and women (civil servants) not 10,000 everyone of whom is trying to act unjustly. It may not be deliberate it may not even be conscious, he may be unconscious, unintentional, and it may be serious or it may be unimportant. But the citizen who suffers is the victim. What can that citizen do now?

Mr. Speaker, the citizen can go to his elected member, and ten of thousands of them do, they go to the member of this House, who has been elected, that is the first one you think of instinctively, you think of going to your elected member. You might even prefer to go, not to your own member, but to some member of the Opposition. If you feel that your own member will not get after the thing, and protect you, and get your rights, ^{you} for/because it was done in the Government, and they do not

MR. SMALLWOOD: draw the distinction between the Cabinet Ministers and the civil servants, it was done by the Government. It was the Government that did this, whereas in actual fact, it was done by some civil servants and on one will grind his teeth in anger more than the Cabinet Minister, when he learns about it, that if he ever learns about it. And in most cases he probably does not even heard it to the day of his death, these things happen. And the citizens who are the victims of these injustices great or small do not bother to go to the Minister, although they have not analyzed it, they sort of think, may be it was the minister who did it, or they do not draw enough distinction between the minister and the civil servants. So, they may therefore go to a member of the opposition. And that is one of the good things about an Opposition, every knows that an Opposition would like to get something on the Government. Everybody knows that, about every opposition in every parliamentary body in the world. I do not suppose there is an opposition anywhere in the world that does not welcome the chance to bold the Government over, to catch them doing something wrong or committing some injustice or allowing some injustice to be committed. So people know this instinctively and they will go to the opposition members, and the House might be surprized to know how many comes to me. Personally comes to me. I have had litterally thousands of Newfoundland people, quite literally, thousands, I do not know how many thousands, three, or four or five in the last twenty-one years, who have come to me, thousands to tell me of some wrongdoing, they did not get the right about of relief or they did not get relief or they could not get a house, or they were put out of a house, or they did not get justice in some court or some magistrate find them to heavily, or find them wrongly, every kind of agrivance and every kind of an injustice, real or fancied, that can occur. People have come to me to describe, and ask me to do something about it. And I may say, that it is one of my many weaknesses, and may be it is an amiably weakness, and I am not really ashamed of it, though I know it is a weakness, that I lose my temper and I lose my head, and I go berserk at the sight or report or news of what I think is injustice. I cannot stand it, it kills me, and it tears me up, and I will tear up anybody that I thought committed the injustice. Okay

MR. SMALLWOOD: Okay, but I am only one person; a minister is only one person, and I do not - I may have more authority than an ombudsman would have. If a woman or a man comes to my office and tells me of some raw deal that he or she got, when I know what department it is, I can take the intercom and I can call the minister, and I can say, "are you alone." Yes, "I am alone Premier." Then I can talk about it on the intercom. If he is not alone, if he has visitors in his office, then I say, "will you ring me back on the phone, so we can have a private conversation that the visitors will not hear." Then I can talk about it, and I can ask him to look into it, and he will always very gladly look into it, because he does not want any black mark against his department, so there is far, far more enquiry going on all the time, into alleged injustices than the House might imagine.

But that is not enough. It has been shown not to be enough and that is why this Bill is before the House. My hon. friend the Minister has just passed me a manuscript of a thing he wrote some years ago and he said this: in the course of that, he said: "here in Newfoundland the fact that we need an ombudsman is proved by the realization that we have actually had one for the past seventeen years; so this must have been four years ago. That we have actually had one for the past seventeen years. How many times has our own Premier Smallwood had to take up the cause of the little man. How many times has he had to cut through red tape to prevent delay or injustice on behalf of individual citizens and how many times has stupid outdated legislation being changed or wiped out, because the Premier heard the plea of the people." Then he went on: very reasonably and very sensibly to say this: "that it is not fair or reasonable for us to expect Mr. Smallwood or his eventual successor." I like that word "eventual", the word "eventual" means that sometime in the course of history, in the course of time, as time unfolds, through the efflux of time, sheer old man time, tempus fugit that eventually, is that the word, that his eventual successor sometime before this present century comes to an end; that it is not reasonable for us to expect

