



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 115

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, JUNE 16, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 10:30 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair:

PETITIONS:

MR ROBERTS: (Hon. Minister of Health:)

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should begin the presentation of this petition by pointing out that it was unknown to me that the gentleman who collected the petition, and I am sure with the very best of intentions, informed the news media of it.

So this morning's "Daily News" has the subject matter of this petition in it. I assume the "Evening Telegram" also will.

I can assure the House that it was unknown to me, and I am sure the gentleman who is responsible for collecting the petition, Mr. Jackman, meant no offence to the House.

I say this because I believe it may very well be shading on a breach of our privileges.

If it is in order, I would ask leave of the House to present a petition which I received yesterday, which has been signed by several hundred, I would think around one thousand, of citizens of St. John's.

The prayer of the petition is quite lengthy but I think if I just read two brief paragraphs, it will show the intent of it.

The petition is that we the citizens of St. John's and nearby suburbs who are of all classes of political and national beliefs and occupations are alarmed, shocked and fearful of the very grave danger of pollution and contamination that will occur to our water supply from Wind~~er~~ Lake reservoir should the proposed building development at nearby Oliver's Pond be permitted.

The petitioners go on, and say that they are very pleased to learn that as Minister of Health, I have been giving the matter full investigation with the far seeing view of the situation as it could be not only today but in five to ten years time, as we see it now in the places that they have mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, the petition is signed by a galaxy of citizens. It might be of interest to the House, sir, to know that three former members of this House have signed it: Mr. Richard Greene who sat for the district of Bell Island; Mr. John R. O'Dea who represented the district of St. John's South and Mr. G. Rex Renouf who on two separate occasions also represented the district of St. John's South.

In addition it was signed by the former Lieutenant-Governor of this Province, the hon. Fabian O'Dea and by the former Comptroller and Deputy Minister of Finance, Mr. Walter Marshall. There is also a J. J. Murphy. I am not sure if that is the late lamented gentleman from the Arcade. I am not sure of that at all.

In any event the petition has been signed by a great number of citizens. I know that the issue is of some concern to a great number of people

in St. John's. As I have said earlier in reply to a question from the Leader of the Opposition, no permit has been issued to the Oliver's Pond and Development until the necessary investigation has been completed, no permit will be issued by my officials.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move that this petition be received and be referred to the department to which it relates, which I suspect is the Department of Health.

MR. JOHN C. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, in connection with this petition, I support the prayer of the petition which is to the effect, I gather, that the petitioners do not want this development at Oliver's Pond to proceed.

The Minister of Health or the Department of Health have been considering this matter now for some months. I do not know what the delay is, either the health inspectors say that it passes health standards or they say that it does not pass health standards. Why the matter should be held up so long is a bit beyond me. I cannot see anything the Minister of Health can do in this matter except act on the advice of his officials; and they must have advised him by now. But the minister is seeking a lot of advice in this matter. But, Mr. Speaker, in my view whether or not this development should go ahead is not just a matter for the Department of Health. I do not believe it is just a health matter. I think that this should be looked as a further abuse of the building permit system instituted by the St John's Metropolitan Area Board. In other words; the developers seek a summer cabin permit, permits to build summer cabins, but, Mr. Speaker, the developer will not be building summer cabins, that is cabins that people are just going to live in three, four or five months a year. What will happen is what has been happening in summer cabin areas throughout the Metropolitan Area. People are building permanent homes, using septic tanks, and wells and living in them all year around but having a summer cabin permit from the St John's Metropolitan Board.

What is needed is regulations passed by that board which will prohibit a person from occupying a summer cabin, if they have gotten a permit for a summer cabin, that will prohibit them from occupying it for more than five to six months a year, some period of time like that.

It could happen to Lawrence Pond. I hope it does not. But within two years or three years the seepage from that septic tank, coming into the head of the pond, not the lower end, could very well contaminate that pond to a degree, certainly if it were multiplied three or four times over you would have what has happened to the seven ponds within the Municipality of St John's, none of them fit even to swim in.

MR MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker!

I too would like to add my few comments in supporting this petition. I brought it up in the House a few days ago, and the whole matter, of course. Anybody who has a small bungalow or small house, summer house, outside the City of St John's, for summer recreation, is no doubt aware of the great many things that could happen to drinking water, so on and so forth. It is not my intention to go into the matter of pollution, Mr. Speaker, but I would say that very, very strict controls are needed on this thing. I do not want to go into the whole matter of pollution again, but we can think of the South Shore of Conception Bay where there is a cesspool created there. This has been done, although they are not summer homes, but by being just allowed to build indiscriminately along an area, and someone else's septic tank is here and the well is just a few feet away. So I would like to concur in the remarks of all the previous speakers, that some stringent regulations should be enforced by the Metropolitan Commission, under whose control the place has come. I am very much in favour.

And, Mr. Speaker, if I may be pardoned, at this particular moment, to extend a welcome to a member of this House, recently elected - unfortunately he has to sit some sixty feet away from the scene of action, in the person of Mr. William Marshall, who I understand, and I am trying to get the matter cleared up, is not as yet entitled to take his seat. We have been looking for rulings from very many people, and up to this point we have not obtained a definite ruling as to when he can assume his seat. I discussed the matter this morning with some officials and I hope to have an official ruling this afternoon and possibly we may be favoured and the District of St John's East may be favoured to have their elected member take his place, possibly before this session ends. Also another distinguished gentleman, in the person of Mr. Frank Moores. I would like to welcome him also, Mr. Speaker.

HON. E. DAWE: A point I should add is that in regarding to the Oliver Pond Development, as you know the Metropolitan Board is under the jurisdiction of my department, and I can assure the House that nothing further will take place there until we receive the report of the Minister of Health and that I will be passing on to the members of the Metropolitan Area Board recommendations that probably we should have more strict building regulations.

I would like to inform the House as well that, for more than a month in the past, the officials of my department, that is of the Planning Division and other officials of the department, have been meeting with the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, with a view of bringing recommendations to government with regards to development of cottage homes and this type of development generally throught the Province. This has been under active consideration, as I say, between both departments and we would hope that within the near future to have recommendations to present to government with regard to this type of development throughout the Province as a whole.

MR SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates:

Those in favour " aye, " Contrary " Nay," Carried.

PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES:

HON. E.WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a report of the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority covering the fiscal year 31st. March, 1970.

NOTICE OF MOTION:

HON. L.R.CURTIS: It may be an exercise in futility, Mr. Speaker, but I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, entitled a Bill, " An Act Respecting The Consolidation And Revision Of The Statutes Of Newfoundland." Also, A Bill, " An Act Further To Amend The Members Of The House Of Assembly Contributing Pensions Plan Act, 1962." Also, A Bill, " An Act To Amend The Waters Protection Act." Also, A Bill, " An Act Respecting Collective Bargaining Between The Government Of The Province And Its Employees And Certain Other Employees."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

HON. E.M. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, on the Order Paper of June 12th., the hon. member for Gander asked a question, no. 551, about some space in the town of Gander, and I earlier referred it to my colleague the Minister of Public Works. His officials have now gotten me the information and so I will answer it. We do not rent any space in the town of Gander, Mr. Speaker, and so part two of the question does not apply. The answer to part one; how many square feet of space is occupied in the town of Gander I cannot really answer. The public Health facilities for the town of Gander are operated from the James Paton Memorial Hospital. I do not know of any areas that is segregated and marked out specifically as being for the purposes of public health. It is part of the hospital's general work as the medical centre for the area. If it is of relevance; the James Paton Memorial Hospital has I am told, 111,000 square feet in but, but as you know, that is for a lot of things. I think that answers the question Mr. Speaker, if not the hon. gentleman could of course try again.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: No, we are not renting anything, we rent nothing in Gander.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question. I am aware of the hospital which is there, I have been fortunate enough not to be detained there yet, but I seem to recall seeing a sign in the shopping centre, the Department of Health sign on a door on the south side of the shopping centre. What is this space being used for, is it a health inspection office?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I will check again, but I can only say I am told by my officials that no space in the town of Gander is rented by the Department of Health for public health services. The only rental units we have in Gander are some housing for some of the doctors on the staff of the hospital. I will check for further points, but this is what I am told.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, before we go into Orders of the Day, I would like to add a welcome to Mr. Marshall also who is up in the gallery. If these by-elections keep up Mr. Speaker, it is going to get quite crowded over on this

side of the House. We hope he will be in his seat before we adjourn.....

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. Minister of Health will be surprised about what is going to happen when the election comes.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Including White Bay North. When the minister goes down in White Bay North, it is going to be disastrous for the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Are we finished the question?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that the House adjourn to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance. I ask leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance. That matter Mr. Speaker, is this - it is the matter of the lay-offs at the dockyard in St. John's, where sixty-eight employees overall are to be laid off. This has now been changed to forty-seven temporarily, because, twenty-one men are to be held over for a month to do some repair work. There are forty-seven employees of the St. John's dockyard to be laid off this week, including men with as much as ten to fifteen years service. The purpose of asking this matter to be debated is to enable the Government to or to request the Government to make representation to the Department of Transport, the Government of Canada, to have work assigned to the shipyards so that the men can continue working.

In other words, although this is not a matter within Provincial jurisdiction, I think that the House should request the Government of Canada, particularly through the Minister of Transport, to see that some Department of Transport ships are assigned for repairs or otherwise to the St. John's dockyard. This dockyard, Mr. Speaker, is suffering because of a lack of drive and initiative on the part of the people responsible to see that we get work in the dockyard at St. John's rather than Halifax or elsewhere in Canada.

I have the matter here in writing Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of an impending lay off of forty-seven men at the St. John's dockyard, and the urgency of the Government making immediate representation to the Government of Canada, through the Minister of Transport, to obtain work for the dockyard so that the

lay off can be prevented.

I submit this is an urgent matter because the men are to be laid off this week Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may, and as your Honour has pointed out to us on a number of occasions, the only relevant question on a motion of this order, of this type, is the urgency of debate, not urgency of the matter. It is our submission Mr. Speaker, that there is no urgency of debate,

MR. ROBERTS: The problem in question arose yesterday. It was reported in the press that yesterday the committee had before it the estimates of the Department of Labour. The matter could have been thoroughly debated at that point if it was in order. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that there is no reason it is urgent, and that the business of the House should be deferred to wait the debate of this. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I would submit further that it is not a matter within the jurisdiction of this House - it is a matter affecting the Government of Canada. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the Government is always considerably ahead of the member for St. John's West. We have for some time been making representation to the hon. Mr. Jamieson, the Minister of Transport at Ottawa, to try to get still further work for the dockyard here in St. John's.

It is a serious problem. The solution to it lies in Ottawa. We have been making representation to the Minister of Transport. While we do not know what will come of it, we intend to go on, keep on making those representations. I submit that there is no urgency of debate Sir.

MR. CROSBIE: With respect to what the hon. minister is saying, Mr. Speaker, this is the palid excuse so often used by the hon. minister, that the matter is outside the jurisdiction of the Government of Newfoundland. The matter of employment in Newfoundland, jobs for Newfoundlanders is a matter within the jurisdiction of this Government no matter who else is involved.

The urgency of this matter is that the men are being laid off this week. They are not laid off yet. The matter could not have been debated yesterday because not enough was known about it yesterday to debate. Some of the men in question saw me yesterday at dinner hour, and the Department of Labour estimates were finished before we came to yesterday's afternoon sitting. I submit that this is an urgent matter. It is a matter of concern, or it should be, to the Government of Newfoundland. The minister has not explained what representation has been made to the Minister of Transport nor what kind of atmosphere they have been received in. I think the whole matter should now be debated Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no further comment on the request to adjourn the House or to grant permission to the hon. member for St. John's West to make this motion, I do not think I need repeat what I have said so many times when similar situations have arisen here.

I do not deny that the laying off of forty-six men is a serious matter, I do not deny that we should debate the matter in this House, but I do not see that the urgency of debate is so great in this matter that all other business of the House should be suspended to deal with the matter at the present time. I do not think, in other words, that the urgency exists, and I cannot accept such a suggestion at this particular time, that we suspend all other business of the House to deal with this one matter, although it is a serious matter, even if it is confined to a small area and a small number of people.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Minister of Health. Will he inform the House as to whether or not there are any negotiations going on between the Government pharmacists and his department with regards to increases in salary?

MR. ROBERTS: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is yes. I received a delegation from the pharmacists society, I think it was Friday of last week. I met with them, I have received a brief from them and that brief is being studied by my officials, prior to a discussion by me with my colleagues, and I will then be in touch with the pharmacists again. The matter is under very active consideration.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Community and Social Development. Could the minister tell the House whether he has sent to the hon. John Marchand, Minister of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion at Ottawa a copy of the "white paper" tabled in this House on June 8, which Mr. Marchand says he has never heard of, according to newspaper reports? Has a copy been sent him?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: The minister says he knew nothing of this paper, he checked with

his officials.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): I am not surprised that he said that Mr. Speaker, since I wrote the paper, and not the minister or anyone else in Ottawa. I tabled the paper here, last Monday I think, and two or three days subsequent to that I sent a copy off to officials in Ottawa. Whether they received it or not I do not know, since I received no acknowledgement.

MR. ROBERTS: The post office is.....

MR. ROWE: Because, I.....

MR. CROSBIE: Was it air mail, special delivery or

MR. ROWE: Because I heard that this morning from Mr. Marchand, that he had not received a copy of the paper, I took pains to send a copy to him personally, this morning, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: How about a copy of.....

MR. ROWE: I will do that on zerox or on telex or something.

MR. CROSBIE: The minister is determined to claim authorship of that paper, despite what some critics have said.

I have a question also, for the hon. the minister, well he is not here, so I will ask the hon. the Premier - is the statement made by Mr. Chretien yesterday, the Minister of Northern Affairs - Indian Affairs and Northern Development, the effect that the hold-up in the Bonne Bay Park is a fact that the Newfoundland Government has to decide the position with respect to mineral and oil resources in the area, and that this is holding up the agreement on the park. Is that statement correct or a correct statement?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would prefer not to comment on what the minister said without knowing first of all exactly what he said. I would prefer not to depend on some newspaper or radio report of what he said, I have had too much experience of such reports to place too much dependence in them.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, he was on - the hon. minister was on T.V. himself, a T.V. interview.

MR. SPEAKER: Is this a supplementary question?

MR. CROSBIE: Did the hon. the Premier see Mr. Chretien, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, on television, being interviewed last evening, in which he made the statement that I have just quoted?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the hon. the Premier. Could the hon. the Premier comment on a statement by Mr. Arthur Lang, in reply to a question from Mr. Walter Carter, the P.C., M.P. with reference to Come by Chance refinery and the wharf at Come by Chance. Is it correct that there is no agreement at this time between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland with respect to the building of the wharf and other facilities at Come by Chance, and that there is no definite agreement as yet?

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. CROSBIE: I did not hear the answer.

MR. COLLINS: On the Order Paper of Friday June 12, question 553, I asked the Premier for certain information in connection with the proposed oil refinery at Come by Chance. Is the Premier in a position to let us have some information now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not remember what the question was.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could read the question on the Order Paper of June 12.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will look it up.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, does the President of the Council realize, the Government Leader of the House, that there are still outstanding on the Order Paper well over 100 questions, unanswered, and that there are perhaps only two or three days to go for these questions to be answered? Does the Minister agree that the Government would want to answer all the questions so that nobody could say that the Government was attempting to hold back any information from the House or members of the general public?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: The minister agrees?

MR. CURTIS: I will take note of that.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question concerning Come by Chance. Is the Premier's confidence still unshaken in terms that this project will be

getting off the ground?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Come off it, come off it.

MR. CURTIS: Number 21.

MR. HICKMAN: MR. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Minister of Education. Is the minister in a position to give assurance to the denominational education committee that the grant of an additional \$6 million will be made available in order to permit school construction before the school year?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: No prompting, no prompting.

MR. CURTIS: Number 21.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of a Bill, " An Act To Incorporate The Moravian Church In Newfoundland And Labrador." (58).

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great personal pleasure that I move the second reading of this Bill. It is a Bill to incorporate the Moravian Church in Newfoundland and Labrador. It may come as something of a surprise to the House to learn that the Moravian Church has not been incorporated in Newfoundland and Labrador.

They have been in this Province, or what is now a Province, for the best part of 200 years, and they are indeed one of the oldest religious bodies that we have in Newfoundland and Labrador today. They are a religious body that has always commanded and deserved great support, great respect and by a great many people a lot of affection as well. I would say that the Reverend Mr. Peacock, the chief Moravian Minister or Priest in Newfoundland, in Labrador, is one of the most widely known and widely respected clergymen that we have in our Province today.

I had the great pleasure in London some years ago of having a visit from a number of Bishops of the Moravian Church, and I was tremendously interested in that because of the fact that the Moravian Church in Europe is the Church at which John Wesley sat and studied the whole Evangelical idea in religion. When John Wesley came back from America, from the American colonies,

the ship on which he sailed was all but lost in a terrible storm, an absolutely terrible storm, in which even the sailors, the crew, cried aloud in fear. Wesley himself was fearful, for the good reason that it seemed that they were going to the bottom. There was a group of four or five men who were quite calm throughout the storm which lasted for some days. When the storm subsided, Mr. Wesley went over to that group of men and discovered that they were Germans from Moravia, that they were Moravia Missionaries who had been out to the American Colonies. He said to the leader of them, "Sir, I could not help but notice how calm and unafraid you appeared to be in the midst of that terrible storm." His reply was, "yes," That he and his colleagues were not afraid, that they felt that they were ready to meet God if they had to, and they were quite unafraid.

This of course attracted Mr. Wesley, and when he got to London he went to the meeting place of the Moravians and it was there in that meeting place that he was converted to the Evangelical kind of religion, and in his famous journal, he entered that night; "I felt my heart strangely warmed within me," which is recording of the fact of his Evangelical conversion. He subsequently travelled on foot and on horseback across from London to a seaport in the Channel and then by boat across to the continent and then on foot and by horse to Moravia where he met with Count Zinzendorf the leader of the Moravians and spent several months with him in Moravia in this famous religious colony made up of several thousand religious pietists led by this German Nobleman, Count Zinzendorf.

After many experiences and long conversations with the Count, he returned to London to launch his great movement which affected the history of mankind. There are very few countries of the world that have not been affected by the work and teaching of John Wesley. So, I have had a great affection for the Moravians in Newfoundland, first, because of the connection of John Wesley with them, and second, because of the glorious work, the noble work that they have done for the people on the coast of Labrador. I do not think that there have been many organizations in Newfoundland's long history, of nearly 500 years, that have done such unselfish and such valuable work, such useful work for people who needed help as the Moravians have done on the coast, on the

seashore, seashore of Labrador.

They have been there now for nearly two hundred years. The first Moravian who was landed there was murdered by the Eskimos, or at any rate, he is supposed to have been murdered because he was never heard of again. I think there were two of them who were landed there by a ship out from England, with a group of Moravians, a Moravian ship, and they left two of their missionaries on shore and they were never seen again. It was a very poor beginning for a missionary effort, but they were not the first missionaries of the Christian Faith to be murdered, to be killed by heathen people.

However, the Moravians persisted Sir, and to this day they are active and energetic and doing a noble work in Labrador. The objects of the corporation are to promote, maintain and carry out the principles, doctrine, worship and congregation light of the Unitas Fratrum?, The united brethren I suppose would be the proper translation.

