

"709p & Profile"  
attached

Hansard Office Copy



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

---

Volume 1

Number 57

5th Session

34th. General Assembly

---

## VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, MAY 18, 1971

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 3:00 of the clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

PETITIONS:

MR.NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table a petition from the residents of the Southside Road. Some 275 have signed this petition. Of course had time permitted other signatures could have been affixed to this petition, but I felt that it was of sufficient urgency, as did the residents of the Southside Road, that they were good enough to bring it to my attention and it is my honour to bring it before the House at this time.

Now, Your Honour, the Southside Road, I think, as Your Honour will appreciate, is one of the oldest roads in this Province. I say that without any fear of contradiction. The residents there have a long tradition and heritage. They have always been loyal and law-abiding, never giving a complaint or public outcry without good cause, always with sound reason. I have had some familiarity with the area, not only because I am the member for the district but, as I will mention, because I have been fairly close to the situation there and the people, for most of my life.

Many of them, as I know, have demonstrated their loyalty to the King and Queen, their love for this country, as it was at that time, in the Great Wars, They gave their sons to do so, some of them paid the Supreme Sacrifice. Many notable people have come out of the homes of the area and have lived there. Your petitioners, Mr. Speaker, proudly point out that the House where, as a matter of fact, the hon. the Premier once lived, still stands, is one of the places that could be affected by the road project that is now frequently in the news. I refer to the arterial road. There are many other names, of course, notable names, on the Southside Road. I could list them at some length. I will just mention some that come to mind at this moment, such as the Bakers, Horans, as they were when I was on the Southside, now they are called the "Ho-rans" I understand. I know that many citizens of St. John's and throughout the Province will know Mr. Tom Ho-ran, who, I believe, may be in the visitors'

gallery. He is in the visitors' gallery this afternoon. The Walshs are over there, Holdens, Noseworthys, Shorts, O'Neils, there were the Dillons, many many more that I can think of, too numerous to list.

People of the Southside Road have always realized the inevitability of progress. They are not people who are simply opposed to something for the sake of Opposition. That is not the way they are made. They have encouraged progress. In some instances that I can think of indeed they have initiated it. It took courage and initiative, in the very first place, if you will look at the history of the thing, to dig home sites out of the forbidding slopes of the rock-bound Southside Hills. But their affection for the area is all the more firmly and irrevocably entrenched because of it. While they have encouraged and nurtured progressive policies, they have been fully aware as well that all progress must be for people and with people and people only in mind. Unless people are helped by progress, Mr. Speaker, unless their lot is made better for them, unless the way is open to higher standards and for that matter improved conditions, then the progress in fact has no meaning whatsoever. The price for it is too high. This is the situation that is now faced by the petitioners that I refer to today. They have no dispute, none at all about the need and desirability of the arterial road. They agree that it should be built, because the arterial road is not for the residents of the Southside Road only. As a matter of fact they themselves may benefit least. The arterial road is for a growing busy, thriving, commercial metropolis, which St. John's is fast becoming. That is the idea of the road. That is the idea behind the planning that will make it necessary for other roads to be built in this city. This is just the first of any number to keep the commercial traffic and the thousands of tons of freight that is constantly coming in to the city, moving freely. But they earnestly and sincerely, with respect and, I submit, humility, Mr. Speaker, ask for reconsideration of the proposed road or route from about Waterford Bridge to the harbour area. There are real dangers to life and limb and property, if the highway is to be built to the rear of the Southside road homes. It would go, as I recall, from

approximately 600 feet, from the side of the road up the hill, at the maximum. Now it does not take too much study nor observation to realize the risks that are involved. Even a brief look in the area, if taken from the point of view of the residents, will suffice. Your petitioners, Mr. Speaker, would like to stress the more obvious. If heavy construction equipment is allowed to roam the Southside hills, behind the houses, digging into the earth, uprooting trees and other growth that now fasten and hold the slopes together, upturning rocks and boulders, then not one single resident will sleep secure. I said this at a recent public meeting, I have no reason to withdraw it today.

There will be constant danger of huge boulders rolling on top of the homes and earth slides and flooding. Residents will hesitate even to sleep, for fear of being crushed in their beds. In winter there will be continuous risk of avalanches, such as happened back in 1948, incidentally, for the record, when a life was lost on the Southside road. Even after the road is completed, there will be the daily, hourly, minute to minute risk of an accident that would propel a vehicle or vehicles into the homes below. Remember, Mr. Speaker, this is meant to be a fast-moving traffic arterial. It is feared too that the vibration from the heavy traffic would be an annoyance of major proportions. No people could live, I feel, under this constant strain and stress. If the road goes the way now proposed, it would be just as well to make up our minds to it now, to ask the people on the Southside road to pull up roots and move elsewhere. They will have no choice otherwise. It must be widespread knowledge that the slopes behind the houses are touchy and they are very very risky.

MR.SPEAKER: Order please. I have to point out to the hon. member that the rules permit five minutes only for the presentation of a petition.

MR.NOLAN: I appreciate your advice, Mr. Speaker, I will quickly come to an end on this matter. The fact is that this is the problem that is very very, very important to the people of the Southside road. I know of no time when they have ever brought a petition to this House before. I do ask the



department concerned to give the utmost consideration to this, what I am saying, in effect, is there is sad neglect there. I am saying that I have just gone through, as the member for the area, some severe problems with construction on the Blackhead Road. I am not an engineer. I know the problems I have had and the people there have had in the last few years. I do not want to see the people of the Southside road exposed to this kind of danger. So, I humbly suggest that this petition be accepted and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I rise with great personal pleasure to support the prayer of the petitioners today. All the people who live in there, in the Waterford Valley, on the Southside Road are known to me. I lived for many years of my life, in the early part of my life, on the Southside. I have relatives living there today. I know the place intimately and I have a deep sentimental interest in it. I heard today mentioned, by the hon. minister, the name of John Baker. I knew John Baker very well, he lived next door. His son Bill, his son Sam, his son John, his daughter Bride were children when I was a child. We grew up together. The Sceviours just in the road from us. The great St. John family, Mr. St. John one of the greatest seal skimmers in Newfoundland history. The Horans now known more generally as the Ho-rans. Mr. Ho-ran who is in the gallery today, around eighty. The father of twenty-three children one of whom is the great Magistrate Ho-ran in the District of St. Georges today. The Kings and the Neseworthys, great people never were there better people in Newfoundland. Now what is it their petition says? The Government have decided that there ought to be a new arterial road built into the City of St. John's from the Trans-Canada Highway and from the City of St. John's out to the Trans-Canada Highway, so as to take some of the heavy traffic, the burden of traffic, the danger, hazard of traffic off the present road that comes into the City. I am not sure in my own mind that this is the time to do it. It is going to cost anything from \$8 to \$10 million to do it. I believe, I can think, probably more than that. I can think of many things I would

rather see that money spent on but,if this is the plan,then the road will be built. What the people up there are afraid of is this; The Trans-Canada Highway, in by the Fort Motel, just beyond the Fort Motel, just west of it, this road would leave the Trans-Canada and come on into St. John's. It will come down through the Waterford Valley. It would come down across the hills near the Waterford Bridge then, where would it go then? There are two ways for it to go. One is down the side of the Southside hill, just up behind the houses. The other way is the right way, it seems to me. That is this: To come right down on the bed of the river, the Waterford River, which is one of the most polluted bits of water in this Province today. Put pipes down through there to carry the water, built the road over the watershed, over the bed of the river, in doing it at the same time put in a water and sewer system. I say that the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada ought to be taken out and punished, if this road is built and they do not put water and sewer facilities in at the same time. The people, all the way from Waterford Bridge down to Sime's Bridge, down to Riverhead, down to the old tressel, all along, those people, hundreds of them, fine families have just as much right to get water and sewerage as any other people in St. John's or anywhere else in Newfoundland. By building the road down through this way, both purposes can be accomplished at the same time.

The day before yesterday, Monday morning, a helicopter left St John's to pick me up, at eight o'clock, at my home on the Roach's Line. We were going to go out to Come by Chance and Sunnyside, On the way back I was going to come along the Trans-Canada turn-off on the new arterial road, because they are cutting the right-of-way, right now, come down that right-of-way, flying a couple of hundred feet, having a good view and come to Waterford Bridge, see where that road should go, Tomorrow morning the Minister and I are going to do that very thing. He is going to pick up the helicopter here, pick me up at eight o'clock tomorrow morning, going to fly over Sunnyside, We have a reason for going to Sunnyside, On the way back we are going

to fly down. Mr. Speaker, the people of that great valley can count on their minister and member and count on me. We are both, we lived there most of our lives, we are with the people. In that valley we are going to do everything in our power to get the road built the right way, not only that, we are not going to be satisfied until there is water and sewerage at the same time, so I give the petition my hearty support.

MR.SPEAKER: Order please. Visitors to the gallery will make no demonstration of any kind whatsoever, please. That is the rule of the House.

MR.MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, after these two dramatic speeches, I would like very sincerely to lend my support to the prayer of the petition. I would first of all, I do not want to make a political issue out of this, but I would like to ask who's idea was it in the first place to build this arterial road down the route it is going to take? I objected to it very strenuously, in the House five or six weeks ago. But that is not solving the problem of these people who all their lives have lived in the area, I do not know them all by name but I know quite a number of them. I could see the problem that would be faced there, to run a road directly behind them, bearing in mind, Mr. Speaker, that at tremendous sacrifice that the people on Blackhead Road had to go through much the same type of excavation so on and so forth. These people have rights, Sir, it is all right to talk of progress. We must progress, but not when the rights of people are sacrificed. As one who, five years ago, went through much the same ordeal, if you like, with my constituents in St. John's Centre, I can really appreciate, Sir, the mental anguish of a lot of those people, I can only ask, Sir, that, as to these two great speeches today and the helicopter flights and everything else, I do not think it is absolutely necessary. But I believe and I sincerely hope that all this House, all the House, on both sides of this House, want to see justice done, Sir, to these people and, for one of the few times in this House, that the voices of the people be heard, the necessary action be taken.

MR.CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of the petition also. We know that the petition has the unanimous support of the House.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that there is no question there is going to be an arterial road from the Trans-Canada Highway into the south part of the city of St. John's. We know that because the first contract for construction of part of that road has been let, that is \$7,297,000. (seven million two hundred and ninety-seven thousand dollar contract) awarded to McNamara Construction. I am glad to see that the Government has apparently had a change of heart as to where the road is going to go when the first contract is completed, because we have to remember, Mr. Speaker, that the planning for this road has been done by the Provincial Department of Highways, although the money to finance it is coming under the DREE programme, primarily the Government of Canada. I notice that the Premier said, when he was speaking a few moments ago, that if this is the plan, that is, if it is the plan that the road go behind the houses on the Southside Road, he would do his best to see it is changed. Well, it is the Premier and the Government who can change it, Mr. Speaker, it is entirely within their hands. It is entirely a matter of their responsibility. The plan is their plan. The contract was let by them and the Minister of Regional and Economic Expansion. It was announced by the Community and Social Development Minister and by Mr. Marchand, together.

So, the Government can have the plan changed, We take it, from what the Premier said, that the plan will be changed. There is one thing about it that this points up and that is the lack of communication between the Government or agencies of the Government and the people that they are going to affect when work is undertaken. Why it was that the residents of the Southside Road only learned a few weeks ago that this road was going to go behind their houses on the Southside Road, baffled me. One would think that they would have been consulted somewhere in the planning stage, before this had gotten that far. So, the plan can be changed by the Government. The Premier has indicated that the plan is going to be changed. This is a matter solely within provincial jurisdiction. although the money will come from the Government of Ottawa. The Government can change the plan, the Government said they will change the plan. That is the sensible

thing. Anybody who looks at the Southside Hills can see you cannot risk putting a road up behind those houses, with the tremendous fall down the Southside Hills, the trouble that would create. The petition is a good one and we are glad to make this support of the House unanimous.

Notice of Motion:

MR.SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow beg leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Election Act, 1954," "A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Local Government Act, 1966," A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Local Government Elections Act, 1965," A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The City of St. John's Act."

MR.MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following motions; WHEREAS the Fishery is the basic most important natural resource of the Province of Newfoundland; AND WHEREAS the Fishing Industry has experienced grave and serious problems which have become critically aggravated over the past decade by reason of depletion of stocks caused primarily by the massive catches taken from time to time in the North Atlantic by ocean going vessels of foreign nations; AND WHEREAS the inshore fishermen of this Province have particularly suffered by reason of apparent over-fishing in the North Atlantic; AND WHEREAS the Prime Minister of our Nation, the Right Honourable Pierre Elliot Trudeau, is presently making a state visit to Russia for the expressed purpose, amongst other things, of discussing with Russian Leaders problems of mutual concern to Canada and Russia; AND WHEREAS it is vital to the interest of Newfoundland and particularly to the welfare of its inshore fishermen that immediate steps be taken to conserve the fishery in the North Atlantic; AND WHEREAS it would appear that effective steps towards improvement of the fishery could be realized by the Prime Minister discussing directly with Soviet Premier, Alexei Kosygin, or Communist Party Leader, Leonid Brezhnev, or both of them the problems experienced by the fishermen on the east coast of Canada and in particular depletion of fish stocks in the North Atlantic; AND WHEREAS the Members of Parliament for Newfoundland have initiated representations to



the Prime Minister concerning the matters herein resolved; AND WHEREAS it is desirous that all the elected Members of the people of Newfoundland join with Newfoundland's representatives in the House of Commons in urging the Prime Minister of our Nation to take up with the Leaders of the Russian peoples matters herein resolved; THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House of Assembly for the Province of Newfoundland hereby expresses its strong desire that Prime Minister, Pierre Elliot Trudeau, discuss with Russian Leaders the grave problems experienced by fishermen on the east coast of Canada and particularly the depletion of fish stocks in the North Atlantic and that the said Prime Minister initiate meaningful discussions with a view to conserving all species of fish in the North Atlantic in order to better assure the future of the fishing industry in this Province and particularly the inshore fishing industry; AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House of Assembly urges the Prime Minister of Canada to invite Russia to join with Canada in convening an International Conference for Conservation of Fisheries in the North Atlantic comprising all Nations utilizing the fisheries of the North Atlantic Ocean and that such Conference be held as soon as possible and, if expedient to the Nations concerned, be held in the ancient seaport of St. John's; AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House of Assembly directs that the contents of this resolution be communicated forthwith by telegram or other wise to the Honourable Prime Minister while he is still visiting the U.S.S.R. and opportunity exists to take up the matters set forth herein with the said Leaders of the Russian peoples.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR.MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the hon. minister of Mines, Agriculture & Resources, re, as I understand, grants of some form on Bell Island for cattle raising and this type of thing. I understand Sir, that these cheques are being passed out by the Mayor of Bell Island, in the Town Office over there. I wonder has the minister any comment to make, or any information on this matter.

MR.CALLAHAN: I do not know precisely what the hon. gentleman refers to

Mr. Speaker, but we may recall, some four weeks ago I believe, I announced in this House the Board of Trustees have been established on Bell Island to administer a community fund derived from the further disposal of assets of the former Dosco operation at Bell Island. This is the only possible, (I do not know how to relate to the question, Mr. Speaker, because it is a curious kind of question) this is the only possible operation that could have any reference to what the hon. gentleman has raised.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, just a supplementary question? How are these grants or loans or whatever it is dispersed and how are applications received, received from the minister or -

MR. CALLAHAN: I do not know how much clearer I can make it, Mr. Speaker, there is a Board of Trustees appointed by the community -

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Reading XI - Social Services and Rehabilitation;

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, to get into the nuts and bolts of the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation perhaps I could inform the Committee that the number of citizens receiving social assistance, in the fiscal year 1970-71, varied only slightly from the preceding years, for both those who are medically certified, incapable of work, and those who are physically able to work but have been unable to find employment through either their own efforts or those of the existing private or public agencies. I might point out also, Mr. Chairman, that within our present restricted resources we have been able to increase social assistance benefits in some respects. For example, food for those on short-term assistance and a more generous policy concerning earnings for this same group, increased fuel allowances for invalid unemployables and implementation of the measures affecting the elderly citizen announced at the Provincial Development Conference in February.

Any dramatic improvements in benefits, Mr. Chairman, without heavy increases in provincial taxation will have to await the outcome of discussions in revamping the terms of the Federal-Provincial Cost Sharing Formulas of the Canada Assistance Plan, which I hope to be able to report to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador following the conference of Provincial Ministers of Welfare presently rescheduled for June 7 and 8, just three weeks away. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see a lively discussion on my estimates and lots of questions and I will try to provide the Committee with all the information that I can. But let us have all kinds of questions and I will see if I can provide the answers.

MR. HICKMAN: Will the hon. Minister make a firm commitment now before we start?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I will make a firm commitment that I will provide all the information I can and if we can finish the estimates of my department before six o'clock, before we arise for dinner, I will say that we have done

a fine afternoon's work.

MR. HICKEY: I am glad to see that the minister invites some questions.

I hope that we can keep him happy and go along with what he suggests.

There are a number of things I would like to discuss before getting into the estimates, and I assume that this would be the proper place to do it. This is the proper heading.

First of all, it is interesting to hear the minister inform the House that the difference in the figures, the past year versus the one previous, were more or less insignificant. It is hard to understand, Mr. Chairman, how this can be, when the unemployment rate during the past year has been worse than it has ever been before. There are a couple of answers, I suggest, that possibly would indicate why there is not the kind of increase in welfare that one would expect.

For example: retraining programme is one. A number of people Mr. Chairman, who are taking the retraining programme in various trades. People attending trades colleges and various vocational schools, all of those people, Sir, while they are not employed in industry as such, are not and do not come under the heading of welfare assistance. I suggest that a good many of them, if they were not in training, would have no alternative but to apply for and receive assistance from the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation. So, Mr. Chairman, the fact that there has not been a great increase in the number of recipients during the past year, certainly does not indicate that we are in good shape employmentwise. It certainly does not indicate, Mr. Chairman, that the whole problem of welfare, in terms of the employables, has been solved.

It would be false security, Mr. Chairman, for the people of this Province and the members of this House, to assume that because there has been such a little difference in those figures, that this is an accurate account or an accurate indication of the general economy of the Province. One wonders, Mr. Chairman, where it is all going to end. We hear that the answer to the high rising cost of welfare is jobs. I do not think anyone can deny that. We hear Government quoting and praising, to no end, our trades college and trade schools. One cannot argue too much with that. The alarming part of the whole

thing is, Mr. Chairman, where those people are going to go when they are finished their training. When they come out of the College of Trades and Technology, and the various trades and vocational schools, where do they go?