his eventual successor to carry out the exhausted duties of the Premier's office and also to be an ombudsman, listening to every single citizen who has a complaint or a grievance to air, but I will tell you this: that while that is logically true the fact remains that the minute you get a Premier in this Province, a small little Province like this one, one big neighbourhood, one big community, where everybody almost is related to almost everybody else, and if we are not all related to each other, we are awfully closely associated here in this Province, in a small place like this, if you ever get a Premier who is too big to talk to the humblest citizen in the land and do it with courtesy and with patience and give even the humblest citizen in the land a courteous and patient hearing and then having heard the complaint, fails to take prompt action to remedy it, the moment you get that kind of a Premier in Newfoundland, I tell you now, Sir, he is in deep trouble, and the government that he heads will be in deeper trouble, because always in a small province such as this, that must always be a large part of the job of a Premier to meet people who want to see him, and to take them in turn like a barber shop, let them take their turn and if some big rich merchant is there or some big rich manufacturer, it may very, very well be in the public interest for the Premier to see him, but not see him and keep some poor humble citizen who is not rich and is not great and is not famous and is not powerful, keep that poor citizen waiting there. That is not the way to do it and that is not the way I have ever done it.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, though I know it is not entirely in order to refer to a debate that is over and done with. You cannot revive debate, and I do not propose to do it, but I do say that this afternoon, I pay tribute to one of my colleagues for the kindness of heart by which he is so well known to everyone, and I want to pay tribute now to my colleague the hon. member for St. John's South who is the Minister of Supply and Services. This has been a passionate concern of his for years. I remember, before he came into this House as a member of the House, and certainly before he became a minister of the Crown,

and a member of the Cabinet, when he was a well-known and extremely popular broadcaster and television star in Newfoundland; he was showing his profound interest in this topic then, at that time, and doing it in a very public way.

I know that it must have been an enormous pleasure to him, a personal pleasure, when here a year or so ago, he was able to introduce to this House, the whole idea of an ombudsman and was able to persuade by his eloquence and his logic to persuade this House to set up a committee a select committee to look into the matter, and I think that must be about two years ago. It was not the last session. Was it not the one before? It was two sessions ago; two before this one, and that select committee that he did persuade the House to set up was set up by your Honour and it did meet and it did take evidence and it did consider the matter, and it did complete its work, and it wound up its work by making a recommendation to this House; so here we are tonight fulfilling the purpose of the whole inquiry. That is to say, I hope passing a Bill giving second reading to a Bill and adopting it in principle, passing it in principle, saying yes - yes in principle we agree to the appointment of an ombudsman, having these powers. In principle we agree. We will vote for this, and in committee of the whole, where the matter will be considered line by line and clause by clause, and we will be able, perhaps, to make some wise amendments, and I do not think for one moment that this Bill is perfect. If it is, it is the only Bill that was ever brought before this or any other House that was perfect, that would not stand improvement, when other brains got thinking about it and reading it. People will see ways of improving it and that is what the House is for. That is why a Bill is brought in here and debated and finally given second reading and then later put into Committee of the Whole where it can be considered line by line and clause by clause so that a more intensive study may be given to the details of the Bill, and I have no doubt that when this Bill goes into

Committee of the Whole, many hon. members will have sensible and practical suggestions to make, but I want to say this, any amendment that anybody proposes that would put the ombudsman over and above the Cabinet, is a waste of breath, is not going to be done. Any amendment that is proposed that will take away from this House the power of the purse and put it into the ombudsman, is wasting his time and his breath and this House's time. We are not going to give anybody, but anybody, but anybody, and I mean, Mr. Speaker, anybody an ombudsman, a trade union, a board of trade, a business firm, anybody, we are not giving anybody the right that belongs to this House. It is this House that has the power of the purse. It is this House that put control, and we must never take that control away from this House; too much blood was shed to win the right of this House, of the elected representatives of the people, the people's House, the people's House to decide what money shall be spent. It is this House and not an ombudsman not an auditor-general, not a trade union, not a board of trade, not a company, nothing, no one, but this House should ever, ever have the right of controlling the purse. This is the most dearly one right of this House. I suppose there are two great rights we have in this House (1) free speech under the rules. Free speech does not mean the right to say anything you like. It does not mean that, but under the rules you have free speech in this House. It took a lot of blood shed to win that right and then the other great right that this House has and the House of Commons at Westminster and the House of Commons at Ottawa and all the provincial Houses across Canada and all the Houses in the British Parliamentary system; the right of controlling the purse. This is perhaps the most basic of all the rights, because you can have the right of free speech and you can talk your head off, you can talk the months away right around the calendar and if you do not have, in this House, the power of the purse to say how much money the Queen's ministers may have, before that, it used to be the Queen. How much would the Queen have or the king.