MR. ROBERTS: Unitas Fratras - unity of brothers

MR. SMALLWOOD: Unitas Fratrum, as laid down by the Unity Synod, all in accordance with the constitution and spirit of the enactments of the said unit, to promote, maintain, superintend and carry on by all such means as the directors may deem fit, religious and charitable work and to unify and extend the interests of the gospel. To organize, maintain, conduct and carry on Christian Missions, missionary schools and colleges, and to erect, maintain and conduct churches, schools, colleges, hospitals, sanatoriums, dispensaries, orphanages, camps, cemeteries and homes for the aged. To promote the spiritual welfare of all the congregations and mission fields of the world. World is right because, the Moravians have gone around the world. They are one of the greatest missionary bodies in the world. For so small, for in number so trifling a body, it is astounding what missionary work the Moravians have done and how far they have gone and to how many countries they have reached and in how many countries they are active today.

To promote the erection and purchase of houses of worship and parsonages, to purchase, acquire and hold all property and land useful and

convenient for the carrying out of the purposes of the corporation and to sell and dispose thereof and to administer property, business and temple affairs of the corporation.

Finally, to assist and support, by any lawful means, the spiritual, educational and social development of the people of the Province, or any class or indigenous group of such people. These are fine purposes, these are noble objectives, Mr. Speaker, with which I am sure every hon. member of this House, on both sides, must agree. The one hon. member who sits on the other side, unfortunately, who is facing me at the moment and listening intently, and I know that his mind is in unison with mine at this moment on this particular matter, and I will be surprised if we do not hear a word of support from him for this legislation whose second reading I am moving today with great personal pleasure, and personal satisfaction. I move the second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this Bill be now read a second time

MR. ABBOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am sure we, on this side of the House, do support this Bill, which one would infer has been long overdue. Nevertheless, we do know of some of the activities of the Moravian Church in Newfoundland and especially in Labrador.

Way back in the early days, when some of us were very young, we did participate in the missionary education of our churches, and one part of that missionary information was that pertaining to the work of the Moravian Missionaries in Labrador. Not only have they been Evangelical, but they have also been very consistent in the Christian Gospel which today is social as well as spiritual. I have met some of the missionaries, I am thinking now of one, the Reverend Mr. Peacock, who has done valuable service for the people of Labrador and is continuing, and not only he himself, but even some of his family are still engaged in that very noble work.

I concur with every word the hon. the Premier has said in relation to the work of the Moravian Missionaries. I do note there, the objects of the corporation are even far beyond what they have accomplished up to this present time. Their horizons are far beyond what we perceive at the present

time. I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill.

MR. WORNELL: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this Bill, Sir, I do honour to my father, because, my father travelled the Northern Labrador for many years, and when I was a small boy from probably the age of five, I remember hearing a lot of tales told about the work of the Moravian Mission and the Moravian Missionaries in Northern Labrador.

I remember one man whose name stands out vividly in my memory, the Reverend Mr. Hettasch. I remember seeing the Reverend Mr. Hettasch in my father's home. I am sure that these missionaries were dedicated people, Sir. Now the hon. the Premier has a wealth of information on the work of the particular branch of Christianity known as the Moravian Church. There is one point that he did not bring out and I think I am right when I say that it was they, and the work of the missionaries in Labrador in particular, who inspired Doctor Grenfell to come to Newfoundland. I think I am right.....

MR. ROBERTS: Dwight L. Moody converted Grenfell.

MR. WORNELL: Yes, but I think that he was inspired to come to Newfoundland by learning of the great work performed by the Moravian Missionaries in Labrador.

Now Sir, I also remember seeing translations of Eskimo, translations into English in a little booklet form, which these Moravian Missionaries performed. They also performed paramedical work - did what they could to alleviate the suffering of the children and others, and wives of the Eskimos especially in childbirth and other things.

In other words they were the true pioneer missionaries, Sir, of the Northern Labrador. I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every person in this House, on both sides, will unanimously endorse this Bill. We have listened with great attention to the Premier's description of the work that was done by this tremendous body of men, and I am sure that there is nothing I can add to it. I have some knowledge of the work that has been carried out. In these modern days, of course, Labrador is not the same as it was many years ago, when we can see this band of men going into the wilds of Labrador. The tremendous work they have done

MR. MURPHY:

In their chosen vocation of catering to the residents of the remote area of that time. So, Mr. Speaker, I will say that we on this side heartily endorse the second reading of this Bill.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, in supporting this Bill I just want to add a few words. I have known the Moravian Mission all down through the years since 1934 and, as a matter of fact, the present superintendent of the Moravian Mission, Rev. F.W. Peacock, who is now stationed at Happy Valley, he and I went to the Coast about the same time. I recall when he came over as a teacher and then when he went back to England and brought his wife back with him, and that is more than thirty years ago.

Sir, the work of the Moravian Mission in Labrador is one unparalleled in any religious organization. As a matter of interest, Mr. Speaker, the Moravian Church were the first independent Protestant Church, away back in 1457. It was 1752 when they came to Labrador and, as you know, Labrador then was in its primitive state and they had to build from scratch to provide not only spiritual guidance for the Eskimo but trading and medical. It is worthy of interest, Mr. Speaker, that the Moravian's in Northern Labrador were not only preachers, they were doctors. I knew the superintendent, Rev. Haddash, who was one of the older superintendents of the Mission. I knew him to amputate a limb, a leg or an arm, whenever an accident occurred, of course, and there were no medical men to go to except the Moravian's themselves, the Moravian superintendent. They were faced with the problem of schools and they were faced with the problem too of having to learn the Eskimo language, which was a terrific job in itself.

But, Sir, all down through the years, as a matter of fact, I do not know what this Province would have done without the services of the Moravians in the early years -

AN HON. MEMBER: Maybe the Eskimos would have become extinct.

MR. WINDSOR: Absolutely. But, Sir, when we say that about the Moravians we must not overlook the fact too that we have in Northern Labrador the Indian population who were provided with spiritual guidance by the Roman Catholic Church and we had a dear christian gentleman in the name of Father O'Brien

MR. WINDSOR:

and Father O'Brien used to travel North for years. We had many a many pleasant evening with Father O'Brien down around David's Inlet and perhaps in a harbour trying to get there. Father O'Brien now, I think, is being promoted to a Monseigneur but I am sure his work will always be remembered among the Indians in Northern Labrador.

But, Sir, the Moravians are a group of people, a devoted group of people, who came there at great sacrifice. Without delaying the second reading of this Bill, Sir, I would say they are worthy of the highest praise and we should thank God that we have such men and organizations existing in our civilized world today.

MR. ROWE(F.W.): Mr. Chairman, just one word on this. I support this Bill with the very greatest enthusiasm and sympathy. My first entry into public life was in Labrador and it was partly at the invitation of the then superintendent, of the present superintendent indeed and of the heads of other churches there that the Premier approached me at that time and ask me whether I would run in that district as his representative.

This fact should be recorded for history: Two hundred years ago the Eskimos of Labrador were among the most uncivilized and barbarous people on the face of this earth. Murder and every other conceivable crime, especially warfare between the Eskimos and the Indians and between the Eskimos and the white people, were the order of the day. This is why, as the Premier said, the first missionaries put there were actually killed by the Eskimos. The fact is that within a hundred years or so these same Eskimos, due entirely to the efforts of the Moravian Church, had become one of the practicable and one of the most essentially civilized people on the face of this earth.

There is no community any where on earth, Mr. Speaker, where you have more honesty, more outright decency, a more lawabiding group of people than you find among the Eskimos of Northern Labrador, and that is entirely due to the efforts of the Moravians.

Finally let me say this, the member for Labrador North, who is also the Minister of Labrador Affairs, has referred to it. Without the efforts of the Moravian Church, the Roman Catholic Church and the Grenfell Mission the

MR. ROWE:

indigenous peoples of Labrador, the two Indian tribes and the Eskimos, would have disappeared from the face of the earth in the same way as the Beothucks. The indigenous people of Newfoundland, the Beothuck Indians, disappeared from the Island of Newfoundland and became extinct to the earth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved and seconded that this Bill be now read a second time. If the hon. Minister speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I will not delay the House but I want to say three things very briefly. In the first place that the Moravian Missionaries in this Province today are all of them, I think, English not German, All or nearly all of them are English and have been mainly so for a good many years past. The earliest Moravian Missionaries were German, some of them or most of them at any rate. The second thing I wanted to say is something that was touched on by the Minister for Labrador Affairs namely that the Moravian Missionaries of Labrador have to a very large extent been medical missionaries. They carried on spiritual work but they were also medical doctors or if they were not fully qualified medical doctors they had been given a course of medical instruction which certainly qualified them far more than were the Eskimo people among whom they lived.

The third thing I wanted to say is this that one of the first problems that confronted this Government when we took office was the fact that earlier Governments had given to the Moravians in Labrador a vast tract of land, a vast tract running, I think, if my memory serves me properly, running I think to some thousands of square miles. It appeared to be a pretty solid claim, a pretty solid right established many years ago, lawfully, legally. The Government entered into negotiations with the Moravians for the recovery of that land and in this we succeeded and the Moravians were very decent about it, very accommodating and very realistic and saw that the time had come indeed for them to pass back the rights that they had been given many years before by the proper authorities of Newfoundland.

I greatly appreciate the unanimous support the Bill has received from both sides of the House and I do commend it to the attention of the House.

On motion, Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee

of the whole House presently by leave. .

MR. CURTIS: Numbers 3,5,6,7,8, and 21, Committee.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE:

A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Schools Act, 1969."

On motion Sections 1 - 9 carried.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I should explain to the Committee here that we are going to recommend an amendment here and a brief word about the background of it. The amendment deals with the length of the school year. Last year, over a year ago, a number of discussions took place, between the churches, the NTA and the Department of Education, on the matter of the school year and there was unanimous agreement that, inasmuch as our school year was one of the shortest in Canada that we should lengthen it somewhat, to bring it up at least to what most of the other Provinces were. This was incorporated in the Legislation last year, in the new schools Act passed last year. Now the NTA, as I said, approved that in principle but because their conference, their annual convention, did not take place until Easter there was no way for them to test the complete reaction of all the 6,000 teachers in Newfoundland.

Subsequently, at their convention, a resolution was adopted which in effect said this; That inasmuch as teachers are docked on a per diem basis if they fail to teach all the days of the school year that they felt that any lengthening of the school year should be done in conjunction with discussions of teachers remuneration. Now, as I said, this came to us afterwards last year and came to us again several times during the year and because the Government have committed itself to a revision of teachers salaries scales, and indeed discussions have already started on that, the Government decided to go along with the formal request made by the NTA. I had this in a letter from the President, following meetings of the executive, and that is that we defer the extension of the school year and have it considered at the same time as we are considering teachers salaries scales. This is not an unreasonable request and this will not mean any loss of actual teaching time at all in the classroom. But it does mean, in this amendment, that I am going to ask my colleague to move in a moment that we will be holding the school year to the length that it has

MR. ROWE:

been all along, the actual length that it has been all year round. In order to do that we must repeal certain things we did last year and we must insert other things to validate the instructions we have already given school boards. We could not wait, we have already given school boards instructions on this. At least we have intimated to school boards what we intended to recommend. Accordingly I am going to ask my colleague, the Minister of Public Works, if he would move that Section (10) be amended, in accordance with this. I have copies of this if anybody would like to have a look at the copies of it.

If I may suggest, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is short and perhaps it would be the simplest thing if the hon. Minister were to read out what it says there and when we come to Section (21) I will distribute copies of that ahead of time for anybody who wishes to see it.

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Chairman, section (10), sections (53) and (54) of the said Act are repealed and the following substituted therefor Section (53). "For the purpose of computing a salary a school year shall consist of such a number of school days within the period referred to in paragraph (d)(d) of section (2) that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council after consultation with the General Advisory Committee may by order prescribe." I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry? Carried. Shall the section as amended carry? carried. Shall (11) carry? Carried. Shall (12) carry? Carried. Shall (13) carry?

MR. WELLS: On 13(2), if, for example when the new text comes out this year it would be of great use to students in grade (11) or any grade for that matter. Under this clause, if it were strictly applied and interpreted, it could not be used for another year, it could not even be used as an additional, not the main text for the course or anything like that. It could not be used for at least another year even as an additional text whereas such other text books being hereinafter referred to in this section as "alternative text books", shall, in writing, request the Minister's approval therefor at least one year before the date on which it is proposed to commence use of such alternative text.

Now I do not mind the basic prescribed text, alright that takes time, but as an additional or alternate text to be used for additional study

MR. WELLS:

why should it take a year, why should there be a years notice, how can that be justified? Surely somebody in authority can assess the thing and let us know.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I can well understand the hon. member's feelings on that at first look at it. Actually it is put in there for practical purposes for this reason that the Department of Education is responsible for supplying the text books and in order to do that normally you would need to know a year ahead what text books you have to order from the publisher.

MR. WELLS: That makes eminent sense.

MR. ROWE: Right but the second part is this, there is nothing at all, if in the meantime a school board, say the board in Corner Brook, decided that they wanted to use a book in their school there and suppose they had the copies of it we can authorize them immediately to use it as supplementary text books.

MR. WELLS: How can you do it under sub-section (2)?

MR. ROWE: Well, I do not know but it has been done and could be done.

MR. WELLS: It starts out by reading, "Any School Board which wishes to use, -

MR. ROWE: Well, there is a technicality there. You see sub-section (2) uses the word text books and a text book is something which has been prescribed but there is nothing to prevent a Board or a school from using supplementary material and that supplementary material could in effect be a text book. I can say this; that there is no danger at all under this. There has not been in the past -

MR. WELLS: That books would be able to be used -

MR. ROWE: That a book would be held up for a full twelve months due to that technicality. It simply means that if a school in Grand Falls, Corner Brook, Gander or any school decided well, look we are going to get some on our own, if we are going to get them for them we have to have a years notice for the very simple practical thing that that is approximately the amount of time that it takes from the time we get a request or make a decision that a book is going to be used until such time as you can get the publisher to publish it and make the supplies available. This is why we need the years notice there. But if some Board wish to use, it is being done every day, if some Board wishes to use a book there is no problem at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (13) carried. Shall (14) carry?

MR. CROSBIE: On (14), Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I certainly support this particular section and in fact most of the amendments now being presented are a great advance, I believe, open meetings of School Boards and the other changes the Minister introduced, election of School Board members. Since I did not speak on the second reading I just want to say that I support all this and I think it is a great step forward.

MR. CHAIRMAN:(14) carried. Shall (15) carry? Carried. Shall (16) carry? Carried. Shall (17) carry? Carried. Shall (18) carry? Carried. Shall (19) carry?

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, we are going through a bit fast here and I am trying to follow my sketchy notes that I have made here. On section (19), this -

MR. WELLS: relates to the use for which assessments may be used. Now the committee and anybody who else is concerned about it will recall that a couple of years ago all school assessments were abolished, and the one percent was added to the social security assessment to act as a substitute, and there would be no further school assessment -

MR. HICKMAN: What section are we on, health?

MR. WELLS: This was subsequently watered down to permit assessments for capital construction purposes. Now under Sub-section II of Clause 19 of this Bill, which purports to amend or will amend Section 97 of the Act. It says, "regulations, made under Sub-section I, shall not prescribe any purposes for which monies raised by means of assessment imposed under Section 97 shall be applied, which is not 14. Then it lists the following: Financing of construction or enlargement of existing schools. Provision of salaries for special teachers for whom ordinary salaries are not provided or the augmentation of salaries where sufficient salaries are not provided by the Public Funds".

Well it is a good thing to have a board able to raise funds and get the kind of specialized teachers that it wants, but all in all, taking this together with sub-section 3, which goes on to read, and the latter part of it, "It may be applied to liquidate indebtedness incurred in respect of any ^{of} the matters in paragraph A. Then sub-section 3 goes on to say, notwithstanding sub-section 2, "the minister, where he is satisfied that exceptional circumstances exist, which, in his opinion, was the making of such an order, may make an order authorizing the expenditure really for nearly any purpose, and prescribing the conditions under which monies may be spent".

Well this opens up the whole thing again. So why go through this whole cumbersome procedure? Why do we not just go back to the state where

MR. WELLS: we were and have school assessments and let local areas decide what they want to do. Certain local areas have school tax assessment. There are school tax areas throughout the Province. And, as nearly as I know, that is not limited to capital construction, the monies raised by the school tax assessment. These are not limited to capital construction, they are given to the school board proportionally to their student population in the area. The money is divided up on that basis. But you know all of this makes this abolition of school assessment ridiculous. Why do we not just forget it, and say, "okay, local areas, local school boards can place an assessment and so on", and forget all this circumlocution that we are providing for here, which really means nothing, because we are back to school assessments for general purposes in any case where the minister wishes to issue a permit under Sub-section 3.

MR. ROWE, F.W. Mr. Chairman, two points to be made here, this Section 19, (perhaps I should have had explained it when it was called) conforms and complements the school tax legislation that this House passed here earlier in this present session. Money collected by school tax authorities, that money is under the same restrictions as outlined under Section 19 here. That is one point, I would say. The other point is, (I explained this before, we debated it at some length) the feeling is, even it is only an interim measure, that there should not be a bed of Procrustes - one hundred percent bed of Procrustes (if I might mix up my metaphors) that there must be some discretion because of the very special circumstances that can take place in the operation of the school board, especially the bigger one. The third thing I would say is that, and believe the committee will hear this with some satisfaction, I can only say generally, we are, Newfoundland is feeling a sway in this whole matter of educational financing. And, I believe, that there is a movement underfoot right now among the boards, I believe there is a movement to explore the possibilities of having a single tax authority for the Province of Newfoundland.

MR. HICKMAN: A Provincial Tax Authority?

MR. ROWE, F.W. Yes, there is a movement underfoot -

MR. WELLS: Is this likely to come into the Consolidated Revenue Fund and be administered by the Government.....

MR. ROWE, F.W. Nothing has ever come to us at all, this is a delicate matter, a very difficult one, it is a very complicated one, but it is being approached, and the very fact that we have a joint - only the other day we had, as the committee knows, a joint representation from all the churches in the matter of capital, \$6 million that my hon. friend referred to. He might have noticed, I do not know. if he recalled signatories to that where the Lord Bishop of Newfoundland, signing it as Chairman of the Protestant Integrated Committee for three churches. The Archbishop signed it, as Chairman of the Roman Catholic Integrated Committee, not a board. But you also had Mr. Rowe of Corner Brook, George Rowe, signing it, as Chairman of the Association of Amalgamated School Boards. You also had Justice Higgins signing it, as Chairman of the Association of Roman Catholic School Boards. And you had Mr. (who is the other signatory into it) Pastor Bursey, of course, as head of the Pentecostal, but not as the Superintendent of the Pentecostal Church, but signing it as Chairman of the Pentecostal Board of Education.

In other words, you have the joint effort there, you might say a joint liberation there, and this same thing, I think, is working now in respect of operating cost of education. And I would not be surprised if within the next twelve months, I do not know, nobody has told me this, but I would not be surprised if within the next twelve months we do not get recommendations from these bodies, individually or collectively, and I suspect collectively, recommending certain steps in respect of perhaps a general education tax for the Province, or a general Provincial

MR. ROWE, F.W. Tax Authority.

MR. WELLS: Okay when we have a unified system, where it is not broken down

MR. ROWE, F.W. These are certain complications in it. But you might say that this discretionary power given the minister here is in the nature of an interim measure. Certainly it is something that would permit some discretionary emergency use of that authority there. I do not anticipate any abuse of it, as I explained at the beginning, certainly as long as I am minister, and I am sure whoever my successor is, he will follow the same practice, he would never think of exercising that authority without having consulted with a number of advisors on it.

MR. CROSBIE: This section has to do with raising the money for school purposes through the school assessment. And the minister says that he hopes that he will use his discretion very sparingly to allow the school assessment fees to be used for other than capital purposes. However, I would prophesy that the minister may have to use his discretion to allow school fees and school assessments to be used for other than capital purposes, if what the various school boards in the Province are saying is in fact the case. And we saw in the paper just last week, I think it was, that the school boards in the Springdale area had gotten together and felt that they could not operate this year on the operating money they were going to get from Government of Newfoundland. I had a letter myself from Brother Molloy of Brother Rice High School, after we had a debate here in the House about the financial problems in education. And he sent me a copy of the school budget for the Brother Rice High School.