Under a cost sharing arrangement, the Government of Canada and the Government of this Province are paying for their training. Under the Manpower Plan, most of those people or a good many of them are receiving salaries the equivalent to and in some instances higher than they were getting in a regular job. Now, Mr. Chairman, one does not quarrel with the fact that those salaries are reasonably high. Certainly, one does not quarrel with a person obtaining a weekly allowance, be it from a position or be it from training in one of those schools or colleges. The more they can get the better, but the question is Sir, what is going to happen to them when they finish their course?

In too many cases Mr. Chairman, at least I have found, some of those people graduate or are given a certificate, and they find themselves forced to take positions which do not pay them as much as they received while they were attending college or vocational school. This, Mr. Chairman, must obviously be very frustrating to someone who, for example, received ninety dollars or ninety-five dollars a week while attending a vocational school. They come out of that school, with a certificate, and if they are lucky enough to obtain a job, end up working for seventy or seventy-five dollars a week. They must obviously ask themselves what they accomplished for that eight or nine months that they attended that school, or six months, whatever the term that they were there.

I feel that this is a problem for the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation. While there may be other agencies, other departments involved, it is certainly a problem that the department and the Government in general must come to grips with. For, as I pointed out, but for those programmes a great number of those people would have the unfortunate experience of being on welfare. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, no Newfoundlander, no matter where he is, no matter what his academic standing is, no Newfoundlander looks forward to being in receipt of assistance from the Government, under the welfare programme.



Mr. Chairman, I hope to make some comments on different aspects of the department. I hope that I can do so under this vote, because I feel that they cover a wide range of topics. I think that this is the proper vote to make them under. I for one, regret that I am not able to stand here today and afford the hon. minister the remarks, the same remarks that I made in this House approximately a year ago, or something more than that.

The minister Mr. Chairman, started out well I thought. I was looking for great things from him. I regret very much that I have been disappointed. Many of our citizens, who have the unfortunate experience of coming in contact with his department, feel the same way. He started out well as I have said. I was one of the first, Mr. Chairman, to offer my congratulations to him when he became minister, and also one of the first Mr. Chairman, to compliment him when he offered suggestions for changes in policy and gave a general indication that there would be new things in that department.

There is no Department of Government, Mr. Chairman, more important, in my view, than the department for which the minister is responsible. We might say that the Department of Economic Development is an important aspect of Government. Certainly it is, as well as all the other departments. This department, Mr. Chairman, deals with the greatest resource of any country or any Province, the people themselves. It is this department, Mr. Chairman, that the people of our Province have to look to and depend upon when they are in need. What can be more important to a person - than need? What can be more important to a person than actual bread and butter? We talk about "bread and butter" issues, Mr. Chairman, we are certainly talking about them today. One cannot get closer to the most important things that effect all our people, than the caring for of those people who are, through no fault of their own, out of employment, cannot be gainfully employed and, consequently cannot support their families.

Too many cases Mr. Chairman, of people who come to this department where they have not been treated fair and just. I am not suggesting that they be

welcomed with open arms. I am not suggesting that we advertise for people to come to us for assistance, but I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that they be treated in a manner which guarantees some level of dignity to those who come to that department for assistance.

I am not so sure, Sir, that this attitude always prevails. In fact, Mr. Chairman, according to various cases that I have come in contact with, listening to various reports from people, one is led to believe that in too many instances the attitude of this department is one of arrogance. I do not know who is responsible for it. I should say; I know who is responsible for it but I do not know who is to blame. I am not blaming the hon. minister. It would be most unfair for me to blame him, who sits in the House, and who sits in his office in this building. He is responsible for it, Mr. Chairman, because, for no other reason than the fact that he is minister of that department.

Whether he has failed to instill in his workers the idea that when assistance is granted from this department, it does not come out of that persons pocket, it does not come out of the minister's pocket, it comes out of the taxpayers pocket, and except in very, very few cases Mr. Chairman, I doubt if there are any, unless those who have been born sick or who have never struck a "tap" in their life, who have never worked at any time, it comes out of their very own pockets. When they were employed they contributed by way of tax in its many forms. It is rather unfortunate Mr. Chairman, and it is a bit alarming to me that those very citizens who worked so hard to earn a livelihood and who, through no fault of their own, find themselves unemployed, should be treated with some kind of arrogance or indifference - but in too many cases they are.

I am not sure, Sir, that the minister has adopted a right course in his attempt to encourage initiative among those unfortunate recipients of able-bodied assistance.

There is the case which we read about recently, of the fisherman who wanted to take his sons and teach them how to fish, only to be told by the welfare officer that if he did, his allowance would be cut. He apparently..

MR. NEARY: Why was he getting an allowance in the first place?

MR. HICKEY: Why was he getting it?

MR. NEARY: Why?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not know why he was getting it. I do not care why he was getting it.

MR. NEARY: That is exactly the point. He was getting it because he was medically unfit to do work of any kind.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I know a lot of people who are medically unfit in the strict sense of the word.

MR. NEARY: I know a lot of people who are mentally unfit also.

MR. HICKEY: Who are what?

MR. NEARY: Mentally unfit.

MR. HICKEY: WE will get to that subject. I know just what the minister is referring to, and we will get to that subject a little later on - do not ever worry about that.

I know a lot of people, Mr. Chairman, who are medically unfit, who are quite capable of sitting and starting up and steering a boat while their two sons fish.

MR. NEARY: Come on now!

MR. HICKEY: Never mind, "come on now."

MR. NEARY: Do not be so hypocritical.

MR. HICKEY: I am not being hypocritical at all, I am being quite factual. I am being quite realistic. Has the minister the gall to sit here or stand here and tell us that, because someone is incapacitated, because someone cannot go out and dig down with a pick and shovel that he cannot sit in a boat and steer a boat while his two sons fish? Is he so naive as to believe that?

MR. NEARY: School boys.

MR. HICKEY: School boys? It does not make any difference.

MR. NEARY: There is nothing in this world to stop him from going out, providing he does not sell the fish and compete with the taxpayers.

MR. HICKEY: Does it make any difference Mr. Chairman? Is that not what the hon. minister should be encouraging, that that man take his sons out and show

them how to work.

MR. NEARY: No, of course not.

MR. HICKEY: No, of course not. No, keep our people on handouts. Keep them in a state where they owe us something, so that when the time comes to vote they will know how to vote. Keep them in this state.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member better stick to real estate or whatever it is he is selling, because he does not know what he is talking about.

MR. HICKEY: I can manage, Mr. Chairman, in whatever field of endeavour I go into.

MR. NEARY: Anything at all.

MR. HICKEY: I have done quite well in the Department of Welfare and the hon. minister knows that but he is not man enough to say so outside this House.

MR. NEARY: Want me to produce your file?

MR. HICKEY: Produce it. I challenge him to produce it now, and bring those three people into the Chamber.

MR. NEARY: It would not be fair to the hon. member.

MR. HICKEY: It would not be fair to the hon. minister. It would not be fair to him. Bring it. I call your bluff.

MR. NEARY: Do not dare me.

MR. HICKEY: I call your bluff. I am daring you, and I will insist on it, until those estimates are through, that you produce that file. I do not know what you think you have in that file, Mr. Minister, but you have nothing only your dirty mind.

MR. NEARY: Let us get on with the business now.

MR. HICKEY: I will get on with it, and I will produce some letters this afternoon to prove to this House just what the hon. minister is.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member.

MR. HICKEY: Just what he is capable of.

MR. CROSBIE: Lay it on.

MR. HICKEY: When he is backed into a corner, Mr. Chairman, when he is backed into a corner - they say, when you back a rat in a corner he goes for your

jugular vein. Well I do not know...

MR. NEARY: The hon. member should know all about rats.

MR. HICKEY: I am not going to stand here and refer to the hon. minister as that, because, I have more manners than that. I was raised a little differently than that, but I will draw a comparison.

The hon. minister was on very dangerous ground when he was backed in the corner on the issue of the girls' home, and he came out with his insinuations, his vile remarks about...

MR. NEARY: Watch your blood pressure.

MR. HICKEY: Psychiatric assessment. Let me tell the hon. minister something. He does not have to worry about me, because I went before a psychiatrist when I was hired by the Department of Welfare. That is more than the hon. minister has done yet. If he says, in this House, that he knows some people who might be suffering from some kind of mental retardation, he must be talking about himself, because he has not gone through the assessment that I went through.

MR. NEARY: This is awful stuff, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HICKEY: I came through, Mr. Chairman, with flying colours, thank God! The hon. minister has not gone through that yet and I doubt very much if he would pass it if he did, because, there are certain qualities that are required by a persons who works in a Department of Welfare. A number of qualities. One of them, Mr. Chairman, one very important quality is: how one reacts under pressure, that he does not go off half-cocked and make all kinds of irresponsible statements, that he does not go off and attack someone's character or employment record, that he does not get so excited that he cannot read black and white.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member is becoming paranoiacal.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister may not know it, but he provided the opening for something which he might yet regret.

MR. NEARY: Right!

MR. HICKEY: I am not petty. If I could not stand the heat, I would get out of the fire. I could not care less what the hon. minister says about me



politically.

MR. NEARY: The heat is on now.

MR. HICKEY: When the hon. minister is going to attack my employment records, that is another matter. Now, let him produce that great file that he has something in. Let him produce it. His bluff is called again.

Mr. Hickey.

referred to him outside this House as being a liar.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. HICKEY: Hoping that he would take me to court.

MR. NEARY: Sit down when the Chairman calls you to order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! We are talking money here. I think we are a little far away from the topic of the administration of the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, now I am going to try real hard to keep right on the subject . I am talking about the hon. the minister and the vote which pays the hon. minister's salary. When I am finished, Mr. Chairman, I propose to move a motion, seconded by the member for St. John's West, that the minister's salary be reduced to \$.98. That is \$.02 below the amount that is normally used. So as far as I am concerned, Sir, I said that I would deal with a number of topics this afternoon surrounding the hon. minister's office, and that is just what I am doing. I only repeat what I repeated outside. As I said, Mr. Chairman, I did not say the hon. minister then laid any charges against me. I was hoping he would. He knew better because he knew that he did not have a leg to stand on. He knew why he made the statements he made, if he ever knows. He knew because he was back in the corner and the only thing he could come up with was to attack me personally. I welcome criticism, Mr. Chairman, politically, seven days and seven nights of the week. I will not stoop so low as to attack any member of this House, personally. I would like to see the hon. gentleman who has all the virtue . I do not know where he is. I would like to see the hon. gentleman who is perfect. I would like to know where he is. We all had better do a little bit of thinking before we attack any one personally. There is no one, but no one, who cannot have something thrown back by way of mud. I do not intend, Mr. Chairman, to stoop so low. I will let the people of this Province, who listened to the hon. minister from the West Coast, when he made his vile statements about me, I will let them decide.

Yes, he can sit over there and grin. Of what mentality one must be to be

Mr. Hickey.

able to sit down, Mr. Chairman, and grin.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Now I think I should point out that a debate is not supposed to get down to a personal level. The topic before the committee this afternoon is the administration of the minister's department.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, do I have a right to defend myself?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

MR. HICKEY: The hon. minister did. He talks about a file that he has. I asked him to bring it here. Is he going to bring it or is he going to get up now and retract that statement?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman has paranoia.

MR. HICKEY: Do you hear the dirt again? Do you hear this stupid, silly nonsense? Do I have to take this kind of thing? Is he going to retract those statements or am I going to be given the opportunity to defend myself? He does not have to take them back, if he does not want to. I can defend myself. I have lots of information on which to defend myself.

Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons why I intend to move my motion to reduce the minister's salary is based on his performance insofar as the Girls' Home is concerned, in handling that situation. Did he come out and give the public the information he had ought to? No, of course not. Did he admit that there were cells in that building? No, he did not. He did not know anything about it. But yet he could stand in this House and brag about how many times he has visited that institution. Well, Mr. Chairman, he must never have gone in the basement. When one inspects the building the usual thing is to go in the basement or wherever the furnace is that heats that building, because I would suggest that that is a rather important part of that building. The hon. minister did not go there. He did not know there were cells in that home. He made a feeble attempt to justify. I do not know who or what he was trying to justify because he had only taken over the department a little while before. He personally could not have been held responsible

Mr. Hickey.

for too much. But no that was the wrong information to give the public. Those were the facts. The hon. minister, Mr. Chairman, was asked to table the report that was made by Mr. McGrath. What did he table? He tabled a report that contained some suggestions. Did he table the report that was compiled by Mr. Roberts of his department, the committee that was set up? I suggest he did not. In that report, Mr. Chairman, that is where one finds it all out. That is where the chicken come home to roost, in that report. We do not see that, do we? Any time I open my mouth about it, as being the one responsible for welfare on this side of the House, what do I get? I am reminded of a file. What low-down dirty politics! I have never heard tell of the like.

It would be better, Mr. Chairman, for the hon. minister to get on with his work. He has a big job to do that he cannot do. He has not got the slightest inkling of doing or performing some of those duties of a welfare minister yet he has the gall and the nerve, when someone criticizes constructively, he has the gall to attack them personally. I heard the statement made one time that "one laboured for a mountain and brought forth a mouse. That is a pretty good description of what the minister brought forth when he started digging on me. Another thing, Mr. Chairman - I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this House, over and above any feud that might exist between the hon. minister and I I could not care less about that because that does not mean two pennies, but what is bigger than both him and me and what is more important is that he and I, and a thousand more like us, are the staff working in that department. I can tell the hon. minister right now that the morale of his department is at an all-time low.

MR. NEARY: Where would that be, at the Children's Home or..?

MR. HICKEY: No not the Children's Home. It is not at the Children's Home. It is the people who are out in the field doing the work, because they do not know what day the hon. minister is going to attack them personally and tell a bunch of untruth and make a bunch of false statements. Too many of those people, Mr. Chairman, are well aware of my term of duty with that department. They are well aware of how I left that department and they are well aware of the fact that I was not asked to resign, which the minister - they are also well aware Mr. Chairman that when proof was offered by way of letters, two letters signed by two different people, one of whom was still an employee of the minister, a senior official of his department, another is the deputy minister who instructed another official to write that letter to me. What did the hon. minister say about that, when he was cornered again, when those letters were produced? He made a brilliant statement, Mr. Chairman, that letters of this type were customary. In other words those officials of his department were just hypocrites, dishonest hypocrites. That is what the minister said, in so many words. Is that not a lovely department to work for, where the minister says that? I do not know what the hon. minister thinks he has. But I know a number of things he does not have. I will make a bargain with him. If he will stop spreading his stories that are unfounded, such as my having to resign from the Department of Welfare and those vicious statements about me. I will stop telling the truth about him. He has that bargain. The minute he stops that, I will stop telling the truth about him. If I were he, Mr. Chairman, I would buy that bargain, because he cannot go wrong.

MR. NEARY : The hon. member...

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister may take this very lightly. I can assure him that I have not lost any loyalty to the Department of Welfare. He need never doubt about that. When somebody spends five years in the Department of Welfare, Mr. Chairman, there are a number of things that rub off.



Mr. Hickey.

One of them is concern for people who work in that department as well as the people who are assisted by that department. It is with no pride that I stand here today and tell the hon. the minister that no matter what he has done to improve the welfare programme in this Province, that he has instilled there into the minds of some of his staff the like of which is unbelievable.

AN HON. MEMBER: A dictator.

MR. HICKEY: No not a dictator. A dictator is much more honourable than that which the minister has stooped to. When someone starts in and digs back on somebody, because they criticized him, hoping to come up with something and comes up with nothing but still makes vicious statements, just how low can one go? How low can they get? What security is there in a department, Mr. Chairman, where there is a gentleman operating under those conditions? What security is there? Is this the kind of relationship that should exist between minister and his staff? Is this the kind of relationship that brings out the best of people in the performance of their duties? There is no better case in point, is there, than the adoption case that I brought up in this House while the minister was away. It was unfortunate that he was out of the house at that time or he might have saved his department another little bit of embarrassment. When one of the Assistant-deputy ministers informed the Minister of Health, who was filling in for him, that that lady had been discouraged from applying for that child, a complete untruth. It was a complete untruth and I say it as long as I have a breath to draw, because, Mr. Chairman, I know from where I speak. The hon. minister is probably gone to get some information. This is one way to get it. You turn on the heat. There is not any doubt, Mr. Chairman, no doubt at all because I would not need any information passed on to me from this lady or some clergymen

MR. HICKEY.

or other interested parties. I happen to know enough about the adoption programmes to know that when someone advances, from the time they make application up unto a time where reports are made on home conditions, where medical certificates are obtained, I know enough, Mr. Chairman, to know that those people could not have done that on their own without being requested to do so by the officials of the minister's department. They were requested to do so. Does the minister want me to tell him who they are? The Welfare Officer in Lewisporte is one. No, I am not going to use any names, Mr. Chairman. There are two, a male and female.

MR. NEARY: Do you know their names?

MR. HICKEY: Yes, I know their names. So does he know their names.

Is the minister going to tell me ...?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! It is not customary to make allegations in committee or in the House against persons who are not here to defend themselves.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate Your Honour's ruling and, if I may, I might just explain. I am not making any allegations against those people at all. Those two people were doing their job. The allegations and charges that I am making are against the minister, who is responsible for the department, and some of his officials. If he wishes to bring the officials, the gentlemen who gave the hon. Minister of Health that information, here, I will tell him.

One particular instance, Mr. Chairman, was that that family were requested to obtain a medical certificate. An inquiry was made as to whether or not they had had their medical. Those people were contacted by this lady and her husband and they were appalled at the statement, that emanated from this House, to the effect that they had been discouraged right from the start from making application for that child. Mr. Chairman, this is what I mean when

Mr. Hickey.

I say that the heat was turned on. It is very strange that three weeks ago, two weeks ago, the people concerned were quite prepared to substantiate that woman's claim; that had been suggested to her. It had been suggested to her that she make application for that child. Within the last week, Mr. Chairman, this one particular person is not prepared to do anything like that at all. How do I know this? Mr. Chairman, I did not come down stairs yesterday. Surely the hon minister does not expect me to tell him.

MR. NEARY: He has been going around trying to pump confidential information out of social workers? Is this his technique?

MR. HICKEY: Does the hon. minister wish to make a charge? Is that all the faith the hon. minister has in his employees?

MR. NEARY: The hon. member is the one who made the statement.

MR. HICKEY: Ah, Mr. Chairman, here we are getting it again. Now we are having a sample. Now we are getting the proof of what the minister thinks about his employees.

MR. NEARY: Oh! come on.

MR. HICKEY: Pumping information from them.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member knows...

MR. HICKEY: Does the hon. minister wish to say that that is the type of employee he has got doing social work?

MR. NEARY: I will answer the hon. member in a minute.

MR. HICKEY: I have more regard for those people who work in that department, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Have what?

MR. HICKEY: I have a more high regard than he has.