The parliament won the right to say how much money the king should have or the Queen and how much taxation the king or the Queen should place on the

people, to take that away from the Queen, from the monarch and put it in the hands of the elected representatives of the people was the greatest single reform in all British history. That right we must never likely give away and people talk to me for example about a government being willing to submit itself to compulsory arbitration in trade union relations, in labour conferences and in labour negotiations, that a government shall pass or take away from this House the right of somebody else, outside this House, to decide what money this House shall vote to the Queen's ministers. When anyone suggests that to me, I think it is the most arrogant nonsense. It is the most stupid and foolish and ignorant proposal that I can imagine in a democratically elected parliamentary body such as this House of Assembly. So do not speak to me and expect any sympathy for the idea that an ombudsman shall have the right of deciding how much money he will spend. He will not have that right and this House shall have that right and do not tell me that in the House, the Government has a majority, of course, it has the majority, and whenever you have a government that did not have a majority; such as, for instance, the Pearson administration, you know what a miserable and wretched affair that is. You are not the government, unless you have a majority of the members of the House, voting for you and the minute they withhold their support, you fall. That is the end of that Government. So there is no use telling me that

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no use in telling me that the House voting for a thing means the majority on the Government side vote for it, that that is an objection - it is a stupid and silly argument to make, that a Government supported by a majority is undemocratic. It controls the House because the majority of the House controls the House. Who should control the House? A minority? Who should control the House? Who should go for the Government jugular? This is what the hon. gentleman wants an ombudsman to be. Someone going for the Government's jugular. This is what certain hon. gentlemen are trying to do, but they are not very efficient at it.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Will the hon. gentleman permit a question? Does the hon. Premier think that the member for St. John's West, seeing that he is having no success whatsoever in getting this Government out, now wants an ombudsman to fire this Government, do the job for him?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, and I thank the hon. gentleman for reminding me of it, because the hon. gentleman to whom the hon. minister referred would use an ombudsman to get this Government out. He would use the Tory Party to get this Government out. He would even destroy the Tory Party in the effort. He would destroy his own friends in the effort. He would destroy anything. I know. I know he will not, but he will try. I only said he will try. He will fail.

MR. CROSBIE: The jug is up. The jug is up, do not worry. The jugular is up too.

MR. SMALLWOOD: After listening to that speech on Saturday night, I say the game is up. The game is up all right, for someone who is now eighteen feet, if not before that speech. That speech on Saturday night shovelled a few more feet on top, because too many people know about that speech, and there are too many tapes of it around.

MR. CROSBIE: I hope there are.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour is so right.

MR. MURPHY: I think the hon. the Premier is going to nominate the hon. gentleman for the office.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He will go for the jugular, but the only trouble is if he is the one that went for our jugular I would appoint him tomorrow, because he is no good at going for the jugular.

MR. CROSBIE: He is not worried at all - he is getting on every day - rambling away. The hon. gentleman is not worried at all.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What was this one - this beautiful word about "shag" Did I hear anyone say "shag something?"

MR. CROSBIE: What about "bite you little buggers, bite."

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is wrong with "bite you little buggers, bite?"

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Anyhow I have finished what I had to say. There were two or three things I wanted to say, and I have said them. And now let the debate go on. I know there are hon. gentlemen who are dying to speak, and I know we cannot possibly finish the debate tonight, but let the debate go on. I am going to vote for this Bill. I am going to vote for it in case anyone is in any doubt, I am going to vote for it.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the night seems to draw to a close and I adjourn the debate, so that I can have time to sharpen my knife and get ready for the juglar. I so move the adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: It now being 11 o'clock this House stands adjourned until tomorrow Tuesday, 3 o'clock.