Brother Rice High have 780 students who will ^{get} \$51.50, the school will get \$51.50 per student for this year, based on the present Government formula for \$40,170, and after deducting their expenses for school loan interest, administration and school bus, leaves them \$23,000, and after they take

MR. CROSBIE: out maintenance and repairs, light, heat, and cleaning and so on. The whole amount is used up, so they have got \$9900 left out of their budget for teaching supplies and aids, music, library, science, athletics, audio-visual and general equipment, just \$9900 left after they meet the essentials.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: This is Brother Rice High School. And Brother Molloy sent me a candy bar, it is a candy bar that the school are using to collect money. He says, "the enclosed candy bar's message speaks for itself, and it is a further reflection of our financial crisis. But I donate the bar to you, so that you may nibble chocolate while you digest this tragic implication of our school budget for 1970-71. You will no doubt, Sir, note that our budget at best is really bare bones. But before we can even give a thought to budgeting for programs we have already over-drawn", Now this is just Brother Rice High School, There are dozens of other high schools in the same position around the Province. The amount there received from the Government, based at \$51.50 per pupil, is just not enough to allow them money for the essentials - \$9,009 in that high school, which has 780 students, to meet teaching supplies and aids, that is all they have left, \$2500, \$2,000 for music, \$400 for the library, \$500 for science, \$2000 for athletics for 780 students, \$500 for audio-visual, and \$2000 for general equipment. And other school boards will confirm the same kind of thing. So I would suspect, Mr. Chairman, that the minister is going to be under heavy pressure to use his discretion under this section to allow them to collect assessment fees for other than construction and salaries for special teachers. In other words for just general operating purposes - unless the grant is going to be increased.

June 16th, 1970

Tape 1266

PK - b

MR. ROWE, F.W. Perhaps before I answer that the hon. member for Burin would like to say something.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, what I would like to say is this, I believe that this section is a very essential section particularly at this time, because practically every school board of the Province is having real problems in implementing the programs that they would like to see implemented in their schools. If we do not confer on the minister the right to give the local authority and the local populace the opportunity to bring in these programs, if they so desire, and if they are capable of paying for them, and if they want to pay for them, then obviously these students are going to suffer. Right now as I understand it that the total grants to schools are based on a per pupil bases. And what I would like to see is something thrown into it for the programs. If the high school or the School Board for Western Newfoundland can show to the Minister of Education and demonstrate to the Minister of Education that they need a program, a reading program in Corner Brook, and that they have the necessary tax base to raise that money, either by way of taxes or assessment or whatever the approach might be then I think it would be nothing short of criminal if that board would be refuse the right to bring that program into operation simply because all the grants are fixed on a per student bases. And all of this, as was said during the debate on this Act last year when it was before the House, and indeed going back to the debate when there was an attempt to abolish school fees and replace it with assessments, that this was a very gingerly approach. But at least it is an approach in the right direction, I believe, to an implementation to some extent of the foundation program in our educational system. Because it is a fact, Mr. Chairman, you can be theoretical as you like, the simple fact is that the cost of educating students or pupils anywhere in Canada varies very considerably from one area to the next. And it is my understanding that you get the reverse from industry. In industry

MR. HICKMAN: if you manufacture 20,000 cars and you suddenly increase it to 30,000 the per unit cost decreases. If you increase the number of pupils in a city or a town or in an area from 20,000 to 30,000 the per pupil cost increases rather than decreases. And the only way you are going to have meaningful programs in the areas where the need is obvious is to give some latitude to the local authorities and the local school boards to collect some money. The day of the bun suppers and the bingo parties and the garden parties and all of that sort of thing as a method to raising money for education now is about as archaic as the wheelbarrow, and certainly does not go anywhere close to meeting any of the additional needs that school boards require. And I am sure the minister ^{or} has he has to have a great deal of sympathy with ^{the} position the school boards find themselves in today. They are sort of the buffer between the Department of Education and the parents. And they are desperately trying - and they are all volunteers desperately trying to find sufficient funds to bring in the programs that parents now want for their schools. And, I believe, that parents are prepared to pay for it. If you can demonstrate to them - number one, that the programs are required, and secondly that you can put meaningful programs into these schools. As I read this section 19, this will enable the minister, whenever he feels that this is necessary and that the funds are available without causing undue hardship, to permit this type of expenditures by school boards. And personally I am all for it.

MR. ROWE, F.W. Mr. Chairman, I am of course in agreement in principle with the sentiments expressed by both hon. members who have just spoken, the member for St. John's West and the member for Burin. There are just two points to be made there. There is a danger that in quoting the figures, as did the hon. member for St. John's West, of a school - the impression might get abroad that the Government makes the grant of \$51.50 per student to the school. The Government does not do it. And one of the reasons

MR. ROWE, F.W. why precisely that is not done, is for a point just brought out by the hon. member for Burin, mainly that the needs of schools differ so much. So while it could be argued and has been argued that this grant of \$51.50 is not enough in total not enough and there is a lot of validity for that, and I am sure a lot of people will agree with that, nevertheless, boards do have some discretionary power in that the grant is made to the boards on the basis of \$51.50 for every child under its jurisdiction. Now what the board does after that, with it, is its own business. It may give to one school where the need is greater, it may give theoretically on the basis of \$70.00 per pupil, and on the basis of other school \$40.00 per pupil, as the member for Burin just pointed out, needs can differ somewhat.

Now in the case of most urban schools there is not that great difference between the needs of schools, so I would think that most school boards in urban areas are apportioning their money, but it is they who apportion it to the school on the strict \$51.50 basis. And I presume ^{they} this is what have done - I judged from those figures given by the hon. member from Burin. And I might say I also received a copy of those same figures. I judge that is being done by the Roman Catholic School Board. But the point I want to make is that it is up to the Roman Catholic School Board whether they do that or not. Some other school board having in the one hand a very highly sophisticated school with all kinds of appliances and specialist and so on, could very well use \$51.50 for that school, and some other school where the needs ^{are} of a less sophisticated nature could very well use a smaller grant, a smaller amount. There is one other point to be made ^{which} is this; both hon. gentlemen are of course correct in that this is an attempt to relieve some of the rigidity that was in the previous legislation. But now the minister is protected in part and

June 16th. 1970

Tape 1266

PK - 9

MR. ROWE, F.W. his advisers under Section XII of the Schools Act, of the parent Act, Section XI, Sub-section j, which says that each board must submit at the end of the school year a financial statement - well here are the exact words. "Submit to the minister at the end of each school year a detailed statement of its accounts audited by a firm of certified or chartered accountants and in such form as may from time to time be prescribed by the minister and furnish a copy of such statement to the appropriate education committee where there is such an education committee." In other words you might say; through their church superiors as well. Now this would be a great guide to any minister in trying to decide whether or not a genuine emergency or a genuine need for his discretionary power is present. The fact that you get such an audited statement, and that statement could be analyzed and assessed by the advisers to the minister on this matter. This I suggest finally is the beginning, Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind at all, and I do not think there is any doubt in the mind of any of us, that the whole problem of financing education is one that we have to tackle even with greater emphasis than we have in the past. And at this moment, the very fact of last week, as I have said, this committee met with the Government, not with the Premier, not with the Minister of Education, but with the Government and sat down there and for a full hour, with all the time that was available prior to this meeting, for a full hour, an hour and a quarter in fact discussed this problem of capital education. And I can say that the matter of operational expenses of schools is one that is concerning every educator in Newfoundland, at our level, including the Department of Education and including the Government itself. We are up against, of course, the overall problem of the availability of money - the availability of money, it is a simple thing.

MR. ROWE, F.W. I have a request on my desk and I have had it from the N.T.A. to reduce the ratio from thirty-five to thirty that is a ratio of pupils per teacher, from thirty-five to thirty. I received a similar request, I think, it was from the Vanier School, P.T.A., I think it was. Anyway it is immaterial, this request comes in. Such a simple thing as that, such a simple thing as reducing the ratio from thirty-five to thirty, would cost us, overnight, over \$3 million extra money. And then when you add to that in any one year, the fact that you have to find \$3 million extra to look after increments of teachers' salaries and additional teachers not raises but increments, this is a \$6 million addition right there. Well then if in any one year you have in that same year, you have to bring in revised payment scales for teachers that would cost - well, it would cost almost anything. But certainly anything realistic is going to cost a good many millions of dollars. You cannot, even at a ten percent basis, on a ten percent basis, as ours is this year, your present bill is between \$35 million and \$36 million, even ten percent it will cost you between \$3.5 million and \$4 million. And so this whole problem is a pretty serious one, make no mistake about that. It is concerning every province in Canada, We have to try and work out something which will do something to ease it, and I believe, I believe that over the next year or two that there will be progress made in that.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, has the hon. minister read a document prepared by Professor Llewellyn Parsons which is on the financing of education. But there are certain findings in it, my concern and my criticism, obviously there is no easy answer to the financing of education in any province, and I would say that it is probably even more aggravated in this Province. But I think what the people are resenting today is that we are trying to paint a rosier picture than we are entitled to paint. And, I think, there

MR. HICKMAN: are certain facts. And if you start off with these facts and then say, what if anything can we do about it? Here are four findings that are contained in the Llewellyn Parsons Report.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, a comparison of educational expenses, these facts (a) referring to Newfoundland, the Provincial expenditure on education as a percentage of the total Provincial Government Expenditure is the lowest of all the provinces of Canada. (b) The per capita expenditure on elementary and secondary education is roughly fifty percent of the Canadian average. (c) A relative effort as measured by expenditure for pupil ability to pay is low compared with that of the other Canadian provinces. And (d) Expenditure per pupil on equipment and materials compares unfavourably with such expenditures in most Canadian provinces.

Now, Mr. Chairman, maybe we can do nothing about it. Maybe the simple fact is that we cannot lay our hands on other nickle as far as - when I talk about "we" I mean Government.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: But I had some other figures that were furnished to me by the NTA.

MR. ROWE, F.W.: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: right, but I had some other figures, I do not know if I still have them, which were furnished to me by the Newfoundland Teachers Association.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, but the thing that will not wash today with parents is the type of statement that we found in the Budget Speech, when we started to compare the percentage of expenditure on education with British Columbia and Ontario. And obviously left the impression that we

June 16th. 1970

Tape 1266

PK - 12

MR. HICKMAN: were putting these provinces in the shade. And that is the thing I say is wrong, because apart from the fact that it is no longer acceptable to our people, it creates a false impression, as to what the actual situation is, and if we say to the people of Newfoundland, "look this is all the Province can raise by way of direct taxation, if you want more, you will have...."

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: Thirty-nine - all

HON. E. ROBERTS (Minister of Health): We are spending more. Now in dollars, it is infinitely less.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Budget Speech does not say this -

MR. ROBERTS: No, and the Budget Speech does not say a lot of other things. It went on for two hours anyway.

MR. HICKMAN: I know, but just listen - what implication can you draw from this? The rich Province of British Columbia is spending on education two point eight percent of its gross provincial product. That is to say, the amount of spending on education in that great Province is just under three percent of the total value of all the goods and services produced there. In Ontario they spend three point eight GPP on education. In Newfoundland, this Government are spending on education seven point nine percent, practically eight percent of the Province's gross provincial product.

MR. ROBERTS: It just shows that relatively speaking the people of Newfoundland - it is like the "widow's mite."

MR. HICKMAN: No, the hon. minister knows - what I say is that if the Budget Speech had been realistic, it would have gone on and said the provincial expenditure on education, as the percent of the total provincial government expenditure, is the lowest of all Province's in Canada.

MR. ROBERTS: That is not correct, because you know you are not comparing likes and likes. It is like welfare -

MR. HICKMAN: No, no. Take a look at Prince Edward Island. Total amount of provincial expenditure on elementary secondary education per pupil in average daily attendance.

MR. ROBERTS: And we are the lowest.

MR. HICKMAN: We are the lowest.

AN HON. MEMBER: Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

MR. HICKMAN: No, this is not the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. This was the study that was done by the Atlantic Development Board.

MR. ROBERTS: There are two important points. One is that relatively speaking, with what we have we are doing -

MR. HICKMAN: Anyway, all I would suggest is this. You know and I do not

want it to be taken in a critical sense at all. There is no one in this House - I am sure, if any hon. member had the answer to the adequate financing of education, he would be very quick to give it and would give it to this House. But what I do object to is this incessant reference in comparison to what we had '49 to what we have in '70, without really looking at what - the only criteria today is what is required in 1970, and this does one or two things. One is, it annoys educators. It annoys school boards and it annoys parents, and secondly, it gives Newfoundlanders a false impression that everything is rosy in the garden when the opposite is the truth.

MR. ROWE (F. W.): Mr. Chairman, before my hon. friend does that. There is just one word of explanation. In order to validate what we have done, we have to delete section 10 and make amendments there. And now, the Department of Justice is prepared for the validation under section 21, and I have circulated this. I am not going to attempt to explain all the details - everybody knows what it means. It means that the school year remains the same as it was, has been for many years. And as I said before, we have to validate what we did ultra vires of the Act last year. And this will permit us then to carry on our negotiations with the teachers on the basis of salaries versus time actually spent in teaching. My colleague, the Minister of Health - if he will be kind enough -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I will move it as it is being distributed to the Committee - unless the Committee wish, I will forebear from reading it -
Carried.

Motion, that the committee report having passed the bill, "An Act to Amend the School Tax Act, 1969", with some amendment, carried:

MR COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: I did not rise before because I did not want to embarrass an official of the city in the House. Is it in accordance with our rules to have persons, other than members holding seats, to sit in this House, other than committee stage on estimates.

MR CHAIRMAN: Not on any other business, I do not think. Estimates only?

MR MURPHY: Is this legal now then, all the work we have done? Do we go all over it again?

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Companies Act":

Bill (29) This Act may be cited as the Summary Jurisdiction Amendment Act, 1970.

MR. CLYDE WELLS: Mr. Chairman, on Clause (2). This is from a point of view of administration. It says, "subject to this Section, when ever any person dies as a result of," -- and then it lists all of the things. How does anybody know that it as a result of negligence until there has been an investigation carried out? I mean that is what is to be determined, of violence - well I guess you could determine that, or misadventure. But surely it has to be something that is suspected negligence, or suspected misconduct, or suspected malpractice. This is what the enquiry is about to determine whether or not the death was as a result of negligence or misconduct or malpractice. So if that is the standard before which an enquiry can be set up, it is not very meaningful. I would suggest, and the Minister of Justice might consider this, or might let it stand and refer the matter further to his officials - you cannot very well just say let negligence lie. It has to be suspected negligence or apparently.

MR. CROSBIE: Whenever any person dies "apparently as a result."

MR. WELLS: Yes, dies "apparently as a result." Right.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Minister of Justice): After the word "any person dies apparently." Yes, that is right.

MR. WELLS: Now Mr. Chairman, before we go ^{on} and carry it - Subsection (2) I do not know whether this change has been made or not, but I would suggest that at the end of Subsection (2) the full stop or full point, as we may wish to call it, be changed to a comma, and we add something like, "but he may in his discretion hold an enquiry." The reason for this -

MR. CURTIS: I think you will find this is covered in other Sections.

MR. WELLS: I agree that he may already do it. It is clear. It is not clear, but I agree that on a strict legal interpretation he may hold an enquiry. Subsection (2) does not bar ^{on} from holding an enquiry, where the director of public prosecutions expresses the opinion that it is not necessary. He can still hold that. In my opinion, it does not bar him, but

I think the way that it is worded, it should be made quite clear. A magistrate is not required - well that does not mean that he cannot. It just means he is not required.

MR. CURTIS: I think by (6) he can go ahead with the enquiry.

MR. WELLS: No, that is just for the exclusion - Subsection (6) just relates to the exclusion of the general public. That is required. Then Subsection (2) goes on to say it is not required -

MR. CURTIS: It is not required, but he may do it.

MR. WELLS: I agree. I agree. But what I am saying is that the general interpretation that would likely be placed on that, particularly by lay magistrates, is that when the D.P.P. says "no", that is it. So I feel that, for greater certainties, should be added, but the Committee may decide not to. It is not essential. The chief says it is not essential. I think he is talking about the comment rather - my comments rather than the amendment. In any event, Mr. Chairman, there is a further one in sub-Section 6. "An inquiry conducted under this section may in the discretion of the magistrate or justice conducting it be held in part, that is all right. Any persons other than those required to be present by law may be excluded.

MR. CROSBIE: Required or permitted.

MR. WELLS: Now, I think, it should be required or permitted or entitled perhaps. I think it should read, "Other than those required or entitled to be present by law".

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: I think it should read either, I do not know if entitled is a better word than permitted.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. WELLS: Entitled, I think. Required or entitled to be present by law. So I would move that amendment.

MR. CURTIS: That is all right. I agree.

MR. ROBERTS: inquired into, it is not inquired into inquiry or whatever you call them.

MR. WELLS: That is right. But he should be entitled to be there. Do

MR. WELLS: you want to put that amendment first, Mr. Chairman, or do you want -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

On Motion Amendment carried.

MR. WELLS: Well that is all on Clause II.

MR. CURTIS: Clause II as amended.

On Motion Clause II and Clause III carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall Clause IV carry?

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I mentioned this when this Bill came up on second reading, that I think these penalties provided for in Clause IV are much too severe.

MR. CURTIS: What would you suggest?

MR. WELLS: For the general nature of the Act, what is proposed at the moment. I want to point out to the committee, the Minister of Justice, of course realizes what this is, but I would like to spell it out for the committee in just a couple of minutes that this is a general provision, it is a catch-all penalty, where there is no specific penalty provided, for anybody contravening the law, without there being a specific penalty provided, this penalty would come into force. And what we have proposed is a fine not exceeding \$500 - now admittedly that could be \$1, the magistrate could apply a fine of \$1 or in default to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months.

MR. CURTIS: It might be one day.

MR. WELLS: And it might be one day. But I think it is too broad, too heavy a fine for a general provision. Any provision of any statute that is serious enough to warrant that kind of a penalty has a specific penalty provided. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, to ^a fine not exceeding \$100, and imprisonment not exceeding thirty days.

MR. CURTIS: I agree.

MR. WELLS: I make that motion, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

MR. CURTIS: Of course remember the court could always, Mr. Chairman, reduce it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the Clause as amended carry?

MR. CURTIS: There is no clause there at all now.

MR. WELLS: No, that is right there is no clause. There are clauses in individual acts.

MR. ROBERTS: There is one in the Liquor Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall Clause V carry? Carried.

Shall I report the Bill with some amendment?

MR. CURTIS: No. 7.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 30.

On motion, Bill No. 30, "An Act To Repeal The Trade Union (Emergency Provisions) Act, 1959, without amendments.

On Motion, Bill No. 46, "An Act Further To Amend The Minimum Wage (Amendment) Act 1970.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, there is a problem with the Minimum Wage, and the Minister of Labour is not here, I had intended to speak to him directly about this. But this can arise under Clause II. Because this provides for the - it amends the primary legislation to give power to the Lieutenant-Government in Council to make certain regulations and orders.

MR. CROSBIE: handicapped employees.

MR. WELLS: I realize it is only about handicapped employees and so on. But there is a problem with the application of the present minimum wage regulations, in that the officers of the Minimum Wage Board are applying a dual standard, depending on whether the man is hourly paid or monthly paid. The regulations at the moment say that the minimum rate of pay, wages shall be paid at a rate of not less than a \$1.10 per hour, and for overtime over forty-eight hours not less than one and one-half times the minimum rate. And the regulations also say that that applies equally whether the man is on hourly, daily, monthly, or weekly or annual salary, you must keep a

MR. WELLS: record of the man's time. It does not matter whether it is monthly or annually, you must keep a record, and the Minimum Wage officers must be able to check his number of hours worked, and his total pay and make sure that he receives not less than the minimum.