MR. NEARY: They do not have a very high regard for the hon. member, I can tell you that.

MR. HICKEY: Oh, is that right now? Well that is shocking. I am sorry to hear that.

MR. NEARY: He has lost his spies, all except one.

MR. NEARY: He still has one spy.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, the Gestapo got nothing at all on him.

MR. NEARY: That is right!

MR. HICKEY: The minister can even say that I have "a spy." In all the people who work in the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation, he can say that I have one spy left.

MR. NEARY: Yes, one.

MR. HICKEY: Is that not something?

MR. NEARY: One.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman might we get a few more fellows in and sit down here so we can conduct the business of the House?

What was that Mr. Chairman? I do not care who wishes to listen to me. I could not care less. The rule of the House is that there be a quorum or we do not discuss business, and that is it. I am the last in the world to break rules.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me make this abundantly clear: I do not go to any welfare official trying to pump any news, because I have more of a regard for all of them. That is more than I can say for the hon. minister.

MR. NEARY: They would not give it to the hon. member anyway.

MR. HICKEY: They work for him. The hon. minister - it is just too bad, Mr. Chairman. It is pitiful that there is not some way for the hon. minister to determine the degree of popularity that he has among his staff. It is just too bad because, if he did or if he could determine that, what a rude awakening he would get. No, Mr. Chairman, my information does not come from social workers. But it comes from a reliable source.

MR. NEARY: Right!

MR. HICKEY: I still have enough of faith in human nature, humanity, not to think that everybody just makes statements which are unfounded, untrue. People in question, Mr. Chairman, would the hon. minister just admit this much, that any parent or parents, as it applies in this case, two people, certainly who cannot be millionaires, would incur a bill of some \$700 for phone services. Will

Mr. Hickey

he tell me that those people do not believe they were wronged? Will he tell me that those people feel they got justice from his department? Would they embark upon that kind of a campaign? They came in or at least one of them came in and saw the hon. minister, last week. He knows that. I know it. Did I have to get that from a social worker too? Hogwash, Mr. Chairman!

MR. NEARY: This is powerful stuff, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HICKEY: I will never stand here, Mr. Chairman, and have their names or the reputation of those people who work in that department tarnished by a suggestion from the hon. minister. I will not stand for it. If he wants to tarnish those people, their reputations, that is up to him. He has already done it with some of his employees, so what is the difference? He has all but referred to two - two employees, one of whom, by the way, is his deputy minister. He has almost referred to him as a hypocrite. I would like to see the day, Mr. Chairman, when I would continue to work for a minister who took a slap at me like that. But I am sure the hon. gentleman in question has his own reasons. He is dedicated to the cause. He is probably like a good many more who figure; well it will not be long now.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister should use more of his energies in thinking up some kind of ways and means to encourage initiative among his recipients, his department, to find ways and means to help those people by some additional means than they are being assisted right now. He should make a much stronger case than he is making to the people at the Federal level, with regards to freeing the money that comes to this Province under the Canada Assistance Plan, so that it can be used by his department in a manner which they see fit and not in keeping with the rules that are laid down by the Federal Government. He should, Mr. Chairman, be coming up with some new ideas at the community level to help the people of this Province. He should be encouraging his staff



Mr. Hickey

and I make this as a suggestion. Of course, at least for the present time, he will throw this down the drain and say it is hogwash and maybe next month, sometime before the election, we are likely to hear an announcement that it is already in effect. This is usually what happens. You make a suggestion, it is worthless. It is useless. It is foolishness. About six months later you find that it becomes law or whatever necessary changes are involved have already been made. What the minister should be doing at the community level is instilling in his workers, his

MR. HICKEY: employees, his social workers to get out in the various communities and encourage some kind of community organization. Community organizations, Mr. Chairman, play a very important role in the Department of Welfare of all the other provinces. If there can be something accomplished by those people in other provinces, one obviously have to raise the question as to why it will not work here.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if we had some kind of community organization at the community level, a lot of the problems, a number of the emergencies that come to the attention of the minister and his department, he would never heard tell of, they would be dealt with by the people at the community level. But here again, he is not too interested in that. Maybe there is not too much mileage in that, politically—but he is not going to get involved in that.

Mr. Chairman, we have not heard anything about the recommendation made by Mr. McGrath and the committee which was set up last fall to investigate the situation at the Boys Home and Training School at Whitbourne, Pleasantville and the Girls Home. The minister said he wanted the press to layoff. Mr. Chairman, that is not where the problem lies. There is no reason in the world for the minister to blame anything that happened at those institutions on the press. If the minister would give, through the press, to the people of this Province, the straight facts of any situation, there would not be any problem. In fact he might find people from all walks of life much more ready to come to his assistance with ideas, suggestions and maybe other types of help as well. But, no one is interested, Mr. Chairman, in getting to involved in a situation where the facts are just being covered up and closed, where the issue is just being smoothened out so that the real situation is not known.

For example, one of the recommendations, Mr. Chairman, of Mr. McGrath is that the number of probation officers be doubled. Another one is to change the names of the institutions. I have not heard anything about this being done. Surely, Mr. Chairman, this does not take six months I am sure nobody

MR. HICKEY: in his department could come up with some kind of reasonable name for those institutions.

MR. NEARY: Could the hon. member recommend some?

MR. HICKEY: Oh, I could recommend a few, Mr. Chairman, but my recommendations and suggestions to the hon. minister were never adopted, you know, until six months later, and then we are told it is the new breed that are bringing in all those changes, all those benefits. It is never the Opposition, My goodness! Who would ever accept the suggestion from the Opposition?

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are also told in this report, Mr. Chairman, that the Home at Pleasantville is to be used for boys under fifteen. Would the minister tell us, if that recommendation has been implemented yet? Or that the girls from the Girls Home are attending co-educational classes? How about those things? The detention facilities, for use by police in juvenile cases be removed from Pleasantville. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the minister realizes how serious this whole problem is. His silence at least does not indicate it; that he realizes. The question was asked during the present session, I believe, as to how many of those children had broken out or had escaped?

I believe, Mr. Chairman, the figure was 485, over a period of time. Of course. That was over a period of five years. Four hundred and eighty-five, Mr. Chairman. Surely the minister cannot deny that a situation which results in 480-odd boys and girls escaping from say, let us say three homes—

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKEY: They just walk away. They leave without permission. Mr. Chairman, what were the two doing in the cells the night of the fire? The hon. minister tells me he do not run jails. That sounds as much like a jail as I know of, the girls are barred behind bars.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. HICKEY: Ah, Mr. Chairman, according to reports that emanate from that home, if the right kind of atmosphere, if the right kind of direction were given to those girls and those boys, there would not be as many of them leave, there would not be as many of them escape. They would not want to escape, because it would be drilled in their heads already, in the proper way, as to

MR. HICKEY: why they are in there.

MR. NEARY: Why are children running away from the home, of the fabulous businessmen, the millionaires, politicians, why are they running away from home, and taking to the open road? Could the hon. member explain that?

MR. HICKEY: I could appreciate them running away from certain people, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Did you ever hear of transient youth? What is causing all of this?

MR. HICKEY: We do not have 485.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is the Government of Newfoundland, that is who.

MR. NEARY: The hon. the minister causing all of this, all those kids taking to the open roads?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I never hinted that the hon. minister cannot even understand plain English now.

MR. NEARY: I understand it.

MR. HICKEY: I have not known, No, Mr. Chairman, he cannot. He just cannot grasp even the slightest phrase coming from this side of the House. I have not said that the hon. minister is responsible for those 480-odd children.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, please? Is there anything in the rose that will make him talk a little faster? I mean this is getting to be really quite unendurable.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, if the Premier does not like the speed at which I am going, he can leave. He can go down and speed his car. Go down and take your car and go out ninety miles an hour. Then come back, and you might be in a better mood. I am not going to hurry up, I am going to take my own darn time and I am going to speak the way I want to speak.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman is taking the House's time.

MR. HICKEY: Well that is too bad, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, that is right, too bad.

MR. HICKEY: Because last night I witnessed something that I never thought I

MR. HICKEY: would witness in this House. I am aware of the fact, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your reminding me, I am not going to get on to a debate which took place last night. I would not want to. I have no desire. But I am just going to speak now at a certain speed.

MR. STRICKLAND: Slow down.

MR. HICKEY: The day will never come, Mr. Chairman, the day will never come, whoever likes to believe it or whoever does not, this is a free country.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member should speak as fast as he drives.

MR. HICKEY: Ah, well, well, a new switch.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not think Your Honour has drawn attention to the rule.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Strangers will take no part in the proceedings of this House either by laughter or any motion.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, it is difficult for people in the galleries not to make noise when they hear such trash.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Invite it. Invite it.

MR. HICKEY: No I am not going to invite it. I am going to ask them to try real hard to hold it back, if they feel they cannot hold it back, would they kindly just walk around for a little while. Oh, such hogwash! It would almost make one slow up even more, seeing it becomes more boring for some hon. gentlemen on the other side.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, now that we know the hon. minister is conscious of my driving, that is interesting.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order, may I ask Your Honour if it would be in order for us to get a tape recording of this and play it on the air so that people can really hear it, because they would not believe it otherwise?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, it would be quite acceptable, if we could have high moments on the other side also recorded, like last night's exhibition. We would love to have it on the air.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, if the Premier can arrange for that tape, I would go right along with it.



MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, order? I am replying to a point of order that the Premier stood on. I stood on a point of order. Mr. Chairman, may I reply, speak to a point of order?

MR. CURTIS: It is not a point of order, it is a suggestion.

MR. HICKEY: Well, the next time the Premier rises on a point of order, then I will trust that the Chair will disregard his presence. It will not apply to me, but it will apply over there. I am not one bit ashamed, Mr. Chairman, to have any of my constituents hear what I have to say in the House, not a bit. If I do not go fast enough for some hon. gentlemen, that is too bad. I really feel bad about that. My heart is aching.

Mr. Chairman, we were told that the Exon House was going to open last year. I think it was last August it was suppose to open; the minister told us. Just another indication, Mr. Chairman, of the kind of answers we get in this House. When did it open? It opened in March of this year.

I could go on through, Mr. Chairman, there are quite a number of questions that were asked, the answers that were given were most unsatisfactory. We will get on to those as we cover various sections of the estimates. But, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. the minister that, if he is going to run his department and if he is going to do the job that he is responsible for and that he is expected to do, then I would suggest that he refrain from getting too involved -

MR. BARBOUR: But, you will agree, he is doing a good job?

MR. HICKEY: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I did agree approximately a year ago, when the minister first went into that department he brought in some measures here that I had to support and I certainly agreed that he was on the right track, but he has gone on an entirely different course since then. I am afraid I cannot agree right now, because you expect certain things from the Minister of Welfare or the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation. We expect understanding. We expect an appreciation for people's rights. We expect a number of things. But when that is not forthcoming, Mr. Chairman, one can only lose confidence, and it is because of that, that I intend to move the motion that I shall move before I take my seat.

MR. HICKEY: Now, Mr. Chairman, this matter, the matter the minister raised, I did not raise it, he did, he referred to a file which was in his department. I am not going to stop, Mr. Chairman, as long as I am able to stand on my feet, I am not going to stop until the minister does one thing or another relative to that file. He either produces that file or he gives an explanation as to just what he meant or takes it back, one or the other. He has attempted to do enough damage to me already. I do not intent to tolerate or take any more, because, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing wrong with my hearing. There is nothing wrong with my eyes. I know the conditions under which I left the Department of Welfare. I read my mail. I also read reports that are made by various people in that department while I was ably employed. None of this at all resembled anything the minister came up with. When he was asked to retract it, of course, he would not. When proof was provided the news media, he then saw fit to attack his own officials.

Mr. Chairman, if the hon. minister can term that fair, I do not. I do not know where his sense of fairness is, but certainly, as far as I am concerned, if I had made a charge against someone, as he made against me, I would be rather quick, Mr. Chairman, and only too happy, if I had made a mistake, to retract it, to take it back. But, of course, we have not heard that from the hon. minister.

Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of documents here that I should produce to the House, in view of the fact that the minister will not have anything to say on the matter. He will not produce the file. Maybe this will change his mind. Maybe he will produce. It is necessary, Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate, I do this with no sense of satisfaction, I can assure the hon. minister and the House, I will ask the House to bear with me.

I never thought, Mr. Chairman, when I entered politics -

MR. NEARY: Is that your resignation there on the desk?

MR. HICKEY: That would be wishful thinking on the part of the hon. minister.

MR. NEARY: And the hon. member's colleagues.

MR. HICKEY: Wishful thinking. Is that right? The hon. minister and quite

MR. HICKEY: a number of other people on that side should be worried so much about me and my colleagues on this side, because they got trouble enough right in their own camp, believe me, and they know only too well what I refer to. So if you want to get like that, let me know, whenever you want to debate on that, and we will have a full-scale debate. Maybe you will be sorry for opening your mouths.

As I would say, Mr. Chairman, when I decided to enter politics I never thought I would see the day when I would have to stand in the House and read a letter or letters written by other people to defend my own employment record. I never thought, Mr. Chairman, that I would run against or run into anyone so low-down as to make such accusations as the minister made against me.

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

MR. HICKEY: Yes, this is in order, Mr. Chairman, because charges have been made against me this afternoon, by insinuation, they have been made outside of this House, I did not raise the issue, he raised it. The hon. minister raised it, now I am answering it.

MR. NEARY: The hon. the minister has not spoken yet.

MR. HICKEY: The hon. minister referred to a file that he was going to bring into this House and I have asked him three times to bring it in here. He does not have the guts to bring it in, that is why.

MR. NEARY: Oh, my!

MR. HICKEY: So for the record of this House, Mr. Chairman,

MR. NEARY: Good parliamentary language.

MR. HICKEY: if I were to walk out of this House, never to come back, tomorrow, I would want those reports in Hansard for all to read.

Let me tell the hon. the minister something else too. Make him bring those two people that signed those. He might have some "yes men" in his department, but those are not two of them.

MR. NEARY: Do not be so low now, let us get down to business of the House.

MR. HICKEY: Let him bring them here. Let him bring them here and be questioned, We will find out the truth.

MR. NEARY: Do not be down grading them.

MR. HICKEY: We will find out the truth of my record in the Department of Welfare.

MR. NEARY: Do not be down-grading the House now.

MR. HICKEY: Ah, to be down-grading the House! The hon. the minister down-grades the House by his very presense, every time he opens his mouth.

MR. NEARY: Keep the House above personalities now.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, in 1964 -

MR. NEARY: I do not think the hon. member likes me very well.

MR. HICKEY: In 1964, Mr. Chairman, I had reason to tender my resignation to the Department of Welfare. I had obtained a position with British American Oil, which gave me something like a \$2800 annual increase in salary. Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind, there is no doubt in the minds of those who worked with me in that department, that there had not always been agreement, There were things that I disagreed with my superiors on, in terms of policy, in terms of regulation. I will make no apology, Mr. Chairman, for that. I do not make any apology to anyone for that, because it is through constructive criticism that you will get some kind of decent policy.

But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, at no time did I resign from the Department of Welfare as a result of a suggestion made by anybody, the slightest hint or anything else. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to read the letter which came to me, as a result of my tendering my resignation. It is dated September 8., 1964 and it reads as follows:

"Dear Mr. Hickey:

Your letter of September 1, 1964, in which you tender your resignation, has been received. I am instructed by my Deputy Minister, (the same gentleman is in that Department today, Mr. Chairman)" to tell you that your resignation is accepted with regret." I suppose this is the part the minister refers to as being customary. If it had stopped there, Mr. Chairman, I might be in mind to agree with him. But it did not.

"I am also to inform you that should you wish to return at any time, you will be welcome." Now, Mr. Chairman, is the minister going to say that the man who wrote that letter and the gentleman who asked him to write it, who informed him of the type of letter to write, were hypocrites? This is what he tries to make them out as. "Should you wish to return at anytime, you will be welcome. Furthermore, if you wish to give the Deputy Minister

MR. HICKEY: name as a reference, he will be glad to write your employer, if requested to do so." Does that indicate incompetence, Mr. Chairman? Which was another wild charge by the hon. the minister.

The hon. the minister now, Mr. Chairman, might open his ears good and wide and listen to this. Because apparently he has not seen it or heard of it. This comes from the department that were so glad to get rid of me, if one were to believe what the hon. the minister said outside of this House.

"We are indeed very sorry that you have decided to leave this department. You have made a valuable contribution to our work and I wish to thank you sincerely for your co-operation and services rendered. I know I speak for the department as a whole when I wish you an unlimited success and happiness in your future."

It is signed, 'Yours, sincerely, C.S. Knight, Director of Field Services.'

That is on the Department of Public Welfare stationery, Mr. Chariman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is another; that when I was leaving the department the minister refers to the fact that I was incompetent. He also said that I did not take any training, did not try to upgrade myself, did not take advantage of the opportunities at university to do so. I repudiated the statements then, Mr. Chairman, and I repudiate them now; that they are untrue



MR. HICKEY: if he would open his eyes and do a little bit more digging, he would find out how many times I attended Memorial while I was in the employ of that Department, but he just sits there with a grin on his face. Like I told the hon. gentleman that time, he would not meet me in a challenge. All right but he does not hide from this House, he has got to take it now.

That last letter, Mr. Chairman, was in 1964, when I was leaving. It wanted us to believe what the hon. Minister says and says that it was customary.....

MR. NEARY: I have not said anything yet.

MR. HICKEY: The hon. Minister had a lot to say last fall.

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister raised it in this House today. He opened his mouth and put his foot in it again and now he has got to sit in the fire and put up with the heat.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Since all this is a personal grievance, which he is dealing with in response to nothing, no one has made any attack on him, this is completely out of order and someone of very higher authority is listening and said this is completely out of order. Pure personal grievance.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order, it is too bad the Premier was not here earlier this afternoon. He was listening, was he? Did he hear what the hon. Minister said?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I heard every word he said.

MR. HICKEY: Did you hear what he said about his file? Would he bring his file? I asked him to bring it but he would not bring it. Did he hear that? A personal attack right in this House, and I am answering it. There was a personal attack outside the House, last fall, and I have a right to answer it and that is just what I am doing, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Do not be so paranoid.

MR. HICKEY: It does not matter a thing to me, Mr. Chairman. There are a hell of a lot of people in the Department of Welfare listening today.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If I cannot get a ruling from your Honour, I will move that the House rise and we will report to Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: On that Point of Order, (1) the hon. member for St. John's East Extern has a perfect right to speak on this matter, now the Estimates for the Department of Welfare are up.

The Minister of Welfare attacked him last fall and alleged that he was dismissed from the Department of Welfare, that he had not resigned. These Estimates are now up and this is the chance for the hon. member to bring this matter up and, as far as the hon. Premier's threatening to bring us out of Committee is concerned, go ahead. It is the wrong procedure. The Chairman can make a ruling and then the hon. Premier can appeal the ruling, if he does not like it. But the hon. gentleman is perfectly at liberty. His conduct was questioned when he made some criticism of the Department of Welfare last fall, with an insidious insinuation, and he is pointing out that it is completely false, and the Minister has not retracted it.

If the Minister gets up now and retracts the insinuation then that is the end of it.

MR. HICKEY: Before your Honour makes a ruling, might I just say one thing. I did not raise this matter, Mr. Chairman, without knowing from where I was speaking. I had already inquired as to what rulings would be made. I had already inquired as to whether or not this was in order. This is in order, very much in order.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, if we want to question the issue let us call the Speaker back to the Chair and have a real ruling there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before your Honour gives a ruling, might I say that the hon. member read those same letters.....

MR. CROSBIE: I happened to be on my feet first, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One at a time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I was on the floor first.

MR. HICKEY: The Premier stands up. He does not bother looking, he says; I am on my feet first. The hon. member for St. John's West was on his feet first.

MR. CROSBIE: Who has the floor, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Premier has the floor.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. member for St. John's East Extern has read those same letters in this House before. There is no need of his doing it now.

MR. HICKEY: To that Point of Order, Mr. Chairman, that is a lie. I have never read those letters in this House before. A deliberate, down-right lie.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, can I have a ruling on this statement now made?

MR. HICKEY: Have a ruling on it. Have two or three rulings on it. You have been calling people liars here for the last twelve months. How about a ruling on that too?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will your Honour order a complete refraction of that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! I ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement.

MR. HICKEY: Never! Never! No I will not withdraw that! You will wait until hell freezes over before I withdraw that! I said those same words two years ago and I spent three days out of here, three days from this House. You can call anyone you like a liar, can you not? Who are you?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I move that he be removed from the House. I move, Mr. Chairman, that he be removed from the House.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, during your absence certain hon. members refused to obey the ruling of the Chairman and we have appealed the ruling to you.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Also, a declaration by the hon. member for St. John's East Extern that I was a "liar" that I had told a "deliberate lie," Mr. Chairman ordered him to retract and he said "I will not, not if hell freezes over" and he has refused to retract it.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the Premier accuses me of reading those letters

MR. HICKEY: in this House before, he knows that I did not read those letters. Those letters are of the nature, Mr. Chairman, that one would not forget them, if I read them. He knows full well I did not read them. He has been on his feet, sitting down, bobbing up and down for the past half hour, attempting to rule me out of Order.

MR. SPEAKER: The report before the Chair at the present time is this, as I understand it; that one hon. member, the hon. member for St. John's East Extern, accused another hon. member, in this instance the Premier, of being, (I have not the exact words in front of me) of being a liar, "it is a deliberate lie". These words, of course, are unparliamentary, they cannot be used in this House.

The Chairman of Committees asked the hon. member to retract the statement, saying it was not parliamentary, it was against the rules of the House, and as I have been given to understand it, the hon. member was asked to retract, he refused to do so, the Committee was raised so that we could come back into the House and deal with the matter.

I now have to ask, the hon. member has made his explanation and said what he has done, I heard the matter outside, of course. Now I have to ask the hon. member to make a retraction, to make an explanation or he will be "named" and I will have to ask the House to deal with the matter further, as to what will be done in this particular situation. Do I hear the hon. member retract the statement that he made a few minutes ago?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, on that point, I have sat in this House, Your Honour, and I have heard that word being volleyed back and forth this House to no end, I have stood on my feet on three occasions and I have asked the Premier to retract a similar statement, He has never, to my knowledge, except on one occasion this Session, has he withdrawn that type of remark. I have made that remark, Mr. Chairman, and under no circumstances will I retract it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member stated that he will not retract the statement. He acknowledges making this statement. I inferred from his remarks that he does acknowledge the fact that he did make the statement of calling another person a "liar", "a deliberate liar", and these remarks have to be retracted the House will decide. That is the end of the matter, I have given my ruling,

MR. SPEAKER: the hon. member will have to retract or I will have to ask him to retire while the House makes the decision as to what it will be.

I repeat it, if the member will explain and retract the statement, then, of course, the matter is closed and we will go back into Committee. I will suggest to the hon. member that he make his explanation. I have heard his remarks as to why he refuses to retract. This matter is now formally before the Chair on a report from the Committee and there is no other alternative then to ask him to retract or to let the House deal with the matter as to what will be.

This is the report as I hear it, this—

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, may I explain?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes I will accept an explanation.

MR. HICKEY: I said that the statement made by the Premier was a lie, a deliberate lie because the Premier knew that I had not read those personal letters. It took an awful lot, Mr. Speaker, to bring me to even read those letters here today. They were never read before. The Premier knows that. Insofar as taking anything back, I can only ask this House to award me the same justice that they have awarded the Premier on a number of occasions. I cannot in conscience take anything back. If the Premier can get away with this, then I can too. It is as simple as that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member refuses to take back the words. He did, I understand it, use the words "that is a lie, a deliberate lie." That is not parliamentary, it should be retracted and regardless of the circumstances under which the hon. member was provoked to say it, he must retract his statement or I will have to ask him to retire while the House deals with the matter, either now or a little bit later.

I will have to ask "Mr. Hickey" to retire.

Does the House wish to deal with the matter immediately? I have to have a motion from the House.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I move that the explanation of the hon. member for St. John's East Extern be accepted, seconded by the hon. the Leader of the



MR. CROSBIE: Opposition.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, your Honour has ordered that the hon. member withdraw, retract and withdraw, he has refused to do so and when this other motion is disposed of, if Your Honour can accept this motion.

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot accept it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well then I move, Your Honour, that the hon. member for St. John's East Extern-

MR. CROSBIE: On a Point of Order, the hon. Speaker has not said why he cannot accept it. It is in line with Beauchesne, page 118, where it says, "in case the offending member does not... If the explanation is deemed sufficient, some member will move that it be accepted." That is what I am doing now. I deem that the explanation is sufficient.

Page 117 of Beauchesne says, "in case a member persists in using unparliamentary language, the Speaker will be compelled to name him," which is what the Speaker has just done, which is equivalent to submitting his conduct to the judgement of the House, The member should then explain and withdraw." The member has explained and withdrawn.

It goes on, "it will be for the House to consider what course to follow in reference to him. If the explanation is deemed sufficient, some member will move that it be accepted."

That is what I am doing, Mr. Speaker. I move that the explanation given by the member for St. John's East Extern be accepted as sufficient and it is in line with the parliamentary explanation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair cannot accept the explanation. I have to have an explanation which is satisfactory to the Chair or I have to name him.. If other members of the House think my not accepting it is incorrect, he can obviously move that it be accepted.

I put the motion, that the explanation be accepted.

MR. MURPHY: Can I speak on that motion, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: You can make a brief statement, seconding the motion, Yer, please do that.

MR. MURPHY: I just want to speak for a moment or so on the same reason that, no matter what happens in this House, the Premier has got to deliver a judgement on it; in fairness to the Speaker.

Now the hon. member has been endeavouring to speak on this thing for the past hour or so. He has been goaded, insulted and everything else, perhaps not insulted and that is the only reason. He was goaded into it and I think he has a perfect right to say that any statement made was not true, if it is not true.

MR. SPEAKER: I will say, just so this thing can be handled in the proper manner, if the tempers would be allowed to subside slightly. If the hon. member had said, "this is incorrect, I did not mean to say that this was a lie and a deliberate lie," well then in this matter I would have accepted the explanation if the House would have.

So I will put the motion now that has been made by the hon. member for St. John's West and seconded by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that the explanation be accepted, that I think was the wording of the motion.

Those in favour, "aye," contrary "Nay", in my opinion the "Nays," have it.

ON DIVISION:

MR. SPEAKER: Will all those in favour of the motion please rise.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Collins, Mr. Earle, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Myrden.

MR. SPEAKER: Will those against the motion please rise.

The hon. the Premier, the hon. the President of the Council, the hon. Minister of Highways, Mr. Noel, Mr. Smallwood, the hon. Minister of Labrador Affairs, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Strickland, the hon. Minister of Education and Youth, the hon. Minister of Public Works, the hon. Minister of Finance, the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, the hon. Minister of Community and Social Development, the hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs, the hon. Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, Mr. Barbour, the hon. Minister of Health, the hon. Mr. Hill, Mr. Saunders, Mr. Mahoney, Mr. Wornell.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CURTIS: I move, Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances, that the hon. member for St John's East Extern be suspended for two days.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded; the member for St John's East Extern be suspended from the services of the House for two days.

MR. CROSBIE: I think it has been pointed out in this House that the hon. member for St John's East Extern is quite correct when he says the expressions 'lie' and 'liar' have been used in this House repeatedly during this session. The hon. the Premier called me, in this House a liar, a dozen times, and was not ordered to withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order Please! I ask the hon. member to be seated, since this is not relevant to the motion that is before the House. The motion is that 'the hon. member for St John's East Extern be suspended for two days' - Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay" - I declare the motion carried:

MR. CROSBIE: On Division:

DIVISION:

MR. SPEAKER: Will all those in favour of the motion please rise.

The hon. the Premier, the hon. the President of the Council, the hon. Minister of Highways, Mr. Noel, Mr. Smallwood, the hon. Minister of Labrador Affairs, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Strickland, the hon. Minister of Education and Youth, the hon. Minister of Public Works, the hon. Minister of Finance, the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, the hon. Minister of Community and Social Development, the hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs, the hon. Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, Mr. Barbour, the hon. Minister of Health, the hon. Mr. Hill, Mr. Saunders, Mr. Mahoney, Mr. Wornell.

MR. SPEAKER: Will all those against the motion please rise.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Collins, Mr. Earle, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Myrden.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON SUPPLY.

MR. CROSBIE: On 1101-01, Mr. Chairman, before that is carried, I would like

MR. CROSBIE: to complete what the member for St. John's East Extern started when he was speaking to the Committee.

The member said that he would end by moving a motion that the hon. Minister's salary be reduced from the amount of \$11,000 or whatever it is to ninety-eight cents. The Leader of the Opposition suggests that it should go down another ten cents, but down to ninety-eight cents. I now make that motion, seconded by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

This is necessary, Mr. Chairman, if for no other reason than that the Minister of Welfare, the hon. Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, made a false charge against the member for St. John's East Extern, last fall, when there was a matter of controversy on concerning the girls' home fire, when the Minister alleged that the member for St. John's East Extern had been expelled from the Department of Welfare or fired from his job. That was a false statement, a false charge. The member for St. John's East Extern today has amply shown the falseness of it by producing letters to him when he left the Department, showing that he had resigned and congratulating him for his service and saying he was welcome back.

MR. NEARY: The hon. Minister did not make any such charge.

MR. CROSBIE: The Minister has not had the good grace to withdraw any insinuation or charge he made. If for no other reason, when somebody takes the Minister to task about some policy matter in his Department, if that is the tactic he is going to use, he does not deserve his salary as a member of the Executive Government.

Now the member for St. John's East had other points in connection with the administration of a Department that he thought the Minister should be criticized on, I am not going to bother going into it, I will just say this, Mr. Chairman, that the motion, in my view, is amply justified by what happened here this afternoon when the hon. member was deliberately goaded and then expelled from the House. All right, I will not mention that again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why not?

MR. CROSBIE: I will let the hon. Leader of the Opposition mention it.

MR. NEARY: Because it is not in order, that is why.

MR. CROSBIE: The Chairman says it is not in order.

So on that count alone, Mr. Chairman, forgetting anything that has happened, the girls' home fire, the report that the Minister once tabled in the House and the rest of it, that motion is amply justified, and since the member is not here, I move it, seconded by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, there are one or two words I want to speak on this motion. I did not hear the charge made by the hon. Minister last fall but I certainly heard him insinuate today, against the hon. member for St. John's East Extern, that he would produce a file. Now what is in that file I do not know but the insinuation I gathered, as I suppose everybody here and also the press and radio, that there is something in the file that was to the detriment of my hon. friend's career in the Department of Welfare.

Now what is in it I do not know. But I was amazed, Sir, I was amazed when a Minister could make that insinuation on the floor of this House and get away with it, impugning, if you like, the reputation of an hon. member of this House who had previously been an employee of the Department of Welfare.

The hon. gentleman, Sir, spoke to the best of his ability.



MR. MURPHY: We are not all great orators like the hon. the Premier and some others on the other side. We just do our best with what we have. We come here to represent people, not to win a public speaking contest. The gentleman was insulted, scolded and everything under the sun that a gentleman should not do, was done by the members opposite - they did - to the hon. the member.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if that is or this is, what happened today, democratic Government and uphold the dignity of this House, I say God help us! That is all I say.

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

MR. MURPHY: God help us! I am speaking of this House of Assembly, and I have as much right as anybody else, of an incident that happened in this House today that I deeply resent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! It is completely out of order to refer to that.

MR. MURPHY:

All right, Mr. Chairman, as I said, we have the estimates to go through. There are many matters in the estimates that we will discuss, but I just say it is terribly regretful, Sir, that we are to be judged on our elocution or any other means, that a man elected by the people he represents, to come here in this House and be insulted, absolutely insulted - I think the apology should come from that side, not from this side.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to have anything to say on these welfare estimates until this latest row developed. But this despicable conduct, which we have seen here this afternoon, on the part of the hon. minister I think is just occasion enough for me to support the motion which was made by the hon. the member for St. John's West.

Any minister who would use the tactics of referring to a file of one of the former civil servants or public service, to bring this into the House or threaten to bring it into the House to condemn a person who is now an elected member is too low to bear any reference whatsoever, and I am quite in sympathy.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order. Is this matter disposed of now or not?

MR. CROSBIE: No, it is not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Under the rules of the House, is this matter, the House has voted on it and taken action, now do we go on debating it?

MR. EARLE: On that point of order, Mr. Chairman, the point of order the expulsion of the hon. member has been dealt with, but he has not been cleared in any way for his action there. We should be permitted to give an explanation of what led up to this. This is what I am in the course of doing.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, we are now debating my motion that the minister's salary be reduced to ninety-eight cents and we are entitled to discuss his conduct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are now dealing with Item 1101-01, which is the salary of the Minister's Office. The matters relating to the manner in which the minister carries out his duty as a minister are subject for debate. Personal matters relating to the minister are not.

MR. EARLE: Well the manner in which, Mr. Chairman, the minister carries out his duties have been very, very amply disclosed here this afternoon. I cannot think of any more dramatic illustration of how the minister conducts his duties, because as minister he is duty bound, I would say, to defend all members of his staff, all former members of his staff and all those who have gone through. It is the most despicable, as I said, sort of tactic, to refer to an employee or a former employee in this snarky manner. Therefore, I think, that the hon. gentleman had ample reason to become properly incensed and annoyed.

But, furthermore than that, Mr. Chairman, during this session of the House the hon. the minister on the other side, in charge of this department, has given repeated evidence of his incompetence. He above all others has been responsible for disruption of the procedures of this House. He has continually heckled in the most childish infantile sort of a manner. He has made absurd remarks across the House. He does not show the dignity nor the proper sense of proportion that a minister of the Crown should have.

Now I contend, Mr. Chairman, that this motion, to reduce the minister's salary, is only a gesture, of course. But, it is a gesture with seriousness behind it, because at no other time do the members of this House get an opportunity to gauge how the minister conducts his affairs or his department

MR. EARLE: except on debate on his department and on debate of other departments in the House.

It is during these debates that we have seen the most ridiculous, childish and silly accusations coming from the hon. the minister. Therefore, he has himself given the strongest type of evidence that he is not the type of person that should be in charge of a department of this nature, of this importance. I contend that the salary vote here is not justified. It is not justified for a person of that type. This is the argument that we are making. This whole thing, Mr. Chairman, the conduct of the affair of the children's homes, I referred to it in previous debates, it was pitiful. I was accused, this is one of the snide remarks the minister made, that when I was Minister of Welfare I did nothing. At least I kept my big mouth closed and did not cause a furor. I kept my mouth closed and did not cause a whole system of caring for the children to be upset by a few foolish remarks, which were publized and made so that the whole foundation of caring for these children was in jeopardy.

Now this again illustrates the incompetence of the minister. A man that will come out in public and start this sort of controversy that developed over these childrens homes does depict the highest degree of incompetence on the part of the minister and that is why I am speaking on this reduction of salary.

MR. NEARY: Do not be so narrow-minded and bigoted.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. the member for Fortune Bay has been speaking for a few moments, the hon. the minister has been interrupting on two or three occasions with the type of base comments that he has been making all through the session of this House. Now can we have an order from you, a ruling from you, Mr. Chairman, asking the hon. the minister, if he has anything to say to rise on a point of order or else sit down and keep his face quiet.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: The hon. gentleman is entitled to his opinion just as I am to mine, We has his opportunity, after I have spoken, if he wants to get up and contradict everything I say, if he so wishes to do. I am making my point and I emphasize it and re-emphasize it that in this House the conduct of the hon. the minister

MR. EARLE: does not lend faith in his ability to act as minister of that department. It does not give public faith. I reiterated that the conduct of the minister, over the Girls' and Boys' Home affair, only further illustrated that point.

The sort of remarks that we have had thrown across this side of the House, about how other members, when they are on the other side of the House, conducted themselves, are nothing of the nature that a man who is suppose to bear the dignity of the Minister of the Crown should repeat. This type of thing is dragging the conduct of this House down to a lower level than it has ever been in the history of Newfoundland. The hon. the man who occupies this post, as a minister, is the one most responsible for it.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot have any useful discussion on his estimates, because he will rise to point of trying to throw red herring across every estimate that may be discussed. We have seen this chap accused, on so many occasions, of matters which are suppose to be discussed intelligently and then some snide remark creeps in from the hon. the minister and throws everybody off, so in this particular minister's case, I think, I would propose that this side of the House, in complete disdain of the hon. the minister and his conduct of this affair, that we will let his estimates go through without question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, the motion is that the hon. minister's salary be reduced. I oppose it, and I oppose it because the hon. minister is one of the ablest ministers of Welfare or Social Services and Rehabilitation in the whole of Canada today. There are eleven of them, ten Provincial and one Federal. He is one of the ablest of the lot in the whole of Canada. An extremely competent and an extremely able minister of what we use to call "Welfare." We now call him, Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation. An extremely abled minister. Not only abled, but compassionate, as a Minister of Welfare should be, compassionate. He is a man with a sense of human compassion. Anybody in the Province can see him. He works an average of fourteen, fifteen hours a day, hard-working, compassionate, an able minister, and the idea of cutting his salary is just ridiculous. It is just too silly,

MR. SMALLWOOD: too silly for words and, of course, we will vote against it.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, on this motion, the facts that have occurred, the actions taken by the minister himself today are grounds enough to sustain this motion of reduction in his salary. To impugn a reputation of an individual, of hiding behind the immunity of this House, is disgraceful in itself, but to impugn the reputation of a former civil servant is unforgivable. A civil servant, when he joins the employee in the public service, takes an oath of secrecy, consequently, that civil servant is not able, if he is going to comply with the oath which he has taken, to defend himself properly. I say, it is disgraceful, it is vile and it is the lowest type of exhibition that I am sure a minister of the Crown, and that is saying something when you look at the record of this Government, but it is the lowest action taken by any minister of the Crown in recent history, anywhere in the world. I would certainly support, it in view of the actions that have been taken today against an hon. member of this House, not necessarily although including, because he is an hon. member of this House, also the fact that he is a former civil servant. A disgraceful attack on his reputation and he being unable to defend himself properly, in any event, because of the oath of secrecy which civil servants take. It is absolutely ridiculous and the hon. the minister should hang his head in shame with the other members opposite, who, some of them, are already showing their disdain by their expressions on their faces.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, on the point of the hon. minister's compassion, if we accept the well known principle that has been enunciated here time and time and time again, by the hon. the Leader of the Government and by other hon. members, that a minister, whether he likes it or not, is responsible for everything, but everything, that goes on in his department.