Now then this is where the problem comes in, they have so interpreted this overtime section that when they go in and check the man who is on an hourly rate of pay, say he is being paid a \$1.50 an hour, and they pay him this across the board, no matter what he works, they make, some highway workers and construction workers and so on are paid on this basis because they are working on and off and all sorts of hours and they want to take advantage of the time to get as many hours in as they can, When the Minimum Wage Inspector goes in to check the books, he - if the man worked say sixty hours, then forty-eight hours is his straight time, the Minimum Wage Inspector calculates that at a \$1.50, which is his normal rate of pay, instead of the minimum required a \$1.10, Then he calculates the additional twelve hours at a \$1.65, and if the two amounts added together exceed his gross pay, the man is being charged, the employer is being charged. So that for the hourly paid employee; they are setting a standard of his basic pay, whether it is a \$1.10 or a \$1.50 or a \$1.40. Now for the weekly paid employee who gets \$75.00 a week, and they go in to check the book, they must use the \$1.10 standard. They cannot use any other. Now this is unfair and wrong.

MR. CURTIS: Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: Yes.

MR. CROSBIE: The minister is sick this week he is not going to be here.

MR. WELLS: Yes, well if we can adjourn at least until the time we could get it cleared up, because I think this matter should be cleared up.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. CURTIS: presently.

MR. ROBERTS: Bill No. 58.

On Motion, Bill No. 58, "An Act To Incorporate The Moravian Church In Newfoundland And Labrador,"
Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment,
carried:

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Minimum Wage (Amendment) Act,
1970.

MR WELLS: Clause 4 of the Bill, where there is provision for the inspection of the books etc, by the inspecting officer - I think they are going about it wrongly. The workers are being cheated, in the long run. In the long run the workers end up, because the contractors just juggle the books. Domestic or casual is exempted.

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

MR HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have instructed me to report having passed Bills. Nos. 33,30 and 58 without amendments and Bills No 29 and 39 with some amendments, and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted, bills ordered read a third time now, by leave:

Third Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Companies Act",
read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Trade Union (Emergency Provisions) Act, 1959" read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act to Incorporate the Moravian Church in Newfoundland and Labrador", read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act",
read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

June 16, 1970, Tape 1268, Page 1

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Schools Act, 1969", read a third time,
ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Second Reading of a Bill, No. 60:

MR. ROWE: The purpose of this Bill has been set out there. Everybody knows that it is a matter referred to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland for a decision. Subsequently the churches got together and arrived at a mutually acceptable decision and we of course have to ratify that here in order for their disposition of that money, which was voted to them by this House, be made legal. I move second reading.

Bill No. 60 read a second time referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend the Civil Service Act,"

MR. JONES: Mr. Speaker, the provision of this Bill is very simple. It applies particularly to teachers. Under the existing Bill a teacher would have to be working for ten years in the teaching profession to have this time made pensionable if she came into Civil Service. Now we propose to have it changed to read one year, change the ten to one, the person employed as a teacher would have then that service counted as pensionable time. I move second reading.

On motion bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, the effect is that if you teach for longer than a year and then become a Civil Servant, that year will be pensionable.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Pensions Premium Act, 1966-1967."

the payment of pension premiums. We still have several boards operated by the government hospital boards and what have you that are not under the Civil Service Pension Act 1967. We want to authorize the collection of their pensions until such time, up to 1972, so that we can collect their pension in the event while the negotiations and legislation is in progress. Otherwise the employees of these boards will be faced, once they come in under the Act they would have to be faced with a sizable payment of back pension premiums.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, on this, with reference to these boards and I think of the Power Commission and so on and so forth, is there a uniform pension right across compared with Civil Service? I understand that some of these have very substantial benefits as related to the Civil Service. Is this an actual fact or is there going to be a uniformity no matter what area of government you are serving whether it is on a board or in the actual civil service itself, instead of giving great benefits to one area and lesser benefits to another sector of the public service.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, in supporting the principle of the Bill perhaps I can just answer the question put by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. The Government (and this Bill is to enable us further, to give us further power to do it) The Government are bringing all of our direct boards, such as the Power Commission, or Medicare or the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, under our own pension plan. We are negotiating with the various hospitals not operated by Government with a view to seeing if they can come in. The benefits in the past may have been different, because there

are a number of separate pension plans. But they are being made uniform throughout not just in pensions Mr. Speaker, but the policy of the government is to have complete uniformity with regard to pay, or wages, annual leave, pensions, The whole business of employee benefits should make no difference whether one works for Her Majesty as an employee in the department of Health or as an employee of the Power Commission which is an agent of Her Majesty. I think there have been variances in the past, We are trying to iron them out and this legislation is to enable us better to do that.

Bill No. 55, read a second time referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Technical And Vocational Training Act, 1963."

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, the teachers in our Technical College and in the Vocational Schools are Civil Servants. This means that they come under the normal civil service regulations. In theory this means that even though classes cease next week in the Technical College over there for the next two months, in theory those teachers are supposed to be over there, even though there is nobody else in the building. And the same thing would apply of course to our vocational schools as well. Now normally what they do, of course, they take their vacation that they are entitled to, their three weeks or four weeks or whatever it happens to be. But still, nevertheless, as things are now we in the department of Education cannot do a thing about it. In theory I tell you that the four hundred teachers are supposed to be in their classrooms or in their offices sitting down there all during the summer. Now what this will do is permit us to make those regulations, so that ridiculous situation will not exist. This will not mean that they will not be subject to duty at any time in that period, but it would mean that the department, the minister, could say to a teacher in the technical college, who happens to belong to Corner Brook, "look, go on home to Corner Brook and make your plans for the month that you have off, you have free during the summer when you are not teaching. And

if we do need you we will get in touch with you and give you ample warning.

This would give us the right to treat vocational teachers, although they are
in the same way
civil servants, as the ordinary teachers are treated by their boards of education.

MR. WELLS: If that follows there is no objection, you can do but if it does not
how are you going to have -

MR. ROWE: Well, we cannot do that right now, we cannot. You know these teachers
in those schools were employed as , they were given to understand they were
civil servants when they came on and we certainly cannot take away that right
unilaterally. That would be something subject to negotiation. If they were
to become ^{of} the same status as ordinary teachers, we would then have to set up
and there is, as a matter of fact, there is a provision for doing this. It can
be done and may very well be done, whereby the technical college and the schools,
vocational schools, could be operated by a board set up for that purpose in the
same way, for that matter, as Western Memorial Hospital is operated by a board.
But in the meantime we should do something to, and this is what we recommend
that we will have the authority to remove this ridiculous or theoretically
ridiculous situation which in theory means that the 120 teachers whatever are
over here in the Technical College has to stay there every day during the
summer even though there is not a student over there.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, just a question. I am a little confused on this.
These teachers are civil servants as such, employed by the government. We
have the teachers in the schools who are not civil servants and we have
Memorial University who are not civil servants. Does this follow then that
they will be taken out of the category of being civil servants, as such,
rather than you have one group as civil servants, whether they are teachers
or what not, who are eligible for these benefits say that when school closes
so on and so forth. Another group might be ^{only} able to get two weeks annual
vacation or things like this, Is this the end in sight, that they would be
graded as other teachers and be a sort of a body operated as the minister

I think suggested perhaps by a board like a Board of Education or the Regents at Memorial University? It seems a fairly complicated problem there.

MR. ROWE: I will answer that when I speak.

MR. CROSBIE: My own view is that I think there is some flexibility needed in this and since Technical College and Vocational School Instructors are teachers, although they are civil servants, they have to, I think there is an argument that they cannot be treated just as every other civil servant. That will require some flexibility so that they can be treated in some ways at least as having equivalent benefits as teachers outside the civil service, which I understand is a reason for this amendment. So that regulations can be made governing their summer vacation etc. And therefore, I support the Bill, I think that the fact that they are civil servants is the anomaly and I think it would be better if they were employed by this Crown Corporation or whatever it is that is going to be set up, by a Board. I think this would be much better. I thought there was an act introduced.

MR. ROWE: Passed last year.

MR. CROSBIE: Passed last year was it?

MR. ROWE: Only for the Technical College.

MR. CROSBIE: I think it would be better if there was a separate board or corporation and employed all the Technical College and Vocational Training School Teachers. But in the meantime I think this should be passed.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, -

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, before the minister speaks. One of the reasons why I raised this is that I heard a request on the radio, I think the N.T.A. was pumping for it. There were going to be two additional days at school this year or something like that. This was included in the - that was what we did just now - the N.T.A. was pumping for two additional days pay. If we do this and for some reason or other, two or three or four years from now, the government that succeeds the present government deems it desirable to set up a tri-semester system so that you have, you know, in order to use the buildings

t to their fullest and have pretty well full time with a week off here or two or three weeks off Christmas or whatever the case may be. And we say to these teachers; now this is the new schedule. We are going to be working an additional month and a-half for five or six weeks, an additional ninety days or whatever, we want a proportionate increase in our pay. Has the government contemplated this? Has the government contemplated this problem? Is there any provision made for this? Because, you know, if those teachers follow through in the same way the N.T.A. did, with this extra two days of school, they wanted an increase in pay that would compensate them equivalent for over the year. Now I understand teachers are paid twelve months around, their cheque, I may be wrong -

MR. COLLINS: They are paid for a ten months salary -

MR. ROWE: Only on a ten months -

MR. WELLS: On a ten months salary that is a bit of nonsense it is based on an annual salary that is what it is based on. Now the fact is everybody recognizes that teachers generally, in most elementary and high schools, only work for the ten months of the year. Only teach for ten months of the year! Now if we do this now and it is found necessary in a year or two years from now to set up a tri-semester system, we are going to be in trouble

MR. ROWE: I can answer that, is there anybody else Mr. Chairman? I will only take half a minute actually. These teachers in the Vocational School and in the Technical College are taken on as Civil Servants and they understand that they have all the obligations of Civil Servants. Therefore, any thing that we might do by way of regulation, under this amendment here, will be designed in such a way that they will understand they are not relieved of any obligation under their Civil Service contract at all.

MR. WELLS: - the minister may revoke it any time.

MR. ROWE: Precisely. This will simply be a convenience that if somebody does want to go and visit his cousin over in Austria in the month of August well he can do it. Now he cannot do it at all. He could do it by applying

June 16 1970 Tape 1268 page 7.

to me and I would say, "Yes, boy, we are not going to need you until the first day of September, go on over to Austria, or you know - even New York. I move second reading.

On motion Bill read a second time ordered referred to Committee of the Whole House, presently by leave.

MR.SPEAKER: It being one o'clock I do now leave the Chair until 3:00 p.m.



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 116

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, JUNE 16, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House resumed at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair:

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Mr. Speaker, with the forebearance of the House, I have the answers to several questions. Question 187, I have not the date of that question, but it was in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's West. Question 187, the answer is no. Question 238, in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's Centre, St. John's Centre? Yes, the Leader of the Opposition. This firm was retained to participate with a representative of the Government of Canada, and with Provincial officials in a review of the Government's cost benefit study relating to the supply of subsidized power for industries. That is Stone and Webster. Question 246, in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's West, no date given in this reply - the answer to the first part is no. The answer to the second part is no. Question 248, in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's West, the negotiations - the answer is yes to the first part, we have been negotiating with Mr. Ginter with regard to his taking over the building which is the property of the Government. The answer to the second part is yes, and the answer to all the three is no. Question 253, in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's West, The description "special assistant" and the description "executive assistant," are somewhat vague, and it is a bit difficult to determine what the hon. member has in mind. There are no officers with either of these specific titles in the office of the Premier, and in that connection the hon. gentleman might see the answer to question 254.

As far as other ministers are concerned, the question should be directed to them individually. I do not think that any of them have executive assistants, or at least anybody on their staff with that title.

Question 432, in the name of the hon. the member for Fortune Bay. Mr. Herman Batten's position in my office is that of liaison officer with industrial projects with which he is required to keep an intimate touch in my behalf as I just do not have the time to keep as closely in touch with them physically out on the site as I would like to do. The answer to the second part is, subhead 303-01, and the answer to the third part is that he resigned

from public service on the 31st. of August, 1969, and he was re-employed on the 5th. of November 1969. He was not of course paid by the Government while he was not working for the Government.

MR. CURTIS: Number 31.

MR. SPEAKER: Item 31, second reading of a Bill, " An Act Furhter To Amend The Income Tax Act, 1961." (74)

MR. E. JONES: Mr. Speaker, the House will remember a few days ago that the Premier made an announcement because of certain changes in the mode and method of collecting income and corporation tax where Newfoundland would benefit considerably in the coming year. As the House is also aware, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government collects income and corporation tax on behalf of the Province of Newfoundland, and they do so on their tax agreement, During the past year, the Federal Government made certain changes in their income tax laws and the method of the laws covering the collection of income and corporation tax. They have requested us, if we will conform with their present legislation by bringing in this amendment to our own Provincial Income Tax Act. I move second reading.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, in connection with this Bill, it was announced, when the minister was out west there a week or two ago, there was an announcement that the Government of Canada would remit, I think it is to the Provinces earlier than it usually does, the corporation tax collected in the Provinces. So, the effect would be that we receive more money this financial year than, say, the last year. Would the minister just explain that to the House. That is connected with this amendment, is it not?

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. gentleman speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. JONES: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if I can explain the details of this arrangement, except to say that this Bill, this amendment here, would give effect to the proposed legislation. The best information - I am not an income tax expert, they are speeding it up I understand from twelve payments to thirteen and that they will draw down money from - the corporations will be required to speed up their payments to the Federal Government, and in turn we will get ^{it} in the Province a bit faster, But the best information I can give

this House, after meeting between my officials and the officials of the Federal Income Tax Department of Revenue and what have you, is that the actual details of this and the full benefit and impact on our revenue for this year will not be known until sometime around July.

As you know, the collection and distribution of income and corporation tax is a fairly complicated matter, and we should know by July just what the impact will be. As I said earlier, in opening this debate, this Bill will give effect to the amendments made in the Federal Income Tax Law.

On motion Bill, read a second time, ordered referred to a committee of the whole House presently, by leave.

MR. CURTIS: Number 65 and number 30.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of a Bill, "An Act To Provide For Ownership Of Individual Units In Buildings." (65)

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to pretend to analyse this Bill in great detail. The effect of the Bill is to allow either the building of apartments or the conversion of apartments into units so that one could buy an apartment as part of the building and sell it again. The idea could be best conveyed perhaps in this way - suppose, for instance, one of the housing company buildings was converted into condominiums, every tenant would be able to buy his own apartment, and he would own his own apartment. He could sell his own apartment, he could mortgage it, he could do what he likes with it, he could treat it as if it were a separate house although it is only an apartment in an apartment building.

The way it works is that there are certain features of the building which are in common with all tenants. The tenants pay - each tenant pays his own share of these common parts of the building, such as for instance the roof, the cleaning, the maintenance of the halls, perhaps heat, perhaps electric light and all that. The great advantage, of course, is that a tenant who lives in that type of building does not have to pay income tax on what he would otherwise be paying as rent. He can have his money invested in the apartment, therefore, he does not have to pay rent for the apartment, therefore

he does not have to earn money, pay income tax on it and use the balance to pay rent. He can save considerably in that manner.

It is a type of building that is getting very popular throughout the North American Continent now, and I think my hon. friend is worried as to.....

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CURTIS: Well yes, suppose for instance now you have an apartment. The rent for that apartment would be \$100. per month. You have to pay \$100. a month. To get that \$100. to pay, you have to earn perhaps \$150. a month, because, fifty percent of it goes to income tax.

MR. WELLS: (Inaudible)

MR. CURTIS: Fifty percent of your income I said, fifty percent.

MR. MURPHY: You are not referring to the tenant, you are referring to the landlord.

MR. CURTIS: In this case there is no landlord, no tenant. You are your own owner, you are co-owner of an apartment building. But you see, the money Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: It is the same as a dwelling house.

MR. CURTIS: It is the same as if it were your own dwelling house. Now, if you have a dwelling house, Mr. Speaker, you pay municipal taxes on it, but you do not pay income tax on it. Whereas, if you rent a house.....

MR. WELLS: The money you earn will pay your mortgage.

MR. CURTIS: Yes, but on the other hand, if you rent - if you pay rent, the money with which you pay rent you have to pay income tax on.

MR. WELLS: The same goes with mortgage payments.

MR. CURTIS: Yes I know, but suppose you have it paid off, there is no such thing as paying off your rent if you are a tenant. I think those of us here who are lawyers.....

MR. COLLINS: - - - - - landlord as opposed to a corporation or a cooperative group

MR. CURTIS: Well, in respect it is the same as a cooperative group, the only thing is, it gives you legal title to a portion of a building rather than a whole building. For instance, you might own the upstairs flat of a house, and

you can sell the upstairs flat. You can own the downstairs flat and you can sell the downstairs flat. You can own any portion of the building and it is yours to buy and sell and to have. So, that instead of becoming a tenant, you are an owner and as owner you only pay your share of the common cost.

I think my friends here, who are lawyers, can probably follow it better than those who are not. I do think it is a form that is desirable to have. I think that since there is some buildings that we are putting up now might well be transferred into condominiums, which would mean that instead of ten people paying rent for ten apartments to a common landlord, each of these ten would own his own apartment. It would all be a big partnership, each paying his own share of the general overhead.

MR. MURPHY: Would the Housing Corporation be prepared at this time to do this with the Churchill Square apartments? Is this the idea?

MR. CURTIS: I am not saying that they would or that they would not. It does open a door. It opens a door to making a new type of dwelling house, which people can own. They can own an apartment instead of owning a house. They can sell an apartment instead of selling a house, and all I can say is this Mr. Speaker, that this Bill has been drafted from Nova Scotia Legislation, it has been drafted from legislation all across Canada, and the man who came up with it came from Scotland. He is on the staff downstairs, and he has also incorporated some of the provisions which they have in Scotland.

I am not pretending that the Bill is perfect. The Bill may have to be amended from time to time, but it is an endeavour to try out this system of ownership so that if people want to take advantage of it they can. I think people will take advantage of it, For instance, they tell ^{me} that if you were going down to Nassau you can buy a condominium, you can buy an apartment. When you are away you just pay the overhead for maintenance of the rooms and the heat and the care. I think that kind of - in our modern society, I think this type of building is going to become more popular as time goes on. I would move the second reading, with the view of getting the feelings of the House on it.

MR. MURPHY: This thing in theory sounds excellent, and I think it would be 7461

a wonderful thing if you got ten or twelve people together with common interests to do such a thing. Looking forward, there are so many problems that could confront. For example, I had one there, say, I did have one in this and I was fairly well liked and respected in this condominium and I decided to sell, well I might sell to a person who perhaps would not be in the least desirable to the rest of the tenants. There would be common things, and I am thinking, I am just trying to visualize, say we had a three storey thing, well the guy on the first flat he would look after that, and then we have a stairs going to the second flat which the second storey tenants would use, we have one going to the third flat which the third storey tenant - you know there are common things.

You mentioned the roof, well someone will have to be responsible between them all to keep the roof repaired. There must be an entrance way in the hallway before you go into your apartment. You have a window on this end of the hall here perhaps looking out, that is not owned by anybody in particular but common to the rest of the building. I am just wondering

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is the difference between eight houses in a row along a street, a row of housing, eight houses.....

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And eight houses tipped straight up one on top of the other?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, well all right, who is responsible for the stairs on the fourth floor?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. MURPHY: Well, there will not be an individual owner.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not the stairs, no.

MR. MURPHY: I just wondered, or the roof as the.....

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would not worry too much about it.

MR. MURPHY: These are some of the thoughts that struck me on it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If I were the Leader of the Opposition this would be the least of my worries.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I mean I am partly.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: In housing, no

MR. MURPHY: I am very interested, very much interested.

MR. CROSBIE: I think that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition will probably be the first - one of the first to move into a condominium when he becomes Premier.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the big one?

MR. MURPHY: What about the chief, what about the estate?

MR. CROSBIE: The chief is going to have to stay out of the condominiums.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have to die before any other Premier can live in that.

MR. MURPHY: I was not aware of that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh yes, I am allowed to live in it till I die, and my wife if she survives me.

MR. CROSBIE: It is going to be a great mausoleum out there Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: So, there will be nobody in the Chamber at the moment, well I would not say that exactly, but no one on that side who will ever live in that house.

MR. CROSBIE: It is going to be like Lenin's tomb Mr. Speaker. We hope that the Premier will be there just like Lenin, and the people will line up every Sunday on Roache's Line. This is in many long years to come, of course, we do not wish it to happen too soon.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not expect to stay Premier any more than another eight or nine years.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, it is not always what we wish that happens.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is the hon. gentleman kidding?

MR. MURPHY: I will let the hon. gentleman carry on

MR. SMALLWOOD: The greatest little kidder in the House.

MR. MURPHY: This is not a Bill to create a new Premier for Newfoundland.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the minister was good enough to let us have a copy of this Bill some time ago, and this is legislation that is in effect in Nova Scotia and other Canadian Provinces. I think it originated down in Florida or other States of the United States, New York, what it does is permit a person to own an apartment instead of renting one. Whether or not ten people may agree to put up a condominium between them, or they might not, but any

developer who wants to can build now,if this is passed, and he observes the
legislation, an apartment building and then advertise the apartment units for
sale. Anybody interested, there maybe 20,000.....

Mr. Crosbie.

interested. They may be \$20,000 an apartment or \$25,000 or \$30,000. Whoever wants to will be able to buy an apartment. He can mortgage the apartment. There will be a new registry in the Registry of Deeds - the Condominium Registry in which there will be registered the plans of this building with a number assigned to each apartment unit and all the plans in the registry and the person will be able to buy an apartment and get a mortgage from a mortgage company on the apartment or if he has the money just buy the apartment. The whole building will be regulated by a corporation that each condominium will have to have in which each apartment owner will be a member of the corporation and that corporation will look after the common areas of the building - the hallways and so on. All the common elements will be looked after and each apartment owner will have to pay so much a month to the corporation to look after the charges that are going to be assessed for all the repairs and maintenance of the common areas of the building.

It is all provided for in the Act. It has been very successful elsewhere. Nobody knows how popular or unpopular it might be in Newfoundland. But for people who do not want to build their own home but who would like to own an apartment rather than paying rent every month - have something that they are going to own, that they can sell or their heirs can sell after they die and get their money back, instead of having it all paid out in rent, this will give them an opportunity to do that, and as the minister says, there may be a turn out in practise that there may have to be some amendments to this, But as far as I could see, looking it over, it seems to have everything covered that one would think would need to be covered in this. I think it is very much to be encouraged. When the first condominium will be built in Newfoundland, I do not know.

Mr. Crosbie.

Well whoever is an alert builder should certainly try one as soon as the legislation is passed. I believe that at present an apartment building could be turned into a condominium also, if the necessary steps are carried out in accordance with the legislation.

Now if the man who builds a condominium cannot sell all the apartments, well, of course, there is nothing to stop him from going ahead and renting the ones he cannot sell. You know he may be able to sell five and have to rent five to other people, and he would be the owner of the other five. So, I think the principle is very worthwhile, whether buying apartments is any cheaper than a house, I do not know. I do not know how the construction costs compare. But some of the buildings that have been built, it would be more expensive. But even Elizabeth Towers, eventually, if it were decided to sell it or if the Government wished to get some of its money back immediately, instead of waiting, it could be turned into a condominium and some of the apartments sold or all the apartments sold. I certainly support the Bill, and I think it is a very good piece of legislation.

On motion a Bill, "An Act To Provide For Ownership Of Individual Units In Buildings," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. CURTIS: No. 33.

Motion, second reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Chairman Of Board Of Commissioners Of Public Utilities Pension Act, 1968, (Bill no. 70).

MR. CURTIS: I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, the second reading of this Bill.

Section 5(1)(c) of The Chairman Of Board Of Commissioners Of Public Utilities (Pension) Act, 1968, provides, inter alia, that the service of the Chairman of the Board shall not be considered as service of an established Civil Servant unless payments, which would have been or are hereafter payable by

Mr. Curtis

the Province with respect to an established Civil Servant for the purposes of the new Pension Plan, have been and are made by the Board with respect of the Chairman. In fact no payments have been made by the Province with respect to an established Civil Servant and none are contemplated.

The amendment repeals paragraph 5(1)(c) and provides that payments shall be made by the Board in respect of its Chairman in amounts sequent to those deducted from the salary of the Chairman and paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

I do not know whether anybody understands that, but it does really provide for payments to be made by the Board of Public Utilities to the Government, equivalent to what the Government would have to pay to the fund with respect to the Chairman's pension.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I think - I do not know what the position is of the other employees of the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities - Do they have their own Pension Plan? They have their own. So, what I gather - this is providing, really, that the employer of the Chairman, which is the Board, make a contribution towards this pension. The Government of the Province are actually going to pay the Chairman's pension. But this requires the Board to match the contribution that the Chairman is now making under the new Pension Plan, so that the Board has also made some contribution to his pension. That is the effect of the amendment is it not?

On motion a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Chairman Of The Board Of Commissioners Of Public Utilities (Pension) Act, 1968," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, before the next order is called, could I have consent of the House to give answers to two questions. Question no. 254 in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's West. It is too long to give orally. It is a list of the employees, the members of the staff in my office and their functions and salaries. Question no 279 in the name of

Mr. Smallwood.

the same hon. member. The answer to the first part is, no. The answer to the second part is, no. The answer to the third part is, no.

Motion, second reading of a Bill, An Act To Authorize The Lieutenant Governor-In-Council To Enter Into An Agreement With British Newfoundland Corporation Ltd And N. M. Rothschild & Sons, Supplemental To The Agreement Dated The Twenty-First Day Of May, 1953 As Heretofore Amended.

MR. CURTIS: - Mr Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill, When in 1953, the Government made an agreement with Rothschild, which ultimately became BRINCO, the Government had nothing to go on but a map of the Labrador, and the various areas which were granted to the company were delineated on a map and that map formed part of the agreement. Since then, these areas have been surveyed. The object of this Act is simply to substitute, for the lines on the map attached to the 1953 Act, to substitute for those lines a written description, which is prepared by proper draftsmen from on the spot surveys. I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the minister can confirm for the House that it is only an improvement in the quality of the description. It does not increase in anyway the area. It is just to give a more accurate description of those areas already existing. That is all. That is fine.

On Motion a Bill, "An Act To Authorize the Lieutenant Governor-In-Council To Enter Into An Agreement With British Newfoundland Corporation Ltd And N.M. Rothschild & Sons, Supplemental To The Agreement Dated The Twenty-First Day Of May, 1953, As Heretofore Amended," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

7468

Motion second reading of a Bill, "An Act To Repeal The Salt Cod Fish Marketing (Control) Act, 1964."

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, Bill no. 76 and 77 - The Salt Cod Fish Marketing (Control) Act, 1964, is being superseded by the Act no. 8 of 1970 known as the Salt Fish Marketing Act and it is, therefore, desirable to have it repealed and removed from the Statutes. I move second reading for the two Bills.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Repeal The Salt Cod Fish Marketing (Control) Act, 1964," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

On motion a Bill, "An Act To Repeal The Salt Cod Fish Marketing Board Act, 1964," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

Motion second reading of a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Avalon Telephone Company Act, 1943."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is to add, to the area to be served by the Avalon Telephone Company, the community of Cormack on the West Coast. This Bill enables that to be done. I move second reading.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, if no objection from this side of the House - people in the community of Cormack have for sometime been trying to get the Avalon Telephone to install a telephone system there - they have gone wherever they hoped somebody might install a telephone system. At the moment there are, I believe, two or it may have been cut back to one telephone in the co-op stores. One company after the other had an excuse - there was not sufficient funds, it was in the other's area and so on. Now Cormack is not the only community. It is in a similar boat. There are several communities throughout the Province in a similar boat. but

Mr. Wells.

I am delighted to see that this will now add the community of Cormack to the Avalon Telephone area, and I would hope that the telephone company can see its way clear, in the reasonably near future, to provide a telephone system within the community. It is badly overdue, and it should not take a great deal of - it is not too far removed from existing telephone exchanges.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I presume that this means that the Avalon franchised territory has been extended to include Cormack.

In view of what the hon. member for Humber East just said, evidently there are some other areas in Newfoundland which falls outside the franchised areas of responsibility and jurisdiction of Canadian National or Avalon Telephone or both, which means, Sir, that there could be areas in Newfoundland which might never be developed because neither of the major telephone companies have an interest or a responsibility there. The people could be denied a service and it would be very difficult to bring pressures to bear on them. It has always been my contention, Mr. Speaker, that if a telephone company has a franchise over a certain region, they certainly have a responsibility to provide services to all of the people in that region, given time and so on and so forth, bearing in mind the great costs involved. But certainly, they should not be permitted to get away with this business of refusing to provide service for too long a period.

Perhaps when the minister speaks again, he might indicate to the House how many areas are outside franchised areas in Newfoundland and if it is the intention of the Government to extend or at least place those areas within the franchised jurisdiction of one company or the other?

MR. CURTIS: I am really unable, Mr. Speaker, to answer that question. I would almost have to be given notice of it. I am not quite sure. I suppose that

Mr. Curtis.

question would come under - I do not know - I do not know . It is hardly under ^{the} Minister of Justice. It might come under Public Utilities, but they only deal with the rates. Yes, but the Public Utilities only deal with the rates, I believe, do they not? I am trying to get the information for the hon. member, if he will care to communicate with me outside the House.

On motion a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Avalon Telephone Company Act, 1943," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presentiv by leave.

Motion a second reading of a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Public Utilities Act, 1964." (Bill no. 82).

MR. CURTIS: This, Mr. Speaker, is a Bill to Amend The Public Utilities Act. As the explanatory notes say, the Bill would amend the principal Act to remove hotels and motels from the definition of Public Utilities in respect of their internal telephone communication systems. It comes under Clauses, 2 and 3. "It would authorize the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities to engage legal counsel and delete the provision whereby legal counsel is engaged by the Minister of Justice (Clauses 4 and 5)" I might say the reason for that Clause is that originally the Board of Public Utilities was just an arm of the Government. The Government paid the shot for the Minister. The Department of Justice provide the lawyers and we paid the entire shots.

Now the Board is entirely self-supporting and just as the Workmen's Compensation Board engages its own lawyers, just as the Labrador Power Commission engages its lawyers, so the Public Utilities Commission engage their own lawyers and so, be sure they are not just at the whim of the Justice Department.

We have been asked from time to time by various departments to designate counsel for them - the Department of Health has been asking us

Mr. Curtis.

for counsel. The Department of Labour has been asking us and it has not proven satisfactory. I think, actually, it would be a lot better if each of these departments could engage their own lawyers and not have to go to Justice every time they need to prosecute or to get their law interpreted.

The Act also requires the approval of the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities to certain agreements. It also would extend the provisions of Section 61 of the principal Act to telephone services. At present it applies only to electrical power and to water. Lastly, it would authorize the Board to order any extension of the service by Public Utilities even though that extension may not be compensatory within a reasonable time, where the extension would otherwise be reasonable. These are just the formal amendments that have been requested by the Board and I move second reading of this Bill.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Bill - the new Section 4: "The Board may employ such legal counsel and so on as the Board needs - the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities. There was a question asked in the House this year by the hon. member for Bonavista North which got a very peculiar answer. The question was; "what lawyers or law firms have the Government retained or any Government agency retained since January 1, 1969 - to do any legal work for the Government or any agency or branch of the Government?" The answer to that was tabled in the House - three or four lawyers who are working on the consolidation of Statutes for the - you know, which is going to be published this year we hope. These apparently - according to the minister's answer these are the only lawyers in Newfoundland engaged by the Government or any agency of the Government to do any legal work for the Government or any agency in the last year in half - now that is obviously wrong. The answer was not correct. There are the lawyers who do the work for the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities. There are lawyers who do the work for the Workmen's Compensation

Mr. Crosbie.

Board. There are other solicitors who do work for collections under the S.S.A. tax. There are lawyers who work on expropriations - the Department of Public Works. There are lawyers who have done work for the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. There are lawyers retained by the Government to act in connection with the Melville Pulp and Paper Mill Project.

So, I meant to draw to the minister's attention the answer before. I could give him the number of the question but the question was most improperly answered. It was; "what lawyers or law firms have been retained in any of those capacities and what have they been paid?" Because, we, in the profession, are always anxious to see how the others are doing, we are sure that that would be an interesting answer, if we got it. So, I just would remind the minister or I can give the minister the number of the question after.

The Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities - the minister says is now self-supporting. That is they are self-supporting because the utilities they control have to pay them certain fees. So, they are able to pay their own accountants, lawyers and so on. They do not have to get any money from the Government to do it. The only other question I had was the new Section 26 (3) - the Public Utilities is not to enter into any agreements for leasing or renting property and so on which requires the payment in excess of \$2,500 in any year without first securing approval thereof by the Board.

Now I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, why that is required. It seems to be quite a minor thing that the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities should have to say to Avalon Telephone or Newfoundland Light and Power that they should have to get permission to rent property, if it comes to more than \$2,500 a year - get permission or approval first from the board. I wonder does the minister know why that is required?

Mr. Crosbie,

And is this usual - is that a usual requirement where Public Utilities regulations are concerned? It may be that they want to prevent a corporation from paying out excessive rent to associated companies or something like that. So, would the minister explain what it is needed for?

MR. WELLS: Before the minister speaks on that point, Mr. Speaker, it does seem rather stringent and I can only assume that the purpose behind it is to regulate the cost that goes into the rate base, because the rates are set and determined by percentage return on the rate base and the rate base is the total capital investment that the utility company has. I cannot see the necessity for this because the discretion will always remain with the Board to include or exclude such a payment from the rate base. If they feel that it is improperly paid, they can inquire into, when the Utility goes before the Board, to have its rate base established. The Public Utilities - the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities can always inquire into any transaction to find out or to determine the propriety of it. If it is improper - if it is excessive, they can refuse to allow it to go into the rate base. It is far better to give the Board that kind of discretion for the purpose of regulation than to so tie down the hands of what - otherwise private companies - that they cannot dispose of an asset or cannot expend money on an asset costing in excess of \$2,500, in any one year by way of leasing or renting property or the right to use any property. It seems to be a pretty stringent control. I do not know, perhaps the Utilities have agreed with it. Has there been any expression of opinion from the Utilities such as Newfoundland Light and Power, Avalon Telephone, Bowater Power Company and others that are regulated by the Board of Commissioners

Mr. Wells.

of Public Utilities? I would like to hear an expression of opinion from them before this was approved, because this seems pretty stringent. The same aim could be achieved by giving to the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities, if they do not now have it, giving them the discretion to either include or exclude such expenditures from the rate base.

MR. WELLS:

The same aims have been achieved but that seems pretty stringent.

MR. CURTIS: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I am not able to answer that question entirely. The change has been made at the request of the Department of Public Utilities and I presume that when they made their request that the request was reasonable because obviously they are not trying to make trouble for themselves and I think they must have found in the course of their work -

MR. WELLS: No, this would give them too much power.

MR. CURTIS: It gives them power but I have had no criticism, no objection. This Bill has been printed now for some while and circulated and I would presume that Public Utilities concerned know about it. Actually there are only about two or three -

MR. WELLS: There are only two or three Public Utilities but -

MR. CURTIS: And there has been no criticism. I tell you, I am prepared, Mr. Speaker, to hold up the third reading pending a satisfactory explanation from the Chairman as to the reason for this Legislation.

MR. WELLS: Would the Minister also make sure that the two or three Public Utilities concerned that they are advised of it and get their views on it?

MR. CURTIS: Well, I will find out if they have been advised to. Now with regard to the question of my hon. friend, the member for St. John's West, ask about lawyers, that question is directed to me and has not been answered. The answer that he has quoted came from another question and not the question that he refers to. I think he will find that because I have been trying to find out, for instance, I am ask "Who is the lawyer for the Workmen's Compensation Board?" I just do not know. What he is paid? I just do not know. He will ask me "Who is the lawyer for the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission?" I do not know. I have to try to find out from them and likewise the other lawyers to which my hon. friend referred. I only know of the lawyers that are engaged by my department and those are the only expenditures that I have any control over. So I have not been able to answer that question and the question that my hon. friend ask was another one altogether. I think probably there were two or three questions about lawyers and I think probably they overran one another but certainly the answer that my hon. friend referred to was not given by me in

MR. CURTIS:

answer to the question which I remember and which I have been unable to answer as yet.

On motion, Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

On motion, that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act To Provide For Ownership Of Individual Units In Buildings," Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. NOEL CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE:

On motion, Clauses 1,2,3,4,6, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The attention of the Committee is drawn to page (6), paragraph (4) at the foot of the page, the second last line on page (6) - if such matters, things. It is matter, it should be singular - if such matter, thing. For the purpose of the record we will have an amendment.

On motion, amendment carried.

Clause (7), sub-clause (3) on page (8) the third line presently reads all persons whose signatures in the instrument are to be dispensed with and the amendment is signatures to the instrument are to be dispensed with.

On motion, amendment carried.

Clause (7), sub-clause (4) the third line from the end of the clause you will notice the word "the" appears twice before judge, "the the judge" delete one "the".

On motion, amendment carried.

On Clause (8), the amendment to Clause (8)(a), "there is registered at the Registry." That should be "there is registered in the Registry".

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, Clause (8) as amended carried.

Clause (9), sub-clause (4a) on page (10) - "Sections 11 to 19 of that Act(which relates -" Change relates to relate.

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, Clause (9) as amended carried.

On motion, Clauses 10,11,12,13, carried.

Clause (14), sub-clause (1e) - "specifying the functions and duties

MR. CHAIRMAN:

of the corporation and the board of directors:", delete the colon and make a semicolon. It should be a semicolon and not a colon.

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, Clause (14) as amended carried.

On motion, Clauses 15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22, carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 65 with some amendments.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act To Amend The Chairman Of The Board Of Commissioners Of Public Utilities (Pension) Act, 1968."

On motion, Clauses 1,2,3, carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 70 with no amendments.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Income Tax Act, 1961."

On motion, Clauses 1, 2, carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 74 with no amendments.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act To Repeal The Salt Codfish Marketing (Control) Act, 1964."

On motion, Clauses 1, 2, carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 76 with no amendments.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act To Repeal The Salt Codfish Marketing Board Act, 1964."

On motion, Clauses 1, 2, carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 77 with no amendments.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act To Authorize The Lieutenant-Governor In Council To Enter Into An Agreement With British Newfoundland Corporation Limited And N. M. Rothschild & Sons, Supplemental To The Agreement Dated The Twenty-First Day Of May, 1953, As Heretofore Amended."

On motion, Clauses 1,2,3, carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 78 with no amendments.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Avalon Telephone Company Act, 1943."

On motion, Clauses 1, 2 carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 81 with no amendments.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Public Utilities Act, 1964."

On motion, Clauses 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8, carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 82 with no amendments.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Technical And Vocational Training Act, 1963."

On motion, Clauses 1,2, carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 61 with no amendments.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act To Validate And Provide For The Enforcement Of A Certain Agreement Between The Heads Of Certain Religious Denominations Respecting The Apportionment And Payment Of Certain Moneys Allocated By The Province For Certain Educational Purposes In Respect To The Fiscal Year 1962-1963 And To Hold Her Majesty Bound By Such Agreement."