Now let us look at the compassion, is a minister, who collects from a man, permanently and totally disabled, a debt that is twelve years old, when he still has five dependents, is that a compassionate minister? If it is a compassionate minister then my interpretation of compassion and the hon.



MR. HICKMAN: the Premier's interpretation of compassion are very much at odds.

Is it a compassionate minister who, when he knows and discovers that there has been a mistake made in his department, seeks to recover from a widow and a dependent child the amount of the overpayment and reduces her total income to \$50 or \$60 a month? Is that compassion? I do not think it is compassion. I say it is hard-heartedness that has been unprecedented in the portfolio of Welfare or Social Services and Rehabilitation.

My interpretation of the administration of the Department of Welfare is that it is suppose to be the very heart of the Government. Governments can make all sorts of plans and announcements and great efforts to try and promote almost any field of endeavour that you can think of that comes under the jurisdiction of a Province. They can try and develop the Province economically, they can try and find badly needed employment for the people of our Province, they can try and improve the lot of education or health or justice or highways or anything that you want to name, but the real heart of the Government, where Government exposes itself to the public as being either sympathetic to the underprivileged, sympathetic to the unfortunates, is through the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation. We have it already in this session of the House, absolute refusal on the part of the hon. the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation to take into account the hardships that are being suffered by people of this Province, through no fault of their own. Compassionate minister? Not on your life. Not on your life, Mr. Chairman. We have never seen such a sharp knife exercised by any Minister of Welfare since Confederation. We have never seen such anxiety to collect back from people who cannot afford it and to cause hardship, as we have seen during the past year, always under the guise that we have to do it because of the regulations. This is nonsense. It is not the regulations, the costing-sharing regulations, that had anything to do with it. If you are going, you can forgive, as one hon. minister said here recently, when a Bill was being passed relating to this department; in the absence of the hon. the minister, the Treasury Board can write off these things, if the Minister of Welfare and Social Services so recommends.

MR. HICKMAN: Is this not what Welfare is all about? Sure, any minister has to see that there is no abuse of welfare. I cannot think of very many cases in this Province today where we find open abuse of welfare by those who are in receipt of social assistance. The regrettable fact is that on very rare occasions this is discovered and any time it is discovered that case does duty for all. There are very, very few people in Newfoundland today, on short-term assistance, who want to be there. There are no people on long or short term assistance today, who are living above the poverty line. The monies that are being voted, the monies that are being provided by the compassionate minister do not enable our people to live with the dignity that they are entitled to receive. When a man is ill and when a man is unable to work or a widow is unable to find any sustenance or support, she, in my opinion, is entitled to live, hopefully at a level that was somewhat similar to that which she enjoyed before she found herself in these unsatisfactory circumstances.

But this is not happening, not on your life. Ask any widow in this Province, who is in receipt of long-term assistance, and there are dependent children, if she can make both ends meet? Ask her. Visit her home, and tell her you come as an embassy of the minister of compassion. You will not find any evidence of compassion, on the part of the Minister of Welfare, for these people. Great statements! Profound announcements! Great academic and theoretical speeches, but none of this help the widow in Point May or Port au Choix. What she is trying to do is to keep body and soul together and she has not been able to do it. I always felt that the Department of Welfare, Social Services and Rehabilitation, that apart from showing compassion to the unfortunates, which it is not doing, had another responsibility in the Field of Welfare and that was to aid and assist organizations and communities and areas that want to provide accommodation for our senior citizens.

I had an experience and this will indicate to the Committee the type of approach and the type of vindictiveness that emanates from the hon. the minister. I have been fairly heavily involved, during the past year, with a

MR. HICKMAN: group on the Peninsula of Burin, who want to build a home for senior citizens. They want to be absolutely certain that the home they build will be eminently suited for the purpose intended. They want to take and avail of all the professional advice and co-operation that they can get from the alleged experts. They want to build something and follow the pattern that was followed by the group in Corner Brook. So the charitable organization has been incorporated. It has not the distinction, it is the second organization of its kind to be completely and absolutely inter-faith. Every church is involved, Pentecostal, Salvation Army, United Church, Anglican and Roman Catholic. They are spear-heading the drive.

So, after it was organized, there was a representation made to that group, by a clergyman or clergy, (I have forgotten which) in Fortune, that they have a look at a motel that was on the market. They asked me about it. My advice to them was; under no circumstances enter into any sort of contract or binding agreement or even give the slightest indication that they were interested more than give a cursory examination, without getting advice from the officials of this department, whose estimates we are now discussing. I found the officials most co-operative.

So we had a meeting one night in Fortune and there was a motion made by me, that we ask the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation to arrange for an inspection by the appropriate officials of Government of various departments. That area was visited by representatives from this department, from Health and from the Fire Commissioner's Office and the Department of Public Works.

Now you have to bear in mind that there are certain people in the Town of Fortune who genuinely believe they are on the right tract. You know they had no experience before, in operating this kind of home, and they were led by the Reverend Saunders. So, after the inspection, the inspection is made, I am not saying there is any obligation on these officials to consult with them when they go down, but they knew little, if anything, about the inspection, until they get a very cursory report from the hon. the minister,

MR. HICKMAN: saying that the inspection had been carried out and that he strongly recommended against it.

Now most people in that committee would be prepared, I know I was, to accept the recommendations of the expert, but the gentlemen, particularly in Fortune, felt that they were entitled to something more than that, that they were entitled to know the professional grounds upon which these opinions were based. Nothing to do with the suitability of the motel per se, nothing at all to do with that, It was not going to be made public knowledge. They wrote and asked him. Now I read to this House a part of that letter, (I do not know where it is now) from the hon. the minister to the reverend gentleman in Fortune, who was acting in his capacity as Secretary of this Commission. Look it is incredible, the reply he got. The insinuation was that the department was not going to have any part of trying to unload what was an unprofitable institute unto this group. The Minister concluded his letter by saying, "I would strongly recommend that you read my speech" (to such and such an organization) "and there you will find the answers."

Well, now, is this the way to treat a volunteer organization that wants to do good work in its area? Is this the minister of compassion and the minister with a heart? Here is an organization that wants to relieve Government of its administrative burdens in that particular field. The thing has been set back for several weeks as a result of it, It will get on the rails again. Fortunately, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation are quite co-operative. I can foresee that before this year is over, if for no other reason, out of sheer determination and need, they are going to succeed, you know. But the impression that has been left with these gentlemen, who are all community leaders, is that they are being treated with disdain by the compassionate minister.

Look, the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation should be on his knees, going all over this Province trying to persuade volunteer groups, interfaith groups, service clubs and any other kind of groups to assist in building and administering these homes for the aged and infirm. We have heard it here in this House a dozen times; that there is a desperate need throughout the Province for these homes. So there is a desperate need.

MR. HICKMAN: but we are not getting much more than lip service. You are not going to encourage the cooperation of the people who are interested and prepared to do this work, if you are going to treat them in the manner that they have been treated.

The attitude; let me sum up the attitude that was put in writing by the secretary of this commission or whatever you would call it - corporation. He concluded, after a very bitter commentary on the way he had been treated, referring to the hon. minister he said; "sorry for the mood, but I guess I have taken just about all the fuddle-duddle and fal-dee-dee that I can."

Now this is the minister of compassion. This is the minister with a heart. Our people, through no fault of their own, are not getting the assistance that allows them to keep body and soul together. The voluntary organizations that want to build homes for the aged and infirm are being insulted. Then we reach the final situation, where no employee in that department can rest easy insofar as his department files are concerned.

This Legislature passed an amendment, I understand, to the Elections Act or the Legislative Disabilities Act, so many years ago. There was a great deal of controversy over it, but the principle was probably sound. It was designed to encourage and permit public servants to enter public life. I can see one or two in this Chamber now and there are other in this House who are not sitting in the Chamber at this time, who, because of that, I am sure, did not hesitate to serve their Province.

Hopefully, in the bowels of this building we have other public servants who too can make a contribution to this Province. But, is any public servant, particularly i



in the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation, is he going to give serious consideration to offering himself as a candidate in a Provincial election, if he knows that the first time he gets involved in an argument with his former minister, he is going to have the threat held over him of exposure of his personal file? No Mr. Chairman, this is not a compassionate minister, and this is what the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation is all about, compassion.

Not a sharp knife, not somebody who watches the balance sheet, yet I have always regarded this vote as an open vote. When you run into the unemployment rate that we have today, you cannot come back and say to these people who have been victimized by the planned fight against inflation, cannot come back and say to them; "sorry, I cannot help you because the Legislature did not vote me enough money to do it."

The money has to be spent anyway, and it has to be spent with compassion, not out of benevolence. There is nothing benevolent about long-term or short-term assistance, it is payments out of compassion. It is payments out of the recognition that these people, through no fault of their own, find themselves unemployed, find themselves unable to work. That is what we are looking for. That is the kind of leadership that this Province is looking for in this department. If there is one thing that is missing, it is compassion.

To try and defend the - or vote against this motion on the grounds that we have a compassionate minister, there should be some better grounds than that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: Does the minister want to speak?

MR. NEARY: I am easy to get along with.

MR. CROSBIE: The Minister apparently does not want to speak.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to get my motion worded quite correctly, it is that the minister's salary be reduced from \$11 thousand by \$10,999.02 to the amount of ninety-eight cents. That is the motion.

Mr. Chairman, the minister has amply demonstrated today that he is not the Minister of Welfare, he is more the "Minister of Fear." This underhanded attempt to intimidate a member of this House, by stating that the minister has information in a file that is damaging to the member, is unheard of. I do not doubt that, if I had time to search Beauchesne there now, I would find that it is a libel on a member of this House and that the minister could be expelled for that charge without backing it up.

The minister should resign his seat, if he does not back that charge up. He has given no evidence yet to back it up. The minister's behaviour has a pattern.

MR. BARBOUR: Bring in the file. Bring the file in.

MR. CROSBIE: Just a minute now. All right now. Do not worry about it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Have us all arrested, why do you not.

Now Mr. Chairman, the minister's behaviour has a pattern. The hon. member for St. John's East Extern, last fall (let us just trace this back) after the fire at the girls' home, was reported in the "Evening Telegram" of November 27, 1970, to say this. "Mr. Thomas Hickey, P.C., St. John's East Extern, the Opposition critic on the operations of the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation, has called for an independent commission of enquiry, "someone without an axe to grind" to investigate not only the girls' home but all institutions." Mr. Hickey said, "If the Government had agreed to his request, some years ago, for a commission to investigate

the whole welfare situation, this incident would never have happened, because the inadequacies of the correction facilities would have been spotted." That is what the member called for last fall.

What was the minister's reaction? The minister's reaction was that of a dodger, of an underhanded twister, who, instead of answering and giving the reasons for not having a public commission of enquiry, tried to insinuate, and attacked the hon. member for St. John's East Extern, by implying that he had been fired by the Department of Welfare, a statement that is not true. The member read today, the very letters that disprove it.

What else did he do? When the "Evening Telegram" was critical of the minister - when the "Evening Telegram" carried stories, and here is a transcript. Here is a transcript of the hon. Steve Neary's remarks about the member for St. John's East Extern. This is what he said on C.J.O.N., after the member called for an investigation. Here is what the minister said: "When the member for St. John's East Extern, as you rightly pointed out, was a welfare officer in my department, he apparently 'ah' would not 'ah' agree to this type of training, 'ah' because, he made no effort at all to qualify himself for the job which he held as a welfare officer." That is a charge that the member was not qualified to be a welfare officer. "Maybe, I do not know whether he had the opportunity to do so or not, but he did not do it. Eventually, because he could not cope with the job of welfare officer, he was asked to resign." This is a transcript of the remarks on C.J.O.N., T.V., of the minister.

Because the member for St. John's East Extern had asked for an enquiry, the minister tried this "cheap-Jack" tactic. What did the minister do when the "Evening Telegram" criticized

him for conditions? The "Evening Telegram" revealed in the press that, at the time of the fire in the girls' home, two of the girls were locked in cells in the basement. That drove the minister right off his head altogether. Instead of dealing with that charge calmly, what did the minister do? Ah! the minister did exactly what he attempted to do to the member for St. John's East Extern, he attacked the "Telegram."

Here is a "Telegram" report, December 4, 1970. The minister had a press conference. He appealed to the Newfoundland press to clear up the "Telegram's" slanted and ill-informed reporting. He said, "highly inflammatory misinformation had been fed to the public by the paper in the name of news." He accused the "Telegram's" Associate Editor, Wick Collins, of organizing what? Listen to this. What? Listen to it: "A Tory plot at the 'Telegram' in an attempt to get anyone associated with the Government or the Liberal Party." This is all a piece. The minister, instead of answering the criticism of his policy in administration, attacks, in a McCarthyite, underhanded, sly manner, the person who revealed facts he did not want revealed.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Noel): The hon. member should know that the use of Parliamentary language goes both ways in this Committee.

MR. CROSBIE: I will give due note to the hon. Chairman's comments.

What does the minister do? Asked how he knew Mr. Collins was a Tory, the hon minister replied; "we have ways of finding out who is associated with the P.C. Party." "We have ways." We have our agents everywhere, the telephones are tapped, that was the implication. Now, to get the public's mind off what the real subject was to be discussed, the fire at the girls' home and the two girls locked in cells in the

cellar, which the minister had denied, and whom Mr. McGrath had never heard of, the man who investigated, the minister attacked the "Evening Telegram:" "It is all a tory plot."

Mr. Wick Collins, he says he knows is a tory. "We have ways of finding out." Then he attacked the paper. Their articles were filled with inaccuracies and the rest of it. He could not release the entire report of Mr. William T. McGrath, because statements contained in it referred to the names of juveniles at the home. That is all of a piece. False, distortion! The names of the juveniles, Mr. Chairman, you just take a typewrite and go XXXXX. The name of the juvenile is gone. Where the report says, "so and so, the juvenile was present, you just "X" it out and his name is gone. That is no excuse for not making public the report.

So, we see that the minister's behaviour is all of a pattern. It is all of a pattern. When the Opposition critic, the member for St. John's East Extern, called - the member did not say anything about the minister. He did not slander the minister, he called for a public enquiry, that is all. The minister responded by this foul kind of insidious McCarthyism. First; that he was not competent when he was a welfare officer, and goes on to say, "because he could not cope with the job of welfare officer, he was asked to resign." Today, when the member for St. John's East Extern reads to this Committee letters from departmental officials, regretting that he was resigning, telling him he is welcome to come back whenever he wanted to come back, a letter directed to be written by the Deputy Minister, does the minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation get up and withdraw that false remark that he has made - the insinuation that he has made against the member?

No, he did not have the decency to do that. He has not done it yet, because this is the minister's response. Mr. Chairman, to any criticism of his department of Government,



or of the Government as a whole. Do not answer the criticism, go on the attack with a red herring. Try to slate somebody's character. Try to slander someone. Divert the public's attention. Say that the member for St. John's East Extern was not competent as a welfare officer. Suggest that he has a file in his department which has damaging information against him. Refuse to bring the file up into the House. It is all one piece. The minister is just emulating the Leader of the Government - the Head of the Government, who has done the same thing.

Whenever there is criticism of the Government, the Leader of the Government does the same thing. He attacks some and he says they are full of hate. He gets off on a diversion. It is the same kind of pattern.

The "Evening Telegram" had an editorial called "A Shocking Situation". What could be more shocking than the minister's conduct this afternoon than the interruptions from the other side to goad the hon. member for St. John's East Extern, who was trying to defend his character and reputation? Then, when they had his temper boiled up enough so that he would not retract a statement, have him expelled from the House. What could be more contemptible than that?

The minister has 1,010 employees in his department, the second biggest department of Government. Those 1,010 have a minister who is so lacking in scruples that they know, if they ever cross him, he will try to use something in the files of that department against them, because that is what he has done with the member for St. John's East Extern. Should this House vote a minister, capable of that conduct, a salary of \$11,000.00 a year? Absolutely not.

The member for Burin has dealt with the compassion and dealt with it well. There are 1,010 civil servants in the

May 18, 1971, Tape 684, Page 8 -- apb

Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation at the mercy of a minister who has shown that he will not scruple to use any kind of insinuation against any of them, should they ever enter public life or say anything about him or the Government.

The second largest department of Government. 1,010 out of 7,100 employees,

Mr. Crosbie.

the minister treated the "Evening Telegram" the same. He used the same tactics against them. He used the "Red Herring" and said that they were a Tory newspaper, which they are not. They are an independent newspaper. He tried to brand Mr. Collins a Tory because of his articles. He did not like it, when the "Evening Telegram" reporters found that there were two girls in cells when that fire broke out, so he had to establish a diversion. This is a pattern of deviousness, underhandedness, slyness, insidiousness, reckless, of wrong-doing, and how the minister treats reputations, desperate, hard-hearted, fork-tongued, sneaky and obnoxious in his conduct in this House, to top it all. It is not bad enough, it is not bad enough that the minister takes this attitude ..

MR. NEARY: Does the hon. member.. ?

MR. CROSBIE: In this very House here, Mr. Chairman, his conduct is obnoxious.

MR. NEARY: I would take it that the hon. member does not like me.

MR. CROSBIE: As far as the minister goes personally, I have always had a pleasant relationship with the minister. We are now discussing his conduct as minister of his department. That leaves a lot to be desired. So, Mr. Chairman, there is ample justification for this motion. Before sitting down I want to read this letter. It is a letter addressed to Mr. T. V. Hickey, Welfare Officer, Placentia, Placentia Bay. It is written on February 15, 1961 and it is from the Department of Public Welfare, F. A. Davis, District Supervisor. "Dear Mr. Hickey: I cannot let the opportunity pass without making some reference to your quarterly report for the period ending December 31, 1960, a copy of which I received in this morning's mail.

This report, in my estimation, is the most comprehensive and lucid statement of conditions in a district that I have ever seen. You are to be complimented for the time, effort and research which you obviously put into it. "

Now, Mr. Chairman, how does that compare with the minister's statement

Mr. Croshie.

on television that the member for St. John's East (Extern) made no effort to qualify himself for his job and could not cope with the job and was asked to resign? The next paragraph:

"You are doing a great service to the people in your district by submitting to the department such a detailed picture of factual impressions on the social and economic conditions in your area. Your report indicates that you are very sincere and have the welfare of the people uppermost in your mind and are doing everything in your power to awaken their initiative and responsibility, which for many of your clients has evidently been dormant for some considerable time. No doubt the deputy minister will pass this report along to the minister and it could end up before Cabinet. I hope it does as the problems, which emanate from , should be known to the powers that be. In conclusion, I would like to say that if more Welfare Officers were to submit objective reports such as yours, I feel that many of the problems confronting us would be eliminated entirely or reduced to such an extent that they would no longer be of major concern.

Keep up the good work, Yours faithfully, F. A. Davis, District Supervisor."

Is that a letter that a welfare officer gets when he has not the type of training and has not made any effort to qualify himself for the job he held as a welfare officer? Is that the kind of letter that a welfare officer gets when he cannot cope with the job of welfare officer and is asked to resign? Obviously the minister's statement to the public and on CJON last fall is completely incorrect - it is completely incorrect, to put it mildly. It is a complete fabrication to put it accurately. It is a complete tissue. I cannot use that word. It is a complete tissue of untruth, of nontruth, of absence of truth, of no comprehension of the truth, of no familiarity with the truth, of inability to distinguish the truth, of inability to repeat facts, of fiction - "f-i-c-t-i-o-n" - fiction, in his allegations against the member for St. John's East (Extern).

The letters read in this House a day earlier, by the member for St. John's

Mr. Hickey

East (Extern) and this one, plus everything else that we have heard today, show actually Mr. Chairman why this motion should be carried and the minister's salary reduced to \$.98.

On motion that the committee rise, report progress, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. NOEL : Mr. Speaker the Committee of the Whole on Supply have considered the matter to them referred and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again, presently.

On motion report received and adopted.

It now beinz 6:00 P.M.. I do leave the Chair until 8:00 P.M.



The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Heading IX - Social Services and Rehabilitation. Shall Item 1101-01 carry?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to take up any more time in this hon. House with refuting some of the nonsense that was spielled off here this afternoon. We have seen enough time wasted by speakers on the other side of the House who are more interested in headline hunting than in communicating. But, I do feel, Mr. Chairman-

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I suppose it is all right for a member to speak is it? Are we having closure in the House?

MR. MURPHY: The hon. member is not suppose to debate.

MR. NEARY: There is no debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is a motion before the Chair.

MR. NEARY: If I may continue, Mr. Chairman, I do feel that in all justice to all those fine loyal public servants who staff the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation, I should clear up a few points that might reflect on individuals who are both personally and professionally as competent as any to be found anywhere in either the private or public sector in this Province.

The first point I want to deal with, Mr. Chairman, is the matter raised by the member for St. John's East Extern, when he referred again in this hon. House to the case of a foster mother who was turned down on her application to adopt a child which had been temporarily placed with her. May I point out to the Committee that in such matters the Director of Child Welfare must be guided by the highly trained members of his staff as well as the faculty of the Department of Social Work at Memorial University.

The particular case that was publized here again this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, has been settled satisfactorily in the best interest of the child, which has been placed with a splendid adopted mother and father, who in the opinion of the Director of Child Welfare and the officials will be able to lavish true parental love on this youngster and provide her with all the

MR. NEARY: advantages of a fine home and the attention of parents who have a normal age differential with the child. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this little innocence child will not be made a topic of a political football, and that we can consider the matter closed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with a matter that was raised by the hon. member for Burin, when he referred to the Burin Peninsula's Senior Citizens Home. Let me point out to the committee, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation has not turned down the idea of a local or a locally run Senior Citizens Home on the Burin Peninsula. We did, Mr. Chairman, on the advice of the Provincial Fire Marshal, officials of the Department of Public Works and the Department of Health and the appropriate officials of my own department, refused to recommend to the interfaith group interested in establishing a home on the Burin Peninsula, the purchase of a most unsuitable building, which is presently operated as a motel. I may point out, Mr. Chairman, that, although it would not make sense for us to recommend the purchase of this building, since such purchase would directly involve large amounts of public funds, this does not preclude the interfaith group on the Burin Peninsula from arranging construction of a building, custom built, specifically built for a Senior Citizens Home.

May I also point out, Sir, that when the people of Corner Brook first thought about a Senior Citizens Home (and my hon. friend mentioned this afternoon that the interfaith group on the Burin Peninsula was the second to be organized in the Province, the first being on the West Coast in Corner Brook) when they thought about organizing a Senior Citizens Home at least two existing premises were suggested by the interfaith group in Corner Brook, which were being operated as motels and were rejected. So today, Mr. Chairman, the interfaith social welfare council of Corner Brook is proceeding very happily with the construction of a fine new 102 bed modern building, which is custom tailored to the needs of its prospective elderly residents.

The same hon. gentleman this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, raised the matter again of the recovery of overpayment. Now, Sir, I would suggest to this committee that the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation is duty bound to recover public monies, especially, Mr. Chairman, where there is

MR. NEARY: evidence of fraud. Now whether recovery after twelve years is permissible is a matter that could only be settled by the courts. Perhaps the hon. member may have some grounds on which to base a case on British Common Law, when debts are collected that have been outstanding for longer than a seven year period. My own feeling, Sir, that if the hon. member feels that he has a case that I think that he should take the necessary action under the law to prove his case, to his own satisfaction, and, perhaps, the results of that could be used as guidelines for my department in the future. Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, we will just have to continue on the way we are going.

Finally, Sir, all the members that spoke in the debate this afternoon referred to the file of the history of the employment of the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern. May I assure this House, Sir, that I have no intention now nor did I ever have any intention of making public the employment record in the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation of any present member of this House. My off hand remark this afternoon, Sir, was taken in the wrong light, as it was intended only as a gentle reminder to the hon. member that he was in my opinion rambling on in a speech that had already lasted too long.

So with these few explanations, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the hon. members will reconsider reducing the minister's vote to ninety-eight cents because, as Acting Minister of Labour, this is below the minimum wage.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to see that the hon. minister regards this motion with some lightness of spirit. We do not on this side of the House regard the motion that the minister's salary be reduced to ninety-eight cents with any spirit of levity whatsoever.

The minister said that what was said this afternoon was time wasted, and was headline hunting. When the occasion comes to this House, Mr. Chairman, that the reputation and character of a member of the House and its defence is headline hunting or time wasted, that is the time for this House to be abolished and done away with. There is nothing that more concerns this House than the character and reputation of members of the House.

The hon. member has made a false charge against the member for St. John's East Extern. I read the charge this afternoon and I will read it again.

MR. CROSEIE: On radio station CJON last fall and on the news media.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I do not think it is really in order for the hon. the member for St. John's West to repeat the arguments that he put forward this afternoon,

MR. CROSBIE: I am not going to repeat the arguments I made this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, I am going to restate them, that the minister has made a charge against the member for St. John's East Extern that that member, who was a former civil servant, could not cope with a job of welfare officer and was asked to resign. The minister has not brought before this House any proof or evidence at all, not one iota of evidence to back that charge.

On the other hand, the member for St. John's East Extern has produced documentary proof that this is not true. The charge is totally false. He has produced letters from the Department of Welfare that congratulated him when he left, saying that he would be welcome back any time he choose to come. He has produced other letters, one of which I read this afternoon, that his quarterly report for 1960 was a model, was going to be given to other welfare officers to go by, would be referred to his Minister and might be considered by the Cabinet. All of that absolutely refuted the minister's charge.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is a well known parliamentary custom that if one member of the House makes a charge against another and is unable to back that charge up or to produce evidence, that if he will not withdraw the charge he should resign from the House.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. the minister, I am paying no attention whatsoever to the hon. the minister. He may call me what he likes, I would not dignify him by replying. The point is that the minister has neither withdrawn this false statement about the member for St. John's East Extern, he has not apologized for the statement, he had not backed the statement up. It is a false statement. There is only one decent thing the minister can do, that is either withdraw what he said about the member for St. John's East Extern or

MR. CROSBIE: back up the charge - three choices, back up the charge or (3) resign from the House.

MR. NEARY: You cannot beat a down-throdden Tory.

MR. CROSBIE: Now which is the minister going to do? He has not withdrawn the charge. He just had his chance. What did he do when he stood up to speak? He said the time was wasted this afternoon, it was headline hunting. He has not done that. He has not put up or shut up. He tells the House tonight, Mr. Chairman, that he is not going to make public the file of the member for St. John's East Extern, he does not need to. He has tried to imply to the people of Newfoundland that the member for St. John's East Extern was put out of the Government's service because he was incompetent. No wonder he does not want to produce the file, because the file contains nothing damaging to the member for St. John's East Extern. He tries to act tonight as though this was a very honourable thing to do, that he did not say he was going to make public this file, Still pretending that the member for St. John's East Extern is incompetent or did something wrong when he was in Government service. This is McCarthyism of the utterist, rankist type. The Minister has his chance tonight and he has his chance now, before this motion is voted on, to get up like a man and say that his statement about the member for St. John's East Extern was wrong; he withdraws it and apologies (and, if he does that, we will consider whether or not we will continue with our motion that his salary be reduced) or bring forward evidence for his charges and, if he does neither, well then resign from the House, because that is the only honourable course for the minister to take. The minister will do neither of these, then we will know how to act with respect to the minister. There is no time wasted in this.

The minister has 1010 employees and they are all going to be subject to this kind of treatment, until the minister resigns, if they buck the minister at all. The minister knows that this is unparliamentary, that it is not honourable, that it is disgraceful conduct of the minister to try to take the heat off of himself. When his department was being criticized, he made these baseless charges against the member for St. John's East Extern and



MR. CROSBIE: against other press media, as I repeated this afternoon.

So our position is clear, Mr. Chairman, we are not wishing to drag this debate on. I am just reiterating tonight, so the minister will be clear on our position, that our position is very clear. Very clear. What we are talking about is reputations, character. It does not matter whether Tory characters or Liberal characters or N.D.P. characters, we are talking about character and reputation, that one member of this House had his character and reputation taken last fall and the minister has not yet withdrawn a false accusation.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. member speaks with a forked tongue. We all know that we can sue for slander. I have been slandered personally myself by the head of the Government, dozens of times, on radio and newspaper and the rest of it. The hon. the Premier knows full well that political liable suits and slander suits are always a risk, that you have to have a jury, that on the jury there can be one person who is biased politically, so you never get a verdict. Well that is no defense, the fact that the minister can be sued for slander. That has nothing to do with it. Why should the member for St. John's East Extern have to sue the minister for slander and take a chance on a jury, when the accusation is completely false and the minister cannot back it up. He does not need to do that. It is the court of public opinion, Mr. Chairman, that the member for St. John's East Extern and myself and other members in this House, who have been slandered, will refer to, not the courts of the land. We cannot be sure of getting justice there. But I think the decent instincts of the Newfoundland people will see that justice is done to the member of St. John's East Extern and myself and others who have been slandered and vilified on the public airways of this Province, for month after month, after month, because we have the temerity, the audacity to criticize the Government or what the Government does.

Now that is what the member for St. John's East Extern did last fall and the minister, in an attempt to divert the public's attention, claimed that he was an incompetent who had been fired from his department, when as we heard the member say today, he left to get a higher paying job with Imperial Oil, and produce these letters.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, Mr. Chairman, the minister will either show that he has got some little bit of decency in him or he will not. If he will not produce his evidence to back his charges, if he will not resign, then we will treat him, Mr. Chairman, with the contempt that he deserves to be treated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Amendment before the Committee is that the vote be reduced to ninety-eight cents.

MR. CROSBIE: The vote, Mr. Chairman, be reduced by \$10,999.02, so that the minister's salary is left at ninety-eight cents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: By \$10,999.02

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, we will vote on that. I have a note from the member for St. John's East Extern, who asks a question. "Why does not the minister take him to court for calling him a liar outside of the House, as he did this evening?" The minister can take the member for St. John's East Extern to court, he has called him a liar outside the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that all members are aware that a great deal of what has been said here today is really out of order, because the only matters that can be raised with questions of privilege or that nature in this House, are things that are said about a member in his conduct as a member of the House. What members say about each other outside of the House is really not the business of the House, not, according to the book.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, the inference today, by the hon. minister, that he had a file on the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern, I think, who was employed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now then the motion is that the vote be reduced by the amount of \$10,999.02.

Motion is lost.

On Motion Item X1 - Social Services and Rehabilitation all items of expenditure carried without amendments.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, before you carry the total, I want to point out to the Committee that there are three votes in here for the Education of Blind Children. There is a grant to the Halifax School for the Blind; Transportation

MR. NEARY: of Blind Children and Education of Blind Children.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, we are passed that estimate. On a point of order!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! What is the point of order?

MR. CROSBIE: The point of order is that we are down on Salary Adjustments, it has nothing to do with the blind at all. That item is passed in the estimates.

MR. NEARY: I just want to indicate to the Committee, Mr. Chairman,

MR. CROSBIE: It is passed.

MR. NEARY: that we intended to transfer these votes to the Department of Education.

They were inadvertently included in my estimates, so, later we may have to transfer this over to the Department of Education. We may do it when the House closes. I also want to thank the members of the Committee for their excellent co-operation in expediting the estimates of the Department of Social Services & Rehabilitation, Mr. Chairman. This certainly is an indication that they have great faith in the Department, they did not ask any questions, I was tempted to ask my colleague, the Minister of Community and Social Development, to ask a question. So, I am very pleased with the way the committee handled the estimates, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank them on both sides of the House for their co-operation.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, I would move that the total be reduced by \$10,999,02. The Hon. minister took it upon himself to thank us for letting his estimates slip through, but I think the hon. member for St. John's West has placed most emphatically before this House, before this Committee, our feelings on the attitude of the hon. minister in this House. So he chose, Sir, because of his conduct, which to us was completely unparliamentary. He still has, in my opinion, (in my opinion this committee should have taken notice of it) implied in his remarks today that there was something against the hon. member for St. John's East Extern, that he did not see fit to take back this remark, Treated that way, Sir, we looked at the fact that, as far as we are concerned, in our opinion, the hon. gentleman is not fit to be a minister of the Crown. We chose to ignore him completely -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition to retract that statement. Retract it Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! What is the point of order?

MR. NEARY: The point of order is; the Leader of the Opposition said that the hon. minister is not fit to be a minister of the Crown, I demand Mr. Chairman that he retract it.

MR. CROSBIE: Hear! Hear! Never! Not fit to be a member.

MR. NEARY: Keep quiet, mutton jaws.

MR. MURPHY: There is the culture coming out.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, is that statement in order, that the hon. Leader of the Opposition made?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister is not fit to be in the Chamber, not fit to be in this Chamber, now is that in order, not fit to be in the Chamber with decent men?

MR. NEARY: No because I am not a millionaire, I do not run with the cocktail set -

MR. CROSBIE: You are a political assassin, you are a character assassin -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! One sometimes wonders who is raising the points of order and who wants orders maintained.

MR. BARBOUR: Mr. Chairman, I have a district to look after. I am getting sick and tired of sitting in this hon. House hearing so much belly-wash.

MR. CROSBIE: Go down in your district.

MR. BARBOUR: I go in my district very, very often. Perhaps more than some hon. members do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The hon. Leader of the Opposition did not say or did not qualify why he thought the hon. minister was not fit, It could be for any one of a variety of reasons, his physical health or something of that nature. I cannot order him, if it is not withdrawn.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, I will carry on, Sir, with my few remarks. They are going to be very short because, as I say, we are just treating this minister's department, not the department itself but the minister, with the contempt that he deserves. Because, as I said earlier, in our opinion the Minister, in view of his conduct towards another member of this House and making charges that he has not substantiated, in our opinion should resign from the position he occupies. Should resign because after all - 'fuddle-uddle,' there is the kind of stuff you get from the hon. minister. That is brilliant. Because, Mr. Chairman, we maintain at this moment, as we have maintained right through this session, that the conduct of certain members of this House is flowing over the whole group. The appearance that this House projects to the public at large is that it is just one joint service.



So, I will say, Sir, that in our opinion and as far as we are concerned we will no longer represent the member for Bell Island as being a minister of the Crown. We will not recognize him.

Amendment is that the total be reduced by the amount of \$10,999.02. those in favour say "aye" contrary "nay". Amendment lost.

Heading 20: Community and Social Development:

Shall 20-01-01 carry?

MR.W.ROWE:                      I hope, Your Honour, that the hon. members opposite have not built up too big a head of steam as a result of their last half hour or so of silence, that they do not take it out on innocent parties to the particular dispute. I might say, Sir, that last year, in introducing the first item, introducing my estimates into the House, I gave a ten or fifteen minute report on the general activities of the Department of Community and Social Development in which I tried to anticipate every question that might be asked. Having done so, sat down, only to be confronted, as the estimates were gone through with, to be confronted with the same questions over again. So, for that reason I do not intend to give any general statement whatsoever. I will be more than happy, however, to answer any questions raised, by any hon. member of the House, affecting the estimates of the Department of Community and Social Development.

MR.HICKMAN: General Administration: This vote, Mr. Chairman, this department embraces a fair amount of activity, as I understand it. Under Community and Social Development we find resettlement. Under Community and Social Development we find Community, Amenities, Infrastructure and Incentive. I believe under that same department, under the heading of Rural Development, will come the Development Councils. Now, Mr. Chairman the Development Councils in this Province are something that grew through their own initiative. Indeed, from the beginning there was not that much assistance from Government, when they first started. But they are now a fact of life in this Province, they have become a very strong fact of life, Government now at long last, have to sit up and take notice.

Mr. Chairman, if this department is going to succeed in its anxiety or otherwise to promote regional development authority, then, in my opinion, there has to be not only some consultation, some public expressions of good-will towards the associations and development councils, but they must be brought in on the original planning, They are entitled to know what is going on before any firm policy decision is made with respect to their area. Otherwise, there is no point in having it.

Mr. Chairman, while we have had heard many great announcements about community development, regional development councils, so far the record has not been an encouraging one, from the point of view of these councils. We have several in the Province, one of which we have is on Fogo Island. I believe that the Fogo Island Development Council has probably been the most successful of any council in this Province.