On motion, Clauses 1,2,3,4, carried.

On motion, Schedule carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 60 with no amendments.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Pensions (Premiums) Act, 1966-67."

On motion, Clauses 1,2,3,4, carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 55 with no amendments.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Civil Service Act."

On motion, Clauses 1,2,3, carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 56 with no amendments.

On motion that the Committee rise and report having passed Bills No. 55, 56, 60, 61, 70, 74, 76, 77, 78, 81, and 82 with no amendments and Bill No. 65 with some amendments, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

ordered

On Motion report received and adpoted, Bills, read a third time presently by leave.

On Motion Bill No. 55, "An Act Further To Amend The Pensions (Premiums) Act, 1966-67, read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On Motion Bill No. 56, "An Act Further To Amend The Civil Service Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On Motion : Bill No. 60, "An Act To Validate And Provide For The Enforcement Of A Certain Agreement Between The Heads Of Certain Denominations Respecting The Apportionment And Payment Of Certain Monies Allocated By The Province For Certain Educational Purposes In Respect To The Fiscal Year 1962-63 And To Hold Her Majesty Bound By Such Agreement," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On Motion Bill No. 61, "An Act Further To Amend The Technical And Vocational Training Act, 1963," read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

On Motion Bill No. 70, "An Act Further To Amend The Chairman Of The Board Of Commissioners Of Public Utilities (Pension) Act, 1968," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On Motion Bill No. 74, "An Act Further To Amend The Income Tax Act, 1961," read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

On Motion Bill No. 76, "An Act To Repeal The Salt Codfish Marketing (Control) Act, 1964," read a third time, order, passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

On Motion Bill No. 77, "An Act To Repeal The Salt Codfish Marketing Board Act, 1964," read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

On Motion Bill No. 78, "An Act To Authorize The Lieutenant-Governor In Council To Enter Into An Agreement With British Newfoundland Corporation Limited And N.M. Rothschild & Sons, Supplemental To The Agreement Dated The Twenty-First Day of May, 1953, As Heretofore Amended," read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

On Motion Bill 81, "An Act Further To Amend The Avalon Telephone Company Act, 1943," read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

The Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred, and directed him to report having passed Bill No. 65 with some amendments, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion that the report of this Committee be concurred in.

On Motion Bill No. 65, " A Bill, An Act To Provide For Ownership Of Individual Units In Buildings," read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

On Motion second reading of a Bill, " An Act Respecting The Organization, Operation, Functions, Powers, Duties, Rights and Privileges Of The Constabulary Force of Newfoundland. (Bill No. 49)

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, about fifty years ago, I was a student of Law in the Department of Justice. The Deputy Minister of Justice in those days was Mr. Charles H. Hutchings. Mr. Hutchings had been in charge of a brigade known as the "Methodist Guards", and at that time, of course, there were other brigades too, there was the Church Lads Brigade, and there was the C.C.C., there was also the Newfoundland Highlanders. But, Mr. Hutchings always fancied himself, and he was always interested in boys brigades. So when there was a vacancy in the police force, he had himself

MR. CURTIS: appointed, Inspector General of Constabulary. And he was a pretty good Inspector General, I would like to tell you. He was a great disciplinarian. And I remember one day, we had motor cars come to Newfoundland on display that had peculiar glass in them. You could not see who was in the car, but the people inside could see out. And one day he landed up to the police station in this closed wagon and all the councillors gathered around to see what was in the strange car - the doors opened, up walked the Inspector General, wanted to know what in the hell they were doing with their time. So that was the type of disciplinary he was. But, he had rules for the police force - I have a copy of it here, it is called the "Police Manual", there is no date. But it is a manual for the guidance of the Constabulary Force of Newfoundland. I think it must have been dated around 1918. There is no date on the book. But this little book, under the Inspector General's signature, was given to every man who became a policeman. And it has conditions of service, general principles, promotion, discipline, how to give evidence, how to proceed, arguments on evidence, arguments on crime, what is the object and end of every police force, the Provincial crime and the protection of offenders. And then in legal terms - how is law divided into two kinds, the unwritten or common law and the written statute law. A very interesting little booklet, which was suppose to be given to every council. Well, these are no longer issued to councillors, I understand the contents they used in the course of their instruction.

Now we are reorganizing the police force, and we have promised them and we are glad to do so, a new Bill which provides for the operation of the forces. It is an up-to-date Act. It was drafted after the modern acts in the Provinces of Canada, and it covers everything from the administration to the constitution and organization of the force. It provides for the appoint of the Chief of Police and other members of the force. It provides the oaths to be taken by constables, and others

MR. CURTIS: entering the force. It defines their duties. Details of offences which will not be permitted. It provides that they shall not be in a trade union, and that they shall not strike. There are clauses dealing with binding and arbitration. But, in all cases the arbitration is subject to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council who must approve any finding and such approvals are subject to legislative approval when money is involved. There are other clauses, they provide regulations for the trials of men who are guilty of offences; punishment for charges, such as overholding of complaints and divulging any matter or things that is a duty of his to keep secret, wilfully or through negligence allowing a prisoner to escape. It is a very comprehensive Act, and I understand, Mr. Speaker, it has been approved by the members of the police force. I do not think I need go further than to move the second reading of this Bill, which takes the police force out of the strickly military category and makes the police force subject to the normal civilian control. I move second reading.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, this legislation purports to be a great improvement of course on the situation that it replaces for the Newfoundland Constabulary. There are - I do not know whether the minister said that the Policemens Committee or the organization or whatever it is whether or not they have approved this. I assume that they have been presented with copies of this Act, and that they have approved it.

There are several points in it that, I think, are a bit questionable. Section 19, for example, states that a member shall not remain or become a member of any trade union, nor of any organization that is affiliated directly or indirectly with a trade union. And secondly that a member shall not strike. I wonder why it is necessary, Mr. Speaker, for the Act to state

MR. CROSBIE: that the members are not to become members of a trade union or of any organization affiliated with a trade union? That a member shall not strike? I would think is common in all police forces, and I can see that is a clause that should remain. But I do not see really why, if the majority of the men in the organization wish to become a member of the trade union that they should be prevented from it. However, if they have no strong feelings on it and they have approved the acts, it is not worth making a great fuss about. I do not see why it is necessary to state that. There is one other point in connection with the Act that seems peculiar. Section 20 deals with bargaining and arbitration. And Section 21 - with an arbitration board. And each party decides on a Chairman. And every agreement made under Section 25, every agreement made under Section 20, and every decision or award of a Board of Arbitration under Section 21 is subject to approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, as provided for in Section 27. And Section 27 says, "The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may approve any agreement, decision or award referred to in Section 25 - subject to such qualifications and additions and deletions as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may prescribe." Now it is hard to see, Mr. Chairman, what the effects of -
and
the arbitration clause is certainly by large done away with, if an award or a decision of the arbitration board or an award of the arbitration board may be approved or may not be approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. So although there is arbitration it is not binding - both parties - is not binding on the Government, because Section 27 says: "That the Government, which is the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, may approve or may not approve. So while one can see that obtaining an arbitration award will be pretty persuasive still if it is not binding, the situation is that the men are not permitted to strike. They are not permitted to be

MR. CROSBIE: members of a trade union, they can be members of their own organization. They can go to arbitration, but the one party to the arbitration, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, is not bound by the results of the arbitration, and I think that is a great weakness. I can not really see the point to arbitration - I do see how that settles difference or disputes between the members and the management, if management is not going to be bound by the arbitration award. It is not automatically bound by it, so that is the second weakness in the legislation. For all that however the agreement is an improvement.

One of the things that I was hoping for, Mr. Speaker, when the Fraser Commission on the Revenue Sources of St. John's was appointed, and I think with one of the questions that Mr. Fraser, I hope he is dealing with it, when he makes his report is this, I would think that it would be very interesting to see what the financial results will be if the police force, the Newfoundland Constabulary, which by and large polices the City of St. John's, if that was turned over to the City of St. John's to operate as a Municipal Police Force, and in return the Government agrees to pay the City of St. John's grants in lieu of taxation.

In other words if all Government property in the City of St. John's was assessed - all Government real property was assessed, as all other property is, and you have the valuation of all property owned by the Government in St. John's and took the tax rate and applied it, so that you would see what the Government would pay in taxes, if the Government were in the same category as a private employer, what would that amount to, would it be \$1 million a year, a half million, would it be \$2 million? Would it be sufficient to recompense the City of St. John's for taking over the police force? Now I do not know what such a study would show.

MR. CROSBIE: I am hoping that Mr. Fraser's study will show what would the Government have to pay to the city if it were a normal taxpayer in St. John's or pay the city of St. John's a grant in lieu of taxes equal to what taxes it would pay were it an ordinary taxpaying citizen - including the water tax and the city property tax. Because that may very well be the long-run answer to this problem which annoys everybody else in Newfoundland; that the Newfoundland Constabulary, which is paid for by all the taxpayers of Newfoundland, is by and large restricted in its operations to the policing of St. John's.

So I hope that when Mr. Fraser reports he is including in his Royal Commission Report an assessment of what the situation would be if the city received from the Government compensation or a grant in lieu of taxes in that way and on the other hand the city took over the constabulary. I believe under the estimates this year the operation of the St. John's police force is going to cost \$1,315,000, which I do not believe includes the payment of pensions to policemen who are now on pension. It includes salaries, travelling, office, equipment and supplies, but not pension.

So I hope that when the Commissioner reports we will have some figures to show what the results will be. Because unless the Province is going to pay for the policing of all municipalities, the Province is now paying for the policing of Corner Brook by the R.C.M.P. And the Province makes quite generous grants to all other municipalities in any event, they get a revenue grant, and special grants, and various kinds of assistance. There would be a possible resolution of that problem if the City did take over the police force and the Government paid the city a grant in lieu of taxes because the value of the real estate owned by the Provincial Government in the City of St. John's is in the many millions of dollars. So I hope

MR. CROSBIE: that Mr. Fraser will include those figures in his report.

Just one other matter in connection with the police force, Mr. Speaker, there was a question asked in this House - asked and answered in the House some time ago in connection with the resignation of the Chief of Police. And the question was asked whether the Chief of Police in the City of St. John's had been asked for his resignation? Yes, here it is here, question 497, "Has Mr. Edgar Pittman, Chief of the Newfoundland Constabulary tendered his resignation and requested his pension?" The Minister of Justice answered that no resignation have been received. If Mr. Pittman has tendered his resignation, what date was it tendered? And was his resignation verbal or in writing? None had been received at least by the minister, so the minister said.

Now that is quite an extraordinary answer, Mr. Speaker, because I am sure we all remember that last November it was stated publicly that the Chief of Police had submitted his resignation, presumably to the Premier, and that his resignation was accepted and the Government was going to find a successor to take over as Chief of the Newfoundland Constabulary.

Now the other question was 495, these questions were asked on April 30th. Question 495 asked, "Did the Premier in November 1969 or at anytime request the resignation of Mr. Edgar Pittman?"

MR. NOEL: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: This is on the Newfoundland Constabulary, and Mr. Pittman is the Chief of the Constabulary.

MR. NOEL: As I see this Bill here - It relates to the organization, operation and functions and powers and duties, rights and privileges of the constabulary force in Newfoundland, in the future, what is to be. I think it should be related to that.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I will just say this that -

June 16 1970 Tape 1273 page 1.

we can pass all the Bills we like but unless these questions concerning the constabulary are settled as to everyone's satisfaction it does not matter what legislation is going to be passed there is going to be trouble with the city's constabulary. And when this Bill is passed the constabulary still has to have a Chief of Police. The present Chief of Police is in a position where we are told, at one time, that he has resigned, or his resignation was requested or he submitted it. Then at another time that his resignation is not received. So it is either one or the other. And since this seems to be one of the bones of contention, the present difficulties in the Police Force, it is a question that the minister, I think, should answer now, as to whether the Chief of Police has actually resigned or whether the government is actively looking for a successor to the Chief of Police.

It is also relevant to this debate that there was a meeting last Friday between the Minister of Justice and Newfoundland Constabulary concerning several grievances that the constabulary had at that time. I think the minister should tell us now whether, what the results of that have been. We know that the salary increase has not been carried into effect yet because presumably the estimates were only all passed on Monday. But there are also other difficulties in the Police Force that were mentioned before that meeting.

Certain men who have been leaders of the Police Committee in the recent troubles were transferred from the CID to street patrols. Sergt. Babb, who was reported upon (there was a report made) was transferred to a job that appeared to be a promotion rather than a demotion. Just how are these things proceeding now? I think the minister should report on that. As far as the Bill itself is concerned, it appears to be an advance over the previous situation. But there are still, to my mind, two fatal defects Mr. Speaker. One, that the men have not the freedom to join a trade union or not to join one. Even although forbidden to strike, I see no reason why they cannot be members of a trade union, if they wish to be. Secondly, that the arbitration provided is not binding on the employer under this legislation. Now that being the case, I

June 16 1970 Tape 1273 page 2.

do not think it is an entirely satisfactory situation. If arbitration were stated to be binding in all respects except with respect to the question of salaries, One can see an argument for that. It has been made in this House before. You know only the House can vote money, the government cannot put itself in a position where it must accept binding arbitration in the matter of salaries. But there are many other things that can go to arbitration, having nothing to do with salaries, having to do with working conditions, grievances of that nature, whether a man has been dismissed improperly, whether a man has been demoted improperly, whether the working hours or conditions are right. There are another hundred or a thousand problems that can go to arbitration. And in my view at the very least that section should say that arbitration is binding even on the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, with the exception of arbitration on the matter concerning salaries. It is too broad in my view as it is now, section 27, Lieutenant-Governor in Council may approve any agreement, decision or award subject to qualifications modifications and additions as they may prescribe. So that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council has absolutely a free hand in whether they accept reject or carry out any arbitration award. I think that is a great weakness and it is a great pity that there is not a better clause than that in the Bill.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to concurⁱⁿ the remarks of the hon. member for St. John's West. This Bill obviously has the agreement of the Chief of Police and his men. And if they are satisfied which apparently they are with the provisions in it, I cannot see much of anything wrong with it. The Newfoundland Constabulary, which has a very lengthy and proud history in the law enforcement throughout the Province, should in my opinion continue to be a provincial police force. Now there are arguments advanced to the contrary but, as I see it, the responsibility for enforcement of law and order rests with the Attorney General of the Province. There is a fine distinction there, Mr. Speaker, The Attorney General, I believe, is in a different category from any of his colleagues in Cabinet when it comes to the enforcement

June 16 1970 Tape 1273 Page 3.

of law and order and the prevention of crime. The Cabinet can by directive or decision indicate to some other minister that he shall not do such and such a thing, but it is beyond the competence of Cabinet to direct the Attorney General not to enforce the Criminal Code of Canada. And indeed in the United Kingdom the Attorney General is not a member of Cabinet. He falls in the category somewhere between Cabinet and the Prime Minister. I am sure that this would appeal to the minister of Justice, that the Attorney General is the highest paid electoral official in the British Parliament. There is no minister of Justice in England and it is to preserve the Independence of the Attorney General from the rest of government that I think that practise is followed and it is a good one. Because the Attorney General is really the first law officer of the Crown and in the matters of law enforcement he should not be subjected to any dictates by government or any one else, nor indeed can he be if he so desires.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been from the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities a request, several requests, in so far as municipal policing is concerned throughout the Province. The latest request, which I think has a great deal to commend it, was that the Province assume the full responsibility for policing the municipalities because the municipalities realize that they get additional grants from the Province, but rather that provision be made for the appointment and training. This is quite important because municipalities now find throughout the Province that they are restricted to the hiring of sometimes local people and then putting a uniform on them and sending them out to collect parking tickets or enforce parking laws.

Mr. Chairman, if the constabulary ever became a city police force I believe in the final analysis the cost to the Province would exceed that which it does today, because last year the strength of the force the authorized strength of the Newfoundland Constabulary is 214 officers and men, 171 men and 43 officers. The total number of prosecutions in the last year

June 16 1970 Tape 1273 page 4.

that they reported was 73,854. Now of these prosecutions a very high percentage were traffic violations, breaches of provincial statutes and the other breaches of the criminal code. Then we had on top of that the enforcement of the parking meters and that sort of thing. Now I believe that the time has certainly come when a policeman's duty and time can be much better spent than going around handing out tickets for expired meters. And that if the city was willing to co-operate and maybe there has been an indication, I am not sure of this, that the city is willing to co-operate, that parking meters fines and ticketing should be handed over to meter maids. Again you have to sit down and figure out the cost. Because the cost of providing the magisterial service here and the magistrate's court.

If the magistrate's court is going to be used to enforce tickets and summonses issued by a municipal meter maid, how much of that money should come back to the Province? So it is not a simple answer that can be pulled out of the hat. By and large, if you accept the principle that the sole and exclusive responsibility for the enforcement of law and order anywhere in Newfoundland vests in the Attorney General, then it seems to me it matters very little whether you do it through the R.C.M.P. or through the Newfoundland Constabulary.

Mr. Speaker, a comparison between the cost of the two is not too valid because you have to bear in mind that with the R.C. M.P. the Province pays fifty per cent approximately of the salary bills, some of the operating cost, none of the capital cost and none of the investigative procedures and none of the training cost. I think it costs something like \$20,000 per man, Royal Canadian recruit, not including training, on-going training from thereon. None of that is charged back to the Province. So what you have to look at is the value that is received from the R.C.M.P. for the amount of money that is spent. The R.C.M.P. does not police and will not police cities the size of St. John's. I know when I was minister of Justice the number of requests that I received from municipalities for assistance of municipal

June 16 1970 Tape 1273 page 5.

police would be about five per cent of the number of requests that I received from municipalities asking for a detachment of the R.C.M.P. It was because I believe that they, outside the city of St. John's the R.C.M.P. have built up a very strong following amongst our municipal authorities and people, and that they like to see them there with all the sophisticated law enforcement equipment and training that they have at their disposal.

Mr. Speaker, I presume we are entitled to assume now that the Province has decided that the Newfoundland Constabulary is to continue as a provincial police force. Otherwise there would be very little point in bringing this Act before the Legislature. If this is a decision of government, then I believe and I am sure the minister of Justice will agree with me on this, that that decision having been made, that the time has now come to provide that constabulary with better equipment and better training facilities and better headquarters than it has today. The ramshackled buildings that are presently being used just cannot permit the constabulary to carry out their law enforcement duties in the 1970's.

Mr. Speaker, another thing I believe that is significant in North America today in so far as law enforcement is concerned, up until recently law and order was not a popular subject. There was not a vote in a barrelful. Nobody was too concerned about it. It was a great thing to make an occasional speech about and that is where it was, where it remained. You would hear talks on British Justice, British Law and Order and the British Law Enforcement Procedures. And this was it. Occasionally, after the hon. member for Humber East arrived in this House, we heard something about a sitting Judge in Corner Brook. This is very rapidly changing and there is no reason to suppose that we in Newfoundland are going to escape this change that is taking place in North America. Today in the larger cities of Canada and more particularly in the United States one of the big issues is the enforcement, the fair and efficient and modern enforcement of law and order in North America. The tendency is developing in the United States and the

June 16 1970 Tape 1273 page 6.

tendency is developing in Ontario and Quebec for the provinces to assume more and more responsibility for the overall policing of the Province and again that same policy has now been implemented, as Your Honour knows, in New Brunswick. Quite recently the Maritimes Chiefs of Police Association passed a resolution calling on the governments of the Atlantic Provinces to assume full responsibility for the policing of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, the Maritime Provinces, excluding the enforcement of city by-laws or town by-laws and that sort of thing which does not take too much training to do. I believe that (1) it would be tragic if we ever wound up in this Province with three separate and distinct police forces, the R.C.M.P., the Provincial Police Force, known as the Newfoundland Constabulary, and then a municipal police force in the larger centres.