MR. ROWE: Eastport Peninsula has one too.

MR. HICKMAN: The Eastport Peninsula one has been good too. Fogo Island Development Council was founded and started I think by the Extension Department of the Memorial University. They worked in very close cooperation since then. I am convinced that six years ago, or even five years ago, Fogo Island was on its way out. They were on their last legs. They decided to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps. They came up with workable plans to make their area a viable one. They forced those in authority to listen to them. Well, Mr. Chairman, that listening has only gone half-way. Recently, there was a meeting on Fogo Island. It was a mini-conference which I understand was promoted by the Fogo Island Development Committee. That Committee invited the Head of the Government, the Minister of Economic Development, may be others, to come to Fogo Island to hear them as they unfolded a mini-package for the development of their area. They were not particularly pleased with the outcome of that meeting, because the meeting was not conducted the way the Development Councils had in fact thought the meeting would be conducted. It was not the Government coming to the area to hear what the Development Councils had on their mind. It was Government coming to unfold to them what they wanted to do. Let me

read to this Committee the newspaper report of that meeting. I think that that newspaper report indicates very clearly, points out very definitively, what happened at that meeting. The heading is - this is from the "Fogo Island Profile," March, 1971, Edition. Editor and publisher, Rev. I. Jespersen, B.A. B.D., of Fogo. Heading is: "Feasibility Study From Mini Conference." "The Government (J.R. Smallwood) came to Fogo Island Mini-Conference with a pre-packaged plan, on March 10. But if he also listened to a brief presented by Mr. Dan Roberts and promised a careful feasibility study related to those proposals made in the brief. In Mr. Smallwood's pre-packaged plan was a survey for an airstrip on Fogo Island and a \$640,000 signed contract which would place 200,000 tons of crushed rock on our gravel and dirt roads. The crushed rock and airstrips are filled, the bread and butter issues on Fogo Island relate to the repairing and equipping of fish plants to provide jobs. The Fogo Island shipbuilders and Producers Cooperative want the Provincial Government to repair the fish plants and wharves in Seldom and Joe Batts Arm, then turn them over to the Cooperative. The Co-Op then would be in a position to apply for DREE Grants in equipping the plants. The Premier felt that, before such action could take place, a feasibility study would have to be done. 'I think it is an excellent idea,' said the Premier at the Fogo Island mini-conference. He continued, "Fogo Island should be declared as a very exceptional case." I think all departments of Government both Federal and Provincial could very well get together, if they could be persuaded to do so." Then the Premier turned to the Hon. John Nolan, Minister of Economic Development and said, 'there is the thing for you, you could make your name on it, if you could get Fogo Island treated as an experimental area. Surely something could be done, if the two governments could get together and really prove that you do not all have to leave and go to Toronto,' he added. That is the change of Government polity. It is a good one."

Then he addressed the people. "If you really want to make Fogo Island a place where your grandchildren can live, boy, do not stop until

you force the Government to back you up." Now this is what I think development conference is all about. But they have to be listened to, Mr. Chairman. He thought such a study would take, this feasibility study, from two to five weeks, and said that if the study proved favourable, there will be little problem in handing the plant over to the cooperative for \$1." The brief, presented by Mr. Roberts, indicated that ninety construction jobs and 332 operational jobs would be derived from the overall plan. Two hundred and fifteen thousand six hundred dollars would be earned during the construction, by local labour. An annual payroll of \$830,000 would be paid to the seasonal workers, in the finished plant. The brief also estimated that the Government would have to spend only a little more than \$1 million to put all this into effect.

The question was asked of the Premier; "if the money he was spending on the crushed rock and an airstrip might well have been used for the more basic needs of the fish plants labour and fishermen?" The Premier ended his conference, This is a development conference, the Premier and his Minister go to Fogo Island, at Government expense, Government conveyance. The Premier ended his formal address to the mini-conference with a plea for continued support in the forthcoming elections. (quote) "I came here," he said, "pleading, do not forget Confederation, You heeded my cry and every time after you helped me in six general elections. You helped me and I feel gratitude." The Conference ended by the closing remarks of Chairman Stan. Kitchen.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here you have a development conference, headed by able men who are more knowledgeable of Fogo Island than any one in Government. They, in cooperation with Memorial University, spent weeks and months preparing a plan that would provide permanent jobs for Fogo Island and their people. Then they invite the Government to come down and hear their plan, but the Government arrives with another plan, a prepackaged plan, that they knew nothing about. They were told; "you are going to have crushed rock and an airstrip." All very fine, but the people of Fogo Island

have their priorities in the right place. They want jobs first, permanent jobs first. All they got was a promise to study the feasibility of it.

How do we expect Development Councils in this Province to serve the purpose and to serve the purpose that was outlined at the Conference down in the Arts and Culture Centre, if we are going to treat them with disdain and not listen to what they have to say and not act upon it?

To give you an idea, Mr. Chairman, on the question of priorities and for the community development of Fogo Island, which is typical of many areas in this Province, let me read another account of this meeting which relates directly to the development, the community and social development of the Town of Fogo:

It was March 10, 1971, in Fogo. When you hear this, Mr. Chairman, you will probably think it was 1771 I was reading, March 10, 1971, in Fogo. "Children packed snowballs in their little hands and threw them into the blazing inferno of Garland Cole's store. Young men shovelled snow through broken windows, buckets of water were carried from the community pump and thrown vainly over the crumbling building. Bulldozers pushed snow around, but the fire was in command of the situation and most people just stood solemnly and watched. There was no water system to fight fires. Hovering, above, in a streamlined helicopter and watching the fire, was Premier Joseph R. Smallwood, Leader of the Liberal Party in Newfoundland and head of the present Provincial Government. In a few minutes he was going to land on Fogo Island to announce that he intend to build an airstrip and deposit 200,000 tons of rock on our road. He made no plans to mention that Fogo had been dropped from the list of those communities which were to receive water and sewer systems. There on the top was the announcement of July, 1970, for water and sewer systems, seventeen million in fifty-two Newfoundland communities, Municipality Fogo Project, Water and Sewer System, dropped, gone now. The insert above is taken from the Newfoundland Government Bulletin of July, 1970. The Government saw fit then to bless one of its oldest communities with the means of sanitation and safety. But the blessings went dry at the Newfoundland and Labrador



Development Conference. Fogo must fight fires with snowballs until another election. "Wake up, you people of Fogo, and throw out a Government which insults you so!"

That is what the Regional Development Conference, that is the 'Fogo Island Profile', written by the Rev. I. Jespersen, a United Church Clergyman on Fogo Island, who has become a real community leader, who is very actively involved in the Fogo Island Development Association.

AN.HON.MEMBER: Two different accounts by the same person?

MR.HICKMAN: Two different accounts by the same person. One man wrote both. That is Fogo Island. They set the priority. They know what they want, permanent jobs. But they are told you are going to have crushed stone first. You are going to have an airstrip before you have jobs. Is that the kind of leadership that we expect from the Department of Community and Social Development.

Now Mr. Chairman, there is another development association, formed out of desperation. That is the development association of the greater Lamaline Area. Quite recently the Chairman of that Development Association made public and released to the press copies of minutes of the meetings of the Association and the difficulties they have been having in trying to catch the cooperation and the ear of the Department of Social and Community Development. They first started off with the then Deputy-Minister, did not get very far. They spent a great deal of work trying to work out a plan to enable them to continue living in the Lamaline Area. They do not want to resettle. But, slowly but surely, they are being faced with, or they were up until a few months ago, no other alternative but to move out. It is quite true and I have no doubt that before the estimates are over the hon. minister will stand up and say; "nobody in Newfoundland has to resettle if he does not want to. No need for anyone to resettle. We do not go in with a gun and say you must move." That is true. But there is another way more effective, far more insidious, that is the gradual withdrawal of government services, of public services, until the people in

a particular community have no choice but to resettle. One of the best examples that I know of is the Lamaline Area. It does not make sense economically. It does not make sense socialologically. It has nothing to do with the school facilities because if they could get a half-decent road between Fortune and Lamaline, where many of them work, they would be perfectly happy to remain as a dormitory town for the industry in that area.

So, why go to all the expense of suddenly removing three or four hundred families or allowing them or aiding and abetting them in removing by one means or another? Then throwing it unto the shoulders of another municipality, the responsibility of providing municipal services, when what they want in that particular area is simply assistance from Community and Social Development and the right of easy communication. They called a great conference. They have decided to follow the experiment of Fogo Island. They enlisted the support of the Department of Extension at Memorial University, there was a good conference held, participated in primarily by the people of the area and representatives from various departments of Government. One of the leading representatives of the Department of Social/Community Development was a gentleman named Landry, and who has recently been appointed to that department. I can say, without any hesitancy, that Mr. Landry impressed -

MR. HICKMAN: the people at that Conference. He impressed the people with his obvious experience in Community and Social Development work. He impressed them with his ability to speak frankly and to give them facts and nothing else.

He left there with the best intention in the world, and he said, you do certain planning and, when you get that planning completed, I will come back and it will be initiated.

One of the plans, because of the tradition and historic industry in that area, of sheep farming and farming generally, this is what the Development Conference, in consultation with Mr. Laundry hit upon. But months have gone by, this was last September, Mr. Laundry came back and he put his finger, and there is a transcript, a complete transcript of his address at the second meeting. I think he put his finger right on the problem and the concern, that is not just Lamaline, that you find in so many places in Newfoundland.

He said: "I have been so impressed by the anguish of you people, over the question of resettlement, that I decided to come back to this area when I had something to present to you. This was my first contact with rural Newfoundland. I saw many similarities in the way of life and the way of thinking with that found in rural Quebec. Therefore, something which was good for rural Quebec, adapted to certain circumstances, might be good for rural Lamaline and rural Newfoundland in general."

Then he went on, he said "tonight I will elaborate on the needs of people of Lamaline and lay before them certain key developments." he told them the planning and what they had to do.

"There are many ways to plan," he went on to say, "it may be done in an authoritative or a democratic way when," and this Mr. Chairman is the key to development conferences and associations. This is where we are in trouble because it is not being done. Now this is what is being done.

When the Government does the planning from the top without taking due advice from people, the result is failure due to lack of participation. The result of this is either active or passive resistance

MR. HICKMAN; and to avoid this sociologists are changing to participation. Any such planners must start at the needs of the people then submit to Government what should be done, Globally this is the process and the planning was done, the programmes were indicated, Mr. Laundry showed them and the Extension Department of Memorial indicated to the people that there was a great future in the area for sheep farming. There was talk of sending a couple of people from the area to Iceland, to bring someone in from Iceland to assist, and a great deal of participation.

The people of the greater Lamaline area were asked if they would work on the priorities and decide what they wanted. They came up with a set of priorities - number one, they do not want to resettle. Number two, they want to remain a dormitory town for the industrial areas of Fortune and Grand Bank and St. Lawrence. Number three, they want the road paved to that area, so that they can get back and forth and to save all the costs of re-establishing the community or communities of that size. Number four - they said they wanted to make certain they had done the preliminary work and made the preliminary studies and had come to the conclusion that sheep farming and sheep raising in the area, with all that it implies, was feasible. They heard nothing else from Government, nothing until March 1, 1971; They had a short letter from the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources saying; "during the coming season we will be developing a community pasture in the Lamaline area. We also plan to initiate some work on establishing a winter forage programme in the same general area. Work will commence on this as soon as weather permits this spring." Then this prompted an official statement by the Association, They were not very happy with this. They made it to the Premier, their position known, they said; "the enclosed report, (this is March 10th.) deals with the activities of the greater Lamaline Area Development Association since its inception last March. We are submitting this to you for your information and consideration. It is readily apparent from the report that we have experienced great difficulties in obtaining any reaction from Government much

MR. HICKMAN: less a commitment regarding development. Today, just as we were about to mail the report to you, we received a letter from the hon. William Callahan, Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, of which a copy is enclosed.

" We are aware that a community pasture is a necessary first step in our sheep raising development, however, as no previous contact was made with this Association, we feel that in actual fact it may be only incidental rather than part of our development plan. We feel justified in stating that, having put so much time and effort into our plan and having so many interested people involved, we deserve to be included in the plans, if any, for this area.

" A copy of this report is sent to the media. Yours sincerely,  
Patrick J. Hann."

Now Mr. Chairman, I use these two Development Associations simply as an example of what not to do if you are trying to get Community and Social Development working in this Province. There is no point in going into an area at the request of an Association. Remember in this case there was more prodding and prodding and prodding and finally, in desperation, Memorial was asked to organize it, which it did.

Then asking the people to make plans for the development of their area, then break contact with them and then unilaterally sent them a letter saying, "we are now going to put a community pasture there."

That is not how you are going to get co-operation. That is not what development associations are all about. It is no more effective, it is no more realistic, it is no more in keeping with the design and concept of community and social development than it is to be invited down to Fogo Island to listen to their development plans but, instead, tell them what is going to be done and ignore their priority.

If we could only impress upon this Committee and upon the Minister of Community and Social Development that the initiative not only must come from the bottom but that once the people are prepared to do this work that they are entitled to be involved in all the planning and the decision and they should not be placed in the position where they receive unilateral decisions.



MR. HICKMAN: Now Mr. Chairman, resettlement also comes under the Minister of Community and Social Development, I made brief mention, the other day in another debate, of a situation which arose and told, on the south coast of this Province, in the District of Hermitage.

The gentleman who wrote me the letter told me I could use his name if I wanted to. I will, if the Committee insists. In any event, he set forth a set of facts which, in my opinion, point out very clearly the lack of planning and the lack of consideration insofar as resettlement is concerned. This gentleman now lives in Fortune. He starts off by saying, "For some time I intended writing you on the subject concerning resettlement where I, among others, paid a certain sacrifice to move to better facilities for our children as well as ourselves, for a brighter future."

MR. CURTIS: Is the hon. member going to table it?

MR. HICKMAN: I am quite prepared to table it. I have the authorization and the approval of the author to table it.

MR. CURTIS: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: How can I read it if I table it first?

"I am glad to say we have all been successful so far, who moved here to Fortune, but there are things happening which are beginning to seem ... Many of our people in the past year, but I will try to explain as best I can and I am sure you will see our point.

"We left Parsons Harbour, Recontre West, Pushtrough, three settlements, leaving only sixteen houses open at Parsons Harbour, for the three places. We could not get a coastal boat, no electricity, no bait unit, no doctor, worst of all no teacher. Parsons Harbour had been the worst isolated community. There are sixteen homes open now, at present, some containing one person, the overall people number sixty."

Now listen to this, "this is after Recontre is gone and Pushtrough is gone and Parsons Harbour is reduced to sixty people. Now they gave them the coastal service, going to give them electricity, also a bait unit, why now?"

MR. HICKMAN: I say that is a pretty reasonable question for any person to ask. "The fishermen there at present are nine where before there were around thirty or thirty-five. The children going to school in 1967 numbered thirty-eight and now at present thirteen and are being taught by a man who failed grade eight. One fellow married and living in one of the homes that was left by people who moved out.

"Why did we not get some of these privileges, such as the coastal boat? They would not even come after our sick people. Was it because we who moved were the only taxpayers? Was it because we were the self-supporting people? Do the Government know that one-half of these sixty people of this settlement are living on Government support, one way or another, leaving nine fishermen to fish and they are handing down to them the things we fought and asked for all through Confederation.

"Tell whoever is in authority over this, that we were all ready and eager to go back, if they want us to, because we feel sure that they think they have made a grave mistake, somewhere along the line, in order to act now to what people wanted all along, all had to leave. Who was responsible for this? This is true, because we get mail which we do not wish to get from the people reminding us of our mistake in moving.

"I sincerely wish you would reword any of this in order to make it speakable and bring it to the minds of those who call themselves leaders. I would not want my name used unless necessary but, if you have to, do not hesitate."

Now here is a situation that brings to light the statement that I referred to last year from a school teacher in Lamaline, that she made over a CBC programme, and she was again referring to the attitude that is being adopted by Government in the question of resettlement.

You have Parsons Harbour, Recontre West, and Pushthrough seeking these public services, a bait holding unit, electricity, better medical service, the coastal boat to call there, and they did not get it. So eventually they resettled, all except sixteen families. Now that they have

MR. HICKMAN: resettled, these very services that compelled them to move out are being provided, that just does not make any sense. It cannot make any sense.

There is a reason why the coastal boat is going into Parsons Harbour now and it did not before. The port of call for Parsons Harbour was Recontre West. Now that Recontre West has been evacuated the coastal boat gets into Parsons Harbour. But remember the people of Parsons Harbour wanted that boat to call there when Recontre West was inhabited.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you ask the Federal Government?

MR. HICKMAN: I only heard of it last week. It is not in my district and I did not hear of it before. I have met some of the people who have come out of Parsons Harbour to Fortune and Grand Bank and Recontre and Pushthrough. They are first class citizens. They are first class fishermen.

You may very well argue that now living in Fortune they have fuller employment. It is probably true, although it is a good all year round fishing area. There is not much doubt that the public services in Fortune are better than they had before and the schools are better. But the simple fact is that these people did not want to leave and they genuinely believe that if they had been given the public services to which they feel they are entitled, they would not have moved. I do not think you can rationalize that under the old argument that even though the older people do not want to move, it is good in the long run for the children, and if they wanted the public services and they felt that they could have been provided.

But apart from all that, how could you justify this colossal failure after the fact, of putting it in after? Because obviously, if it is justifiable now, it was even more justifiable three or four years ago.

Now maybe the hon. Minister when he comments on his Estimates will not take the position that people do not have to move unless they wish, that technical position that, in my opinion, is not defensible.

Of course, people do not have to resettle if they do not want to. If they are prepared to live in an area without any public services,

MR. HICKMAN: they can stay there forever, as long as they want. But if these public services are withdrawn then it is inevitable that the people are going to move and are going to follow the services and go where they can find them.

What, Mr. Chairman, happens to these communities in the process of dying, these larger communities? Again I go back to Lamaline, a community of say 1,000 people. There has been some resettlement, again because of lack of services. As Mrs. Angela Cowan says "we must remember that a town cannot die overnight and that in many of these towns already designated as phase out areas there will continue to be families and children for many years."

This is true. These towns now of 1,000 people down to say 600 will last for at least one more generation. There will be one more generation of children to be educated in the schools which are dwindling in size.

I remember five years ago the Anglican school in Lamaline had five teachers, there are now two or one, I believe they are going to close it this year. But think what has happened during the five years and what will happen during the next five, unless this trend is arrested.

There is not much point looking a boy straight in the eye in 1985 and saying "unfortunately for you, you were born and raised in a town that was dying. Because it was dying you did not get twentieth century quality of education. But you paid a great sacrifice. You certainly did, because now your town is resettled and your children will not have to undergo the same hardship, the same lack of quality in education."