MR. WELLS: We have that now.

MR. COLLINS: What about the company of Newfoundland Rangers?

MR. HICKMAN: The company of Newfoundland Rangers I suspect, I hope, has died a deservedly but unnatural death. There was not too much as I could see it to commend that piece of legislation that was passed some years ago. In the municipalities throughout Newfoundland now you have some gentlemen who are municipal police. But their responsibilities are restricted to the enforcement of municipal by-laws. They are not municipal police forces in the sense that you find in Ontario and Quebec and even in Nova Scotia where you have the city of Halifax Police Force while Ontario and Quebec are better examples you have the Metropolitan Police Force of Toronto, then the Provincial Police Force of Ontario which two carries a lot of policing within the city of Toronto, and then you have the R.C.M.P. also carrying out policing in the city of Toronto. And there is more overlapping, more wasting of money, more redundancy can arise out of that than one can imagine. I believe you will find in North America and certainly in Canada as Attorneys General and it is the Attorney General not the Government of Newfoundland is responsible for, nor the city of St. John's nor the city of Halifax, that is responsible for the enforcement of the criminal code and any rights that any city acquire are rights that are

June 16 1970 Tape 1273 page 7.

delegated to them are responsibilities of the Attorney General and no one else. I would assume therefore that the enactment of this legislation means that a policy decision has now been made by government with respect to the Newfoundland Constabulary and that the necessary training facilities will be provided.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a few years ago, I think it was when the hon. Davey Fulton was Minister of Justice, and I know it was reactivated when Mr. Pennell was solicitor general, the Government of Canada indicated that it realized its responsibility to the provinces with respect to the enforcement of law and order. So far the Parliament of Canada has gotten away pretty cheap. They passed the Criminal Code and then said to the provinces, you enforce it. (with very little involvement on the part of the Federal Government other than its cost to the R.C.M.P.) Following that line of thinking and realizing that provincial Attorneys General either themselves or through delegated powers to some large municipalities where enforcing the Criminal Code, there was a decision made and it was announced, I think in the early sixties, that in Ottawa there would be built a National Police College. The idea behind that was that Provincial Police Forces could at least send their officers and selected men to this National Police College for training comparable to that received by the R.C.M.P., and training that no one single province could ever afford to provide and certainly no one municipality could ever afford to provide. This was to be made available as well to municipal or metropolitan police forces. Now I do not know what the status is on that whether it has been caught up with the austerity programme. I think that the hon. Minister of Justice will recall that plans had been formulated and I believe a sight had been chosen and selected for the building of this National Police College and it seems to me that the Government of Canada is not being very generous or charitable when it embarks on that sort of programme, rather it is only paying back and discharging some of the responsibilities that it has to the province. I would hope that we will see representation

June 16 1970 Tape 1273 page 8.

from the various provincial governments in the larger municipalities to the Government of Canada urging them to pursue the announced decision, at one time, of building a good police college because small police forces just cannot give the type of sophisticated training that we are going to need for law enforcement in this Province or anywhere else in 1970. The Act I hope goes a long way towards that principle and I am very happy to support it.

MR. CURTIS: The Attorneys General are having a meeting. We originally planned to have it in July. It is now scheduled for August.

MR. HICKMAN: Here?

MR. CURTIS: No, not here, no. In Halifax as a matter of fact. And I am hoping then to bring up the question that my hon. friend has raised, which by the way has not come before, officially, since I took over. So I suppose he must have buried it before he left -

MR. HICKMAN: No it did not come when I was there either. It came when you were there before.

MR. CURTIS: I see. It is so long since it has been coming now it is almost required by statute. With respect to the point raised by my hon. friend from St. John's West, I might say it would be intolerable to have a police force a member of a Trade Union. Can you imagine a Trade Union in Vancouver having some difficulty and calling out the Police Force in St. John's as a sympathy strike. Would not the very idea strike as protest. If a police force was allowed to join the Trade Union, that is the time things would happen. They would be called out for sympathy strike for something that has happened away, thousands and thousands of miles away. Now justice does not work that way. I mean a police force has to be always on the job. It would be out of the question to have a police force, tied up to Trade Unions, vowed to go out on a sympathy strike whenever they are called upon to do so. That would never do.

MR. CROSBIE: You could still have the clause saying they cannot strike.

June 16 1970 Kape 1273 page 9.

MR.CURTIS: Well they should not be allowed to strike. either. A police force should not strike. They are knocking down the doors to get in and they have to take the chance out of what they get. I mean you cannot have a police strike demanding more money, demanding more money from the Government. I mean the thing is -

MR.CROSBIE: You have already - I mean how can you stop -

MR.CURTIS: Because men are unwise. Now, Mr. Speaker, the other point raised by my hon. friend, the question of wages, as he knows you cannot have an arbitrator fix wages to be enforced by this House." This House, the Police Force nor no other force is of course operated for profit. Where there is a profit involved then wages come into the consideration. But when wages are paid by the community in respect of services the community is the one that has to decide what they can pay.

MR.CROSBIE: What about for the other matter, you know all the other matters could be dealt with.

MR.CURTIS: All the other matters. I quite agree with my hon. friend and I assure him that there will be no effort made to control those. Everybody is entitled to have his own living conditions and working conditions looked into, and I do not think the Government is noted for being harsh in that regard. I do not think there are any other points, therefore, I move second reading. Bill No. 49 read a second time referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend the Automobile Insurance Act."

MR.FRECKER: This is a very simple matter. There is an error in the Act called "An Act To Amend the Automobile Insurance Act, 1968." A little gremlin slipped in, got into subsection (2) of section 33 and this Act would simply eliminate so that as it reads now, "against the insurer and by any other person," the word "by" would be left out and we would have, "against the insurance insurer and any other person." I move the second reading of this Bill.

On motion bill read a second time, ordered referred to a committee of the whole House presently, by leave.

June 16 1970 Tape 1273 page 10.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Direct Sellers Act, 1966."

MR.FRECKER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is intended to protect the public to a certain extent at least against a modern trend to offer gimmicks and to entice people to buy on a promise of getting a rebate. For instance, a direct seller may offer say an encyclopedia to a prospective buyer and tell him that if he gives him the name of five other customers, then he will get a rebate on the basis of each of these customers who puts an order in for the encyclopedia or any other article. It would make a contract entered into on the basis of such an inducement non-binding and we have introduced the clause to do that and I move second reading of this Bill.

MR.CROSBIE: I support the second reading of this Bill Mr. Speaker, I remember that my first job one summer was, when a salesman sold a certain kind of vacuum cleaner at our house, twenty or twenty-five years ago, and he hired me on as his advance man and I went around of course and got him to in every other member of the family that I knew. I would call up and say, you know, "I would like to come down and see you, Granny." I would go down to see granny and the salesman pop in behind me with the vacuum cleaner. Anyway he sold five or six extra vacuum cleaners that way and I made a few dollars. So I assume it is this kind of thing you would outlaw. But actually it is, this is a scheme which has been used quite a bit in St. John's, where if you give them the names of other people to contact and they succeeded in selling two of them they will give you a reduction in price on what you are buying from them. I think it should be an improper practise and should be cut out.

Bill No. 63 read a second time referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Respecting The Organization, Operation, Functions, Powers, Duties, Rights And Privileges Of The Constabulary Force Of Newfoundland."

On motion, Clauses 1,2,3,4,5,6, carried.

MR. CROSBIE: Clause 7, Mr. Chairman, brings me back to the point I had ask the Minister of Justice to clarify this position for us as the Chief of Police. Clause 7 says, "The Lieutenant-Governor In Council may appoint a commanding officer of the force, to be known as the Chief of Police", what is the position on our present Chief of Police? Has he resigned or not resigned and is the Government looking for a replacement or is the Government not looking for a replacement?

MR. CURTIS: I am, Mr. Chairman, looking for a replacement for the Chief of Police who has intimated to me his anxiety to retire.

On motion, Clauses 7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18, carried.

MR. CROSBIE: I want to repeat my objection to part of Clause 19, Mr. Chairman. I agree with the section of that clause that says, "A member shall not strike"

I do think that the public safety and order demands that members of Police forces not be permitted to strike but I still feel it is objectionable that we state that no member could be a member of any trade union or any organization affiliated directly or indirectly with a trade union. The fact that you are a member of a trade union does not automatically mean that you must go on strikes in situations where you are forbidden to strike, that applies to the union also.

So I would move that sub-section (1) of Clause 19 be deleted and that Clause 19 thereafter read, "A member shall not strike."

On motion, amendment lost.

On motion, Clauses 19,20,21, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN(NOEL): Now in 21 would the Committee please note that on page (11), sub-clause 8(b) in the third line, "respecting the appointment of the arbitrators who is to be chairman" should be just "arbitrator." We will just treat that as a typographical error.

On motion, Clauses 22,23,24, carried.

MR. CROSBIE: On 25, Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat my objection. Section 25 is the effect of an arbitration award and each arbitration award is subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council as provided for in Section 27. I can see some force to the Government's argument with respect to salaries or financial provisions that they do not want binding arbitration on that, but as I mentioned before and I do not want to repeat it to any length, there are a hundred or a thousand other matters that may go to arbitration. I therefore suggest an amendment that on line (4) delete the words, "as provided for in Section 27" and substitute the words, "is subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to the extent that salary or other financial costs are involved", and then it will go on, "and, where required, the enactment by the province of legislation."

On motion, amendment lost.

On motion, Clauses 25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36, carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 49 with no amendments.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act To Amend The Automobile Insurance Act, 1968."

On motion, Clauses 1,2,3,4, carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 62 with no amendments.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Direct Sellers Act, 1966."

On motion, Clauses 1,2, carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 63 with no amendments.

motion that the Committee rise, report having passed Bills No. 49, 62, and 63 with no amendments

MR. WELLS: There was another Bill that came before the Committee earlier and it was agreed that, this is the Act To Amend The Public Utilities Act -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WELLS: No, no, I might say to the Committee before it rises that I have talked with Mr. Templeton of the Newfoundland Light and Power Company and I have talked with Mr. Beardsley of the Bowater Power Company, I have not talked with the Newfoundland Telephone Company, and the position is this that they understand the reasoning for it and they understand the value in it but it does go too far unnecessarily. It should only go so far as Section 26 as it now exists in the Act.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WELLS: No, no I do not mean that. \$2,500. is a reasonable figure for rental I agree with that but this is sub-clause 2 in the present 26 which says "if the Public Utility intends to demand from a customer or customers any contribution toward the cost of any new extension," in other words if they want to include it in the rate base,"the Public Utilities shall not proceed therewith or demand such contribution without first securing the approval of the Board, they shall not proceed with the extension or demand the contribution without first ring the approval." Now that is entirely reasonable, There is nothing wrong with that and I agree that it should now be extended to include leasings and rentals but the only thing is, Mr. Chairman, that provides, though in sub-section 2 I submit, ^{it} should apply to the new one (as it is now worded it would not) to the new clause 3.

In other words they could do it. If they did not, if they wanted to waste their profits on buying Cadillacs for their ten top men, well it is none of our business. But do not include it in the rate base so it will increase the price of hydroelectric power, but if they want to do it let them. At the moment it is an absolute prohibition, "they shall not", shall not for the purpose of improving, extending or rendering more useful to its customers. Now they can say, "The Chairman of our Board will be far better able to manage this company if he is driven around in a chauffeur driven Cadillac which will cost us \$300.00 per month, that is for the purpose of improving." It can be extended a great distance so all I am suggesting is that there be an additional thing in this amendment, leave this as it is but to include before sub-section 3 the

MR. WELLS:

limitation already included in sub-section 2 where it relates to direct purchasing as opposed to rental. It will correct completely, and then they can do it if they want to but they run the risk of not having it included in the rate base for the operating expenses in case of rental difficulties.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I have not had the privilege of speaking with any of the people whom we attempt to regulate the Power Companies and so forth but I have spoken with the Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission on this point. He tells me that this clause is drafted to plug what in effect has become a loophole in the Act, while I do appreciate what my hon. friend, the member for Humber East, says I do feel that 3 as it stands, "A public utility shall not, for the purpose of improving, extending or rendering more useful etc." is sufficiently limited.

The Chairman of the Public Utilities told me that the clear intention is that where they want to add anything in the rate base what they do is -

MR. WELLS: Right, there is no doubt about intentions.

MR. ROBERTS: Right. And so I am told that the draftsmen feel this is adequate. Now if it is not, if in practice it turns out not to be, then I suggest the remedy is to come back with another amendment. But with respect, Mr. Chairman, and my hon. friend I know would agree with this, we are not in the habit of letting utility companies write the statute under which we regulate.

MR. WELLS: And neither should we.

MR. ROBERTS: I said the hon. gentleman would agree with me and he does. So I do not think the section need be amended further, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN(NOEL): Order please! There is no business before the Committee at the present time in view of the fact

On motion that the Committee rise, report having passed Bills No. 49, 62, and 63 with no amendments, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN(NOEL): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and directed me to report having passed Bills No. 49, 62, and 63, made progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted, Bills ordered read a third time presently by leave.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Organization, Operation, Functions, Powers, Duties, Rights And Privileges Of The Constabulary Force Of Newfoundland," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

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

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

On motion, Committee ordered to sit again presently.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Public Utilities Bill which passed Committee be recommitted and that the House also go into Committee on 4 and 5, the motions.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we go into Committee on 4 and 5 I wonder if we may avoid some confusion if it were possible for us to agree now that the Bill together with the resolution be distributed the same time and that we treat the Bill in the Committee as we would a Supply Bill, examine it item by item in Committee and then give it its first, second and third readings forthwith without having to go all over the same drill on the second time. Is it the wish of the House that we do that in that particular manner?

ALL HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

On motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions, "That it is expedient to bring in a measure further to amend The Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957, the Act No. 70 of 1957, to provide for the advance of loans to and the guarantee of the repayment of bonds or debentures issued by or loans advanced to certain persons and corporations," Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. NOEL CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE:

Before proceeding with the resolution we will now turn to the Bill.

A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Loan And Guarantee Act, 1957."

On motion, Clause 1 carried.

CLAUSE (2):

MR. MURPHY: Is the Minister going to give us some explanation

MR. JONES: I will do my best, Mr. Chairman. I was hoping that some of my colleagues who were affected by this Bill would be present to render their able assistance.

Bonavista Recreational Association - After the stadium between Bonavista and Catalina was built it was my understanding that there were a number of bills, sundry bills outstanding that had not been paid and they were in dispute for sometime and then finally the Government assumed responsibility and paid off these outstanding bills.

MR. MURPHY: That is \$25,000.

MR. JONES: That is \$25,000. It was a direct loan to the Recreational Association.

Shall the Bonavista Recreational Association carry? Carried.

ST. CLARE'S MERCY HOSPITAL:

MR. JONES: This is a guarantee I understand which will be repaid immediately.

MR. ROBERTS: This is how the hospital was able to carry on last year.

MR. JONES: That is right.

Shall St. Clare's Mercy Hospital carry? Carried.

MR. CROSBIE: Because of the money in the estimates this year there will not be any need for the guarantee this year, is that - ?

MR. ROBERTS: That is correct, Mr. Chairman. I am told that the \$5.5 million which the Committee has approved in the Health estimates will cover it. This \$1.8 million is how the hospital was able to carry on, it was not widely known at the time but the people sort of assumed the hospital found the money on their own.

MR. ROBERTS: In cooperation with the Government by agreement, we guaranteed it by order and now this is a legislative sanction. We should need no further guarantee this year to enable St. Clare's to meet all their commitments.

MR. CHAIRMAN (NOEL): Does the item carry? Carried.

GAULTOIS FISHERIES LIMITED:

MR. JONES: This grant is a guarantee for the purchases of two draggers from Atlantic Sugar, Atlantic Fisheries at Marystown. This is in addition to the fleet at Gaultois.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the item carry?

MR. CROSBIE: These are to fish into the Gaultois Fish Plant, two draggers for that plant?

BURGEO TRAWLERS LIMITED:

MR. JONES: That is the same thing Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Is that two draggers also?

MR. JONES: Yes I think it is. My information is that it is two vessels, but it is draggers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry? Carried.

HARBOUR GRACE FISHING CORPORATION LIMITED:

MR. CROSBIE: We have a mortgage in all these cases do we not? I mean a mortgage on the.....

MR. JONES: Yes, a standard mortgage.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is still part of the plant is it not?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, I do not think so.

MR.-JONES: Mr. Chairman, I think Harbour Grace Fisheries Corporation Limited, that is the corporation that was set up when the Government purchased the Harbour Grace plant. This was to dissolve a balance of inventory that was left. We bought the inventory and had to get a bank loan to guarantee it. Then we sold the inventory and I think this is more or less a self-liquidating amount.

MR. ROBERTS: This was ship supplies on hand, oil in the tanks, fish on hand and that sort of thing.

MR. MURPHY: Quite a bit of fish.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the item carry? Carried.

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR COMPUTER SERVICES LIMITED:

MR. JONES: This was a loan made by the Government Mr. Chairman, or a guarantee by the Government last September when it was decided to set up the Newfoundland Computer Corporation outside the Department of Finance.

MR. CROSBIE: Would that be repaid now?

MR. ROBERTS: It has been retired

MR. JONES: I am not in a position to say Mr. Chairman, what the present position of this loan is, but I would think that it was retired out of payments that have been made by the various departments. The university, Medicare, to this corporation. I think that is clear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. JONES: Right, it should be self sustaining in other.....

MR. ROBERTS: This was wonderful working capital

MR. JONES: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the item carry? Carried.

QUINLAN BROTHERS LIMITED:

MR. SMALLWOOD: (First part inaudible) standard plant.

MR. ROBERTS: In Bay de Verde.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In Bay de Verde yes

AN HON. MEMBER: Expansion.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. WELLS: Was there any prior guarantee to this grant, and what does this make the total amount.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not immense. It is a very successful plant and they serve practically all the fishermen in the place and some other places around. Longliners and other boats that fish in and out.....

MR. ROBERTS: This is one of the areas where we are going to miss Ross Young for months to come.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They employ about one hundred and fifty people.

MR. WELLS: And they have kept up to the prior one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are very good.

BURIN COMPANY:

MR. JONES: This Mr. Chairman is a guarantee on a loan which we made to George Humby from the West Coast, on the Bank of Nova Scotia, I think it was in Corner Brook, and I understand that

MR. ROBERTS: None of it has been drawn

MR. JONES: No, none of it has been drawn down. The fact that we guaranteed - it was to buy heavy equipment to employ about one hundred and eighty men.

MR. ROBERTS: I think I can add to that because, I have a great deal of knowledge of it - this is in White Bay North in Roddickton. George Humby is now incorporated. I think it was Northern Equipment - Northern Lumber Co.Ltd. or something, it is secured or will be secured by a mortgage to assets greater than that. I do not believe he has drawn any of it, and it is the Bank of Montreal in Corner Brook, not the Bank of Nova Scotia.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, while I am on this, and I see the names of an individual, a corporate body I do not mind. Is there any insurance or anything guaranteeing it - if he should die tomorrow or next week, what guarantee is there unless we are covered with some sort of a debt.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is the mortgage.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, there is no life insurance, not Mr. Humby's -

MR. MURPHY: The mortgage means nothing.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh no, we have a mortgage to assets that are greater in value than this. Whether the gentleman lives or dies, our mortgage will be good security. One cannot shut off ones debts merely by dying.

MR. MURPHY: No, I know that but, people.....

MR. ROBERTS: We have a mortgage - specific physical assets that are

MR. SMALLWOOD: What did you say, you cannot get rid of your debts by dying?

MR. ROBERTS: No Mr. Chairman, you cannot get rid of your debts by dying, but we do have an asset in the case of Mr. Humby, infinitely more physical assets than the \$50,000.

MR. MURPHY: I do not want to give the gentleman a spiel on this type of thing, but the infinitely more assets you know, are good for quick disposal

MR. ROBERTS: Oh no, no, no, these are one dozen trucks, that sort of thing.

I also might add that we have an assignment from the people to whom he is selling in P.E.I., a lumber company.

MR. WELLS: Is the Leader of the Opposition suggesting that we require multiple purchase life insurance.....?

MR. MURPHY: No, all I am saying is this,.....

MR. MURPHY: And we are on the bite for \$100,000. eh! It is all right if you can get your business going and - what if something happens prematurely in a year or so, where is this \$100,000. you know, this is common practice in all - it is just a thought, with individuals as I say, you do not mind.....

MR. ROBERTS: Then we have to realize on the mortgage, maybe we should take life insurance as well.

MR. MURPHY: Well, at least you are provided - you take fire insurance I presume, it gives you fire insurance

MR. CROSBIE: Usually a lender requires that an individual borrowing sign a life insurance policy to him, if he has one. So, it is something that should be done, if it is not done.

MR. MURPHY: Fire insurance is the same way, if you have a mortgage.....

MR. ROBERTS: Well that is the usual.....

MR. CROSBIE: In the case with George Humby, I do not know if this is the first guarantee of a loan of this nature that the Government has ever given or not, but this is a loan guaranteed by the Government to enable Mr. George Humby to buy equipment to operate a logging operation in Roddickton. I do not think that there would be many - I would think that this is the first loan of this nature that the Government has made. As I understood it the Government was always very reluctant or has been up to recent months, reluctant to get involved in guaranteeing loans for logging operations.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how many saw-mill operations and small logging contractors and so on I have run into in this Province in the last six months or twelve months, all of whom tell me that if they could get someone to guarantee a loan for them at the bank of perhaps ten thousand, five thousand, fifteen thousand dollars, they would be able to employ perhaps

thirty or forty men - keep thirty or forty men employed and they would be in business. But, they cannot get the credit by themselves, and there is no agency from which they can get credit. In fact, I had this experience just three days ago. A certain gentleman from the central part of Newfoundland was in the city here looking for assistance, he has a sale for the wood, in fact the member for Gander would know him, he has a sale for the wood and he needs fifteen thousand dollars. He needs someone to guarantee a bank loan for him for fifteen thousand dollars.

Well, this is a profitable operation, the bank would be repaid and forty or fifty men would be working for a few months. Now, Mr. Chairman, I say

MR. COLLINS: 120 men would be employed

MR. CROSBIE: 120 was it, well it was quite a few men. There seem to be quite a few situations like that around the island, and I cannot see why the Government

MR. ROBERTS: No, they are not like that.

MR. CROSBIE: Perhaps not just like Humby, but like what I am talking about. The minister can explain if Humby is different later. You meet enough of these people from around the island who say this kind of thing, and I cannot see for the life of me why the Government does not have some arrangement with the Department of Mines Agriculture and Resources or elsewhere, where the Government would be prepared to guarantee loans in situations like that once it has been looked into and found to be feasible, with somebody in the department looking after it who can check on whether the work is being done, and how it is being carried out and whether it is a proper operation with the proceeds going to the bank as they come in and so on.

If George Humby's loan is in connection with logging operations at Roddickton,

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, that is right.

MR. CROSBIE: Canada Bay Lumber operated there and wanted some assistance earlier from the Government which they did not get.....

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, they wanted a straight gift.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, that may be something different.

MR. ROBERTS: No, but I know about it.

MR. CROSBIE: Right, and I am all in favour of George Humby getting his loan if it puts one hundred men or one hundred and fifty men

MR. ROBERTS: Over that.

MR. CROSBIE: Or two hundred men to work at Roddickton. When I was last up there, there were very few working....

MR. ROBERTS: Things have improved since then.

MR. CROSBIE: Before the Humby loan was arranged

MR. ROBERTS: It has not jacked up because the hon. gentleman was there in Roddickton.

MR. CROSBIE: I did very well by the way in Roddickton.

MR. MURPHY: Since your visit things have improved considerably.

MR. CROSBIE: Due to my visit Sir, certain things went into operation and there has been a big improvement at Roddickton the minister will agree. Apart from that.....

MR. ROBERTS: The big improvement is that the hon. member left Roddickton, that is why Roddickton.....

MR. CROSBIE: I had a letter Mr. Chairman, from Roddickton the other day, a telegram

MR. ROBERTS: I am glad.

MR. CROSBIE: Asking me about the water and sewage for Roddickton, and I wrote back and I said, "you are all fixed up, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs has you listed for this year."

MR. ROBERTS: That is right, I was talking to the mayor about it today.

MR. CROSBIE: To go back to this particular thing, I would like the minister to comment on why the Government could not attempt to expand this kind of operation and have somebody check out whether or not some Government department might consider guaranteeing loans for logging contractors, or saw-mill operators if it was carefully watched and checked.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to consider this sort of thing, provided they are equivalent to this - this is not a small - the type of situation to which the hon. gentleman referred, and with which we are all

familiar is usually a fellow who if he get five or ten or fifteen thousand dollars with nothing of his own, gets a push bench saw and he produces maybe 43,241 feet of lumber in the course of a year.

The Humby operation worked out on a benefit-cost analysis. Since then, to my own knowledge, we have looked at at least one other in the Province which did not work out. Furthermore, the Humby operation involves a personal investment of well over \$100,000. in other words, twice our own risk, whereas, the others too often look to us nearly for everything.

Finally Mr. Chairman, the Government do give considerable help to people through access roads. Again looking at benefit-cost arrangements there is a vote in the estimates approved by the committee for the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, and there is also money in the DREE program for access roads. I think briefly, in a sense, if anybody can put together an operation comparable to the one that Humby has at Roddickton, we would be quite prepared to look at it, and if circumstances are comparable we would be quite prepared to ask the people of Newfoundland to put their credit behind it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: He is out today because, the river blew away his bridge yesterday at Beaver Brook. The Canada Bay operation, they wanted a gift of \$100,000. and we were just not prepared to do it. Peter Gardner just wanted a gift of \$100,000. and we were not prepared to do it. Humby is not asking for any gifts.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): We have paid a price for that.

MR. ROBERTS: Well Mr. Chairman, we certainly paid a price, but not as great as \$100,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not as great as \$100,000.

MR. ROBERTS: In any event Mr. Chairman, if anybody has a project comparable to the one that George Humby is running at Roddickton, which is a fairly large fifteen to twenty thousand cord a year pulpwood operation, we would be quite willing to look at an application for financial assistance.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, what you lose on the swings you gain on the

roundabouts, and I imagine that George Humby did his best up in the Roddickton area, when they have all treated them kindly like the.....

MR. ROBERTS: George Humby is a model citizen.

MR. CROSBIE: To come back to the point.....

MR. MURPHY: They sound like conservatives.

MR. CROSBIE: Would the minister tell us - look, if I guarantee loans for everybody who approached me in the last year, I would have about now in guarantees more than the Newfoundland Government.

MR. ROBERTS: I thought the hon. gentleman had.

AN HON. MEMBER: How about Deputy Ministerships?

MR. CROSBIE: Deputy Ministerships?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. CROSBIE: Where so they fit in?

MR. ROBERTS: Well they do not, that is the problem.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Oh no, no, no, I was not able to make any promises like that, it did not look sure enough, but nobody would take that promise as meaning too much. To come back to this, if in situations where you are approached by people as I was describing, who say that they have got a good possibility and they have contracts and they can sell the logs, who do we refer them to? Who in the Government can we send them to?

MR. ROBERTS: They can write to my colleague the Minister of Mines, to my colleague the Minister of Finance, or to my colleague the Premier. They will all end up in the hands of Mr. Power in the feasibility studies outfit or division. As I said, within recent days I have seen one done by Ed. Power on another forestry operation in the Province that just does not work out on a benefit-cost and therefore we are not prepared to assist and a letter is gone out to the promoter.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, yes, there has been one done on the Humby operation and this is a you know, a substantial return to the Province for our investment or our risk. But, they could approach, really, any member of the Government Mr. Chairman, and provided it is comparable to this we are prepared to look at it

and if the circumstances are as favourable on the benefit-cost, we are prepared to try and do something about it. That does not include the fellow with the push-bench, who has no investment, and I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that that sort of thing is a different - it makes for a different kettle of fish.

MR. CROSBIE: All right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the item carry? Carried.

OCEAN HARVESTERS LIMITED:

MR. JONES: That is the loan to the Harbour Grace plant to get it revitalized if that is the word, and that is the Old Perlican fleet freezers.

BRIGUS KNITTING MILLS LIMITED:

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are still negotiating to try and find a buyer - we are negotiating with a very fine Italian firm who have opened up on the mainland of Canada, and have been visiting here and Brigus. We are trying hard to get them to buy it, if they do I think we will have a success story on our hands. If we do not we will have

MR. ROBERTS: These were two guarantees to the bank during the sixties, and ten further down through the year until we took the decision to pull the plug and close them which we did.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are closed now.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are still closed.

MR. JONES: Oh yes, they are still closed. They have been closed for about four months.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. JONES: Well there was an auction of.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: What auction, not an auction, a sale, not an auction.

MR. MURPHY: An auction.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, we got whatever was in it anyhow.

MR. JONES: Yes, and it has been credited to the account of Brigus Knitting Mills, but when this new company appeared on the scene Mr. Chairman, we saw that there was a possibility of selling or reopening the plant. I had the sale of the sewing machines and the knitters and what have you stopped, because, we

thought that we would have a better chance to sell the thing as a going concern than we would just as a vacant building.

MR. MURPHY: What about materials and everything else?

MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, one might get the impression that material was practically given away, but I would like to point out that the material that was sold was not knitted at Brigus. This was bulk material that was brought in and cut and made into

MR. ROBERTS: It was sold by the trustee.

MR. JONES: It was sold by the trustee, not by the Government.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. JONES: Of course.

MR. CROSBIE: Who is the trustee?

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know.

MR. CROSBIE: It is somebody under trustees or mortgages.

MR. ROBERTS: It has to be trustee and bank.....

MR. JONES: I am not sure if it is Peat, Marwick is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: I am not sure if it is Baird and Baird or R.H.Stone, I am not sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the item carry? Carried.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THE POWER DISTRIBUTION DISTRICT OF SOUTH NEWFOUNDLAND:

MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, I think this is just routine. We loaned the Board of Trustees of Southern Newfoundland money and now there is a gradual phasing out I believe of all these trustee boards, and they have been taken over by the Power Commission. Again I think this to be self liquidating, I could tomorrow give you the details on it, but I am not.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the item carry? Carried.

BRIGUS KNITTING MILLS LIMITED:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the item carry? Carried.

BAY BULLS SEA PRODUCTS, LIMITED:

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking from the recesses of memory now, but as I recall it Bay Bulls Sea Products had a plant up in Branch or St. Mary's somewhere. It burned, we collected the insurance, you know because of course it was insured they wanted to put some facilities back. We agreed to

do it, but it required, you know - this is not a net expenditure, this is less than the insurance but it must come back to the House for authority if we are to guarantee it.

Now I am speaking, I stressed from the recess of my memory, but I think that is substantially correct. Another of the Ross Young deals.

MR. CROSBIE: I think Bay Bulls Sea Products have some kind of a little operation in St. John's Harbour, have they not? On the Southside, is the Government involved in that, or are there any loans for that Mr. Chairman?

MR. ROBERTS: Not - have they applied for further loans?

MR. NOLAN: They are presently working with their solicitor, and I understand they have made approaches to the Government through their solicitor, the final details on it I do not have at the moment.

MR. CROSBIE: What are they doing in that plant there? - What is it for?

MR. NOLAN: I do not have the details here at the moment, I do know that operator is hopeful that he may employ up to sixty to one hundred men when it gets going.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry? Carried.

BONAVISTA COLD STORAGE CO. LTD.:

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, a word of explanation on this. When we inherited by purchasing all of the assets of the Northeastern Fish Industries, and we operated them as the committee knows for a period of months, and then we called for a public reply, public tenders to take the assets, buy them, the successful tender for the package which comprised Fermeuse and the four trawlers, was the Bonavista Cold Storage Co.Ltd., the Russell family. They paid us I think \$400,000. in cash and we have agreed to lend them the rest which they are going to repay over a period of years. This amount of \$850,000. is the authority to guarantee the loan necessary for that to be reduced over a period of years. I do not think anybody who knows the Bonavista Cold Storage people have any doubt that they are as good as we have in the Province.

My friend the member from Burin if he were here would get up and laud them, he has on a number of occasions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry? Carried.

On motion Resolution carried:

Motion, that the committee report having passed the Resolution and recommend that a Bill be brought in to give effect to the same, carried:

RESOLUTION # 52:

That it is expedient to bring in a measure further to amend The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957, the Act No. 71 of 1957, to provide for the advance of loans to and the guarantee of the repayment of bonds or debentures issued by or loans advanced to certain Local Authorities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With leave of the Committee we now proceed to the Bill.....

A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957."

On motion Clause (1) carried.

MR. MURPHY: Clause (2), Mr. Chairman. The Town Council - is this for water and sewerage and something like this.

MR. DAWE: This is a road reconstruction program in conjunction with a recent completed water and sewerage system for the Town of Burgeo. This is paving and reconstruction of the road after installation of water and sewerage system.

On motion Clause (2) carried.

Motion; that the Committee report having passed the Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Local Authorities Guarantee Act, 1957," without amendments, carried.

Resolution: In Relation To The Advancing or Guaranteeing Of Certain Loans.

Motion; that the Committee report having passed the Resolution and recommend that a Bill be brought in to give effect to the same. Carried.

A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Public Utilities Act, 1964."

Motion that the Committee report having passed the Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Public Utilities Act, 1964," without amendments.

On motion that the Committee rise, report having passed Bill no. 82, without amendments and report having passed the resolutions and recommend that Bills be brought in to give effect to the same.

Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. NOEL: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have passed a Resolution in relation to the Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957 and recommend that a Bill be

Mr. Noel.

introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion report received and adopted, Bill ordered read a first time. On motion Resolution read a first and second time.

On motion Bill read a first time.

On motion Bill read a second time.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Loan And Guarantee Act, 1957," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. NOEL: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have passed a Resolution in relation to the Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957 and recommend that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion Resolution read a first and second time.

On motion Bill read a first time.

On motion Bill read a second time.

On motion, a Bill, " An Act Further To Amend The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. NOEL: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having passed the Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Public Utilities Act, 1964," without amendments, and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted,

On motion, a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Public Utilities Act, 1964," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion, second reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Motor Carrier Act, 1961."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, the main purpose of the amendments to this Bill, of which I now beg to move the second reading, are three fold. The first is to require taxies which operate under charter to be certified under the Act. Taxies operating at separate fares are required to be certified under the Act. Those operating under charter are not. The absence of regulation over chartered operations make it impossible to enforce the Act and regulations governing taxies which operated separate fares. The loop hole is that the charter is free to provide the chartered fare amongst the passengers, thereby achieving separate fares in fact. The amendment provides that the Act does not apply in municipalities which licence public service vehicles under local government legislation.

The amendment also provides that a person shall not be guilty of an offense under the Act, if he operates for hire without a certificate provided that service was of a type which the board considers to be an emergency.

The second point covered is an amendment which removes the exemption presently extended to operators of trucks with a capacity of less than 10,000 pounds. Generally speaking, trucks in Newfoundland are on the small size. By exempting those under 10,000 pounds, certified truckers are exposed to moonlighting and price cutting. The major reason for exempting trucks under 10,000 pounds, originally, was that the Motor Carrier Act was proclaimed in mid-year and it was considered adviseable to concentrate on operators of larger trucks first.

Mr. Curtis.

Vehicles engaged exclusively in the transportation of pulp wood, mineral ore, unprocessed products of the farm, unprocessed products of the sea and transportation of goods and chattels belonging to the owner of the vehicle are still exempt under the Act.

The third reason is that Section (15) of the Act authorizes the board on its own motion or upon complaint to conduct an investigation into whether any person has operated any public service vehicle in violation of the Act or regulations.

The amendment broadens this power for the purpose of enabling the board to conduct general investigations into the Provincial motor carrier service including rates, discriminatory practices or any other matter for the purpose of ensuring that the service is reasonably adequate and safe. The amendment also provides that such investigations be conducted in the form of public hearings. I move the second reading.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I notice that the Bill - Section (4) of the Bill, repeals Section (7) of the Act and Section (7) of the Motor Carrier Act provided: that carriers who perform the service for twelve months before the coming into force of the Act to be given a certificate without a hearing. Why is that being repealed now? You mean the twelve months is now gone, but

..

MR. WELLS: How long are those rights? You would have to have a certain time..

MR. CROSBIE: This has been in operation now, I suppose, for a year or so. So anybody who has not already applied - I guess that does not matter.

Mr. Crosbie.

The other question is in Section (8), the last section. Any person who by virtue of the Act is required to hold a certificate and so on and who is operating the vehicle for the transportation of passengers and freight prior to the date of the Act is not required to comply ^{with} Subsection (1) of Section (6), if an application or certificate is filed with the Board within ninety days after the date of this Act. Does that mean this amending Act? Is this ninety days after this amending Act comes into force? In other words, is it ninety days from when the Lieutenant-Governor now signs it or is it ninety days from the time the other Act was passed? I presume it means ninety days after we passed it now?

MR. CURTIS: Ninety days after the date of this Act.

MR. WELLS: This Act? Right. Clause (8) is not an amendment in the other Act. It stands on its own in this Act.

On motion a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Motor Carrier Act, 1961," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House now by leave.

On motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act To Amend the Motor Carrier Act, 1961," Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. NOEL CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE:

On motion Clauses 1,2,3,4,5,6,7 and 8 carried.

On motion that the Committee rise report having passed the Bill, "An Act To Amend The Motor Carrier Act, 1961," without amendments. Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. NOEL: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered

Mr. Noel.

the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having passed the Bill, "An Act To Amend The Motor Carrier Act, 1961," without amendment.

On motion report received and adopted, Bill ordered read a third time.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, something has just come up. I apologize to your Honour. I did not realize it before. Somebody has just mentioned it to me. It is not my original idea of a matter that arises before we give this third reading. What about the individual trucker in Newfoundland. There are an awful lot of them who get two or three weeks work for their dump truck with this highroad contractor and two or three weeks work somewhere else with another highroad contractor. Must he be licenced by the P.E. Board or is that what we are doing now is going to require him to do that? There are an awful lot of people who own their own trucks that haul wood with it or do whatever they want in their own business and in their off-season they get a couple of weeks work in the summer with a highroad contractor somewhere to help them pay their costs. It is good for the contractors and it is good for the truckers. I think we better, perhaps, before we give it third reading, let us take another look at it.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that the House at its rising adjourn until tomorrow Wednesday at 3: p.m.

I make that motion, Sir, because I think we will save a lot of time, if we had the morning to keep after the printer and to try to have everything ready. There are several Bills down to the printers. I went down to my office at 4:30 p.m. and found everybody

Mr. Curtis

gone. This new closing has been taken advantage of by all and I find that we are left stranded up here without any help from our officials but please God, they will be to work in the morning and we will see if we cannot be ready for 3 p.m. I think we will be able to clean up the Order Papers tomorrow afternoon.

MR. MURPHY: They come in at 8:30 a.m. and leave at 4:30 p.m.

MR. CURTIS: Yes, but I have not been here at 8:30 to see if they come in at that time, but I am going to make an effort.

MR ROWE (F.W.) I was here. I was here. I can vouch that they were all here.

MR. CURTIS: Dr. Rowe on his way home last night, came in.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and second that this House at its rising adjourn until tomorrow Wednesday at 3 p.m. and that this House do now adourn.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow Wednesday at 3 p.m.