That is not the answer, Mr. Chairman. The answer surely is to go firstly to these people. To go to their development associations and say; "look, you want to stay. If you want to stay we are prepared to provide certain Government services. But you also think that your area can be developed. Tell us how it can be developed. You tell us what your skills are. You tell us whether your skills are in farming, or fishing, or mixed farming and

MR. HICKMAN: mixed fishing. If it is, you put a proposition to us and then we will provide the experts and the planning, know-how that will ensure that you can avail of whatever DREE or ADA grants or ARDA grants or whatever other grants are available." This, Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied has been done in this Province to date. I say this in the full knowledge that Community and Social Development is a new Department. I do not say it is a reflection upon the Minister personally at all. I realize that it is only this past year that he has attained the services of highly qualified planners and people with the skills that are necessary to develop the community and the social life of the community in this Province.

What I am very concerned about, and I trust that he is too, is that these development associations that are born out of necessity or conceived out of necessity, that work and are prepared to work as a cohesive unit, will be discouraged before they get off the ground by the attitude that has been displayed toward at least these two that I have cited and I have no doubt hon. members can refer to many more. The planning must come from the ground up and not from the top down, Mr. Chairman.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, I promised the hon. Minister that I would not delay the consideration of his Estimates very much. Actually the Minister of Community and Social Development is one of the more gentlemanly ministers in this House and certainly an example to some of his colleagues. He has been most co-operative. He has stuck to the point and answered questions and I should like to pass him the bouquet of saying that he is behaving himself in the House as a Minister should. Therefore, we will treat him in the like way and will respect the way he respects us in return. But I have just one little bone of contention to pass on to the Minister.

On Sunday I believe he appeared on the programme "Analysis" and in a statement he made there was something to the effect that the



MR. EARLE: members on this side were a bunch of dumb bunnies who had not spoken much during the House, if at all. He did not recall his own colleagues who have been silent all during this Session. The fact is that if you look at Hansard, we have all spoken, over-all many, many times, at great lengths, and I would be strongly tempted to carry on for two or three hours tonight just to pay him back for that statement. But I shall not do that. I will get on with the business and try to confine my remarks to his Department.

I should like first of all to mention a few of the things - My colleague on my right, who just went outside for a moment, made rather an amusing comment, I thought. He mentioned that during the Development Conference on Fogo Island this winter that they were promised an air strip and 200,000 tons of crushed rock. Well I happen to have been born on Fogo, I wore out many pairs of shoes travelling over the rock on that island, and this is one thing they do not need on Fogo Island is rock.

Anybody that knows the place would think that it is just one big solid rock. If the Development Conference in going there, instead of saying that they would import 200,000 tons of rock, if they had said to the people, "this is an ideal place for rock crushers to develop all the rock in the world for the rest of the island," they would have created a little industry. It would have been a productive industry which could export the product rather than one that could import one at great Government expense. I thought it was very amusing indeed. Talk about taking coals to Newcastle, rocks to Fogo Island is just about the height of any ridiculous statement I ever heard in this House. Anyhow be that as it may, people on Fogo Island have shown an admirable example in their efforts to develop their communities and that particular part of Newfoundland and they have been one of the foremost and progressive development associations in the Province and I hope many others will follow their example.

MR. EARLE: It brings me back to refer to particularly the part of the Country which I represent, the South Coast. Now the Minister, about a year ago, was going to bring into the House - I think it was stated at that time, that the overall master agreement, five year agreement, would be presented last July. We are now into May of this year and we still have not got that master five year agreement and all the questions that we have asked in the House so far have not been very definitive. There certainly has been no statement on which we can latch ourselves onto and say that this particular programme, a five year development programme, will be signed within a matter of days, weeks, months, or anything else. It may well go on another year.

Well I know that planning takes a lot of time. I know the Minister has undoubtedly had his problems. But the things which distresses me about all of this is that so much of this Province, which has not been designated as one of the DREE areas, are waiting for assistance of various kinds. and encouragement of various kinds, and I imagine that that can only be carried out if the master agreement of the five year programme is implemented. That will then free the Government to spend other monies, which we hope they have, on other parts of the Province which are not included in these particular agreements. This is what we have been told in the House, of course, it is likely to be a case that by the time all of these agreements are ready to be signed, somebody else will be signing them not the present Government. So perhaps we will be able to speed it up a little bit.

On the South Coast of Newfoundland, the area which I represent, it has always been a bit of a mystery to me, when you think of Community and Social Development, in particular, why that part of the Province is not paid more attention to

MR. EARLE: and has not been developed more rapidly. It is rather peculiar that in one part of the Island, where we have all-winter ports, where the Province does not suffer from ice barriers for parts of the year, where the snowfall is probably the lightest in all of the Island, is the one part of the Province that has not been properly developed.

Now take in roads alone, which is part of the minister's responsibility in these programmes where he is getting encouragement to build roads. It always struck me as extremely stupid that the Government, instead of going across the south coast of Newfoundland, connect up all the many settlements that were there, decided to build around the other fringe of the country first and then come right straight down through the country about eighty-five or ninety miles of road on a direct line from Bishop's Falls to the Head of Bay D'Espoir. This in effect means that in order to get to the Harbour Breton area, which will soon be connected up, you have to drive from St. John's approximately 420 miles or 430 miles, in a huge circle. The actual mileage, if this had been done in a sensible way, coming from Terrenceville over to the Head of Bay D'Espoir, would be something like fifty or sixty miles of road. Fifty or sixty miles of road that could have been constructed across that part of the country, with millions and millions upon millions, upon millions of dollars less money, and would have connected up all that section of the south coast years and years ago. But, for some unknown reason, this was not done. The excuse was used that the territory down there was too difficult. That the settlements could not be connected up, But this is balder dash because, since then, roads have been put into far less accessible areas where the terrain was every bit as difficult and where it was just as costly to build roads. Yet for some reason this whole section was neglected.

Now what has happened because of that, the minister must be very interested in this because apart of his programme is to look after the Resettlement Programme, the people in so much of Fortune Bay and that area got so tired of waiting to be connected up with civilization that settlement after

MR. EARLE: settlement just disappeared and there are now only comparably few settlements remaining in that area. Many of these people either went to the Canadian Mainland or they moved into Grand Bank or Fortune or somewhere like that and left what were very substantial homes and very fine villages. I do not think it was necessary and I do not think it was to any great advantage for the people actually. Because to take, for a prime example, one little settlement in that area, which has remained and is still there and is progressing in spite of the fact that, up to about a year ago, they got virtually no help at all from the Government, The settlement of Pool's Cove, on the west side of Fortune Bay, consists of probably fifty or sixty families, the very finest type of people you can get in Newfoundland, who, of their own initiative, have supplied their houses with water and sewerage. They have beautiful homes. They have now gotten underway and provided a very fine Medical Clinic in the place. Now they have at last being getting some help. But they have developed this settlement to the extent of getting a bait depot and a fish holding unit there. All of this over the years. When I first went there, there was complete apathy, almost there was complete hopelessness about the place because this was thought to be just another area that was going to disappear. But by talking to the people and encouraging them and giving them hope for the future, they got up themselves and went after these items and started to install them and develop them, and now they have a very fine settlement which is self-sufficient. So many people there make excellent incomes. There is a good herring fishery in the area. It is a good lobster fishery. They are now getting very much involved in the cod fishery. As I said, they have beautiful homes. They are well established. They have always had good teachers there. There is no earthly reason why the people should <sup>not</sup> live there, They are as happy as clams. They love that settlement, they are turning it into a very fine one. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that there have been dozens of other settlements along the South Coast that, with the proper encouragement and help, could have been the same type of settlements as is Pool's Cove today, where the people in many cases would be far better

MR. EARLE: off and far happier than they are now, where they have moved. The opportunities are there, they would make just as good a living, probably a lot better living than some of the people who have moved away and gone to these other places at considerable expense to the Government.

While speaking on the Resettlement Programme in certain areas, which has been a Godsend, I will not dispute this with the minister. There are certain places where there is absolutely no future, it is a dead-end, an island or something of that sort, where it is only sensible for the people to move. In these cases the only pity is, of course, it did not start earlier, that the people did not move, because I have several prime examples in my district, where just about the time that the people were getting ready to move they put in a bait depot or a community stage or a public wharf or something of this nature, at great cost, and the people just moved out and left it. Well that was just absolutely stupid. There was no planning whatsoever in these particular cases. I do not think the Government will ever live that down, because they wasted tens upon tens of thousands of dollars in so doing.

But, when I first entered the Government, I was on the other side of the House at that time. I proposed for my area on the South Coast the development of key areas which could be self-sustaining and self-sufficient. But their main need was to be connected up with the rest of the island, with roads, so that they can get into communication. The story is a sad one because it took me eight years to get eight miles of road built in that district.

While the Premier was boasting about his 6,000 miles of new highways and so on and re-conditioned highroads, Fortune Bay got eight miles of road in eight years, one mile a year for ages upon ages upon ages. It was pitiful and disgraceful. Instead of completing the job and going on and doing it properly, this was the sort of tactic the Government used. I remember one time chatting to the Premier about this particular area and its needs. And I said; "look, for heaven sake, let us get going and connect up these few remaining settlements. It is only a matter of thirty or forty miles of road and we will bring them in to the Twentieth Century." And he said, "oh, first of all we have got to build another road into Gander." Well, Gander was very



MR. EARLE: well served at that time. Fortunately, the then minister, Mr. Pickersgill, who was the representative in Ottawa, did not see it that way and he did not agree with the Premier and that road was never built. But the idea of even considering, talking about another entry into Gander, when a whole section of Newfoundland did not have as much as a cow path, was beyond thinking about. But this seems to be the Government's queer idea of priorities. I think really what doomed the South Coast of Newfoundland was the fact that some years ago there was a South Coast Commission that went up and down the South Coast and reported on the economic prospects and the viability of that whole area. Well that report should be condemned to the fires of hell, because it has ruined the lives of hundreds of thousands of our people. This predicted the South Coast as a completely undeveloped area that had no future, apart from Port aux Basques, the tip of the Burin Peninsula and I think a little area around the Head of Bay D'Espoir, is all it said that could be done.

Well since that report was written, the people on that coast had been some of the most hard-working people in all of Newfoundland and in most areas down there the percentage of welfare or social assistance has been far less than it has in many other areas of the country. All the time that they were suppose to be going out of existence, that their future was hopeless, they were deep-sea fishermen, they were earning good livings and they were getting good incomes. All they needed was this meager amount of help to connect them up with the rest of their own Province. But, they asked as they might, that whole coast was completely and absolutely neglected, except for the development of the whole of the Burin Peninsula and the development around Port aux Basques. The rest of it was due to, what was done on the coast, was done by private industry. The Harbour Breton area was built up because of the fish company and Gaultois and Ramea and these areas were all private people who got in there and tried to do something for the area. But they themselves really had to do it the hard way, because they were trying to conduct businesses, trying to build up viable industries, without any of the normal facilities which the rest of the country was enjoying.

MR. FARLE: I used to think when I first went down into that part of the country, it was like going to the far north or something. When I left home and went down in my district, a few years ago, the communications, to get a message home or something like that, were out of this world. Well we have fought and we have struggled and we have got telephone communications. We are getting a few roads, it takes an awfully long time to get them. We have got telephones now and we have roads and we got some communications, but this is all ten to twenty years behind the rest of Newfoundland, in most places. As I said, the reason for it is quite beyond me because that has always been the most prosperous and one of the most viable areas of all of Newfoundland.

But just to finish on the resettlement programme, one of my chief gripes with the hon. the minister and his department is that the wheels of Government move exceedingly slow in these things. I do not think sometimes that they realize quite the disruption that people get involved in when they leave their homes, particularly old people, and move to a new area. The pity of it is that very often, for the matter of a few hundred dollars extra, the job could be finished and these people could be made completely comfortable. But I have seen people, families for instance, who move from Point Rosie and to Garnish, they were three years getting this thing straightened out. They move their houses in, some of them bought house there and some moved their houses in. The plan was good, the whole thing was ideal, for them to settle down and be with their fellowman in a place of the type they were used to. But heavens how we had to work, how many complaints and how many appeals I had to make to get the meagerist little thing done their, to finally get them straightened away. To begin with, some contractor went in there and stuck everybody with the few dollars they had left, on their plumbing facilities, when they were trying to get their houses fixed up. This fellow took them to the cleaners, in this particular place, and these people were - you imagine a family coming from a place like Point Rosie, not experienced in plumbing or heating or electricity or anything of that sort being - left completely at the mercy of some operator. They go into a place, they pay too much, they get a

MR. EARLE: poor job done and then the fellow walks out with the job half finished.

This makes the people so exceedingly disguised with the whole thing that they wonder if the Government really knows what it is doing. Now this, I think, the present minister is trying to remedy, but again the problem is one of slow progress. The whole operation of this department, it seems to me, is being governed largely by experts and people who are theorists and people who want to see all their "i's" dotted and "t's" crossed before they do anything.

I have a feeling, I maybe wrong, I have a feeling that Ottawa takes a look at this expenditures of this department and says; "look, how in the name of Heavens can we trust the Newfoundland Government to spend the money properly, which we give them? They have made so many mistakes in the past. They have recommended so many foolish things that we have got to be absolutely sure, sure, doubly sure and terribly sure that the money that we give the Department of Community and Social Development is well spent." That is why there is all this endless planning, endless looking into things and endless preparations before anything is actually done.

But in the meantime, people are people. Newfoundlanders have to live. Newfoundlanders cannot wait for some Government just to take its time in developing a master scheme of which they are neither aware of the implications, they are not aware of the way in which it is being developed. They feel they are just being led up one rosy garden path and that the end will never come.

I think, it would be far more sensible had the Government followed the plan of taking regional areas in the Province, say around Belleoram, which Belleoram was one of the most active and creative fishing ports in Newfoundland at one time. It is surrounded by six or eight settlements, all of good hard working people. If this had been centered into a community effort of that whole area, not just one settlement but the whole thing and developed for the fishery and what natural things were available there, instead of leaving the people to rot without help or guidance of any sort, I think, this plan would have got off to a good start. But now you have a whole feeling of

MR. EARLE: dejection and wonderment and doubt and despair and everything else.

I do not blame the people, I think that they have been very, very badly let down over the years.

One other point, before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, onto the minister's department comes the small business incentives. The idea is an excellent one. We heard at the development conference that there was suppose to be some liaison set up so that businesses could get encouragement to start up a small project or a medium size project or so on.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Department of Economic Development.

MR. EARLE: The Department of Economic Development, I am sorry. I thought it came under the hon. minister's department. Well my apologizes. But in any case it is related to the minister in this way and he should take a very active interest in it, because his department, as the name implies, is interested in community and social development. Community and Social Development of course is very, very closely indeed related to the kind of activity that goes on in these places. I am quite sure that if his department can encourage a speed up in this sort of help that, he should take a very, very active interest in it and try to help it along.

But, I feel that in many of these places there are very small undertakings that people can themselves undertake, if they are given the necessary instruction, the necessary information and the necessary financial help, which is not very great in many cases. But it is frustrating and completely self-defeating when a chap tries to get into this sort of thing, because he seems to be up against a stone wall.

Mr. Chairman, at this stage of the discussion on the estimates, I do not wish to have anything else to say on this particular item. But, I would like the minister to bear in mind the gist of my remarks, which is to the effect that as his department develops, and if and when the whole regional plans are agreed or the whole agreement is made with Ottawa, that they take into very serious consideration indeed and develop the pockets of people in certain

MR. EARLE: areas that can be self-sustaining, that can look after themselves and that can develop their communities, as the Community of Pool's Cove has done. I think that the money that his department may spend would be very well spent in such areas without perhaps the elaborate hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of dollars which are being slanted in certain directions, which may or may not bring development, unfortunately an awful lot of this money which is being spent is being spent, particularly this year, for temporary jobs on construction and highroads and things which are not going to bring any lasting employment, whereas money that would be spent or should be spent in the way I am suggesting, might help these people to earn their living and a decent living forever afterwards and not something that will just cease when this particular election year is over.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman,

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Do you want to go first?

AN HON. MEMBER: Go ahead Lieutenant.

MR. CROSBIE: Thank you Leader. I am ready to become a private or corporal. Mr. Chairman, I just want to review some of the ministerial statements that we have had from the hon. minister, because this is the department from which ministerial statements flow like a cornucopia. If we just look at last year -

MR. HICKMAN: Try that again.

MR. CROSBIE: Cornucopia. You never heard of that one before?

The trouble with DREE, Mr. Chairman, is that it is in danger, if the Government does not show a little restraint and a little common sense in describing what it is going to do. It is going to be in danger of becoming swallowed up by the bull that is handed out about it. The minister is one of those who have handed out too much bull about DREE.

Here we are after two years of talk about DREE, the minister has still not got his four year agreement signed or his five year agreement signed. Just looking briefly at some of his statements, Mr. Chairman, we see that last year the minister made the following statements about DREE in this House: April 15, 1970, a statement by the minister to explain why he had



MR. CROSBIE: nothing to tell the House at that time. It took him four pages to tell us why he had nothing to tell us. At that statement he was telling us that the actual one year agreement was not yet signed and he was giving some reasons why it had not been signed, and, of course, the reasons had nothing to do with the Government of Newfoundland. No, it was Mr. Tom Kent and the officials up in his office that were dragging their heels. The minister was in touch with Mr. Kent and he was extremely disappointed that there was going to be a delay. So that was a four page statement on that delay.

Then the minister came before the House, Mr. Chairman, last year with a statement, a week later, on April 22. That statement was to the effect that an \$82 million agreement had been announced by the Federal and Provincial Governments and signed on April 21. There was going to be spent in Newfoundland that year, last year, in the eight special areas, then the minister listed the special areas about \$82 million last year and this year, most of it to be spent last year according to the minister's statement.

There are going to be industrial incentives the minister said, and help on roads, schools and the rest of it. There is a joint planning committee and the minister said in this statement of a year ago, April 22, 1970, that there is a joint planning committee which expect to develop a four year plan for the special areas covering projects to be started from next April onward. Now that April, Mr. Chairman, was April 1971, which is now come and gone. There is still no four year plan, at least that the House has heard about, covering projects to be started that the minister said last year would be started from April onwards.

The minister made certain additional remarks showing how much money was going to be spent, the total altogether of \$41 million, directly in the Newfoundland agreement.

Now this year when the Budget was brought down, Mr. Chairman, we discovered that \$16 million was spent last year, not \$41 million, not \$82 million. Sixteen million. That was his statement of April 22. Then the minister last year on April 30 made another statement. April 30, 1970. This is a dandy one. This was outlining all the projects that were going to be carried out last year with detailed breakdowns - municipal, industrial, infrastructure, roads, forests, accessroads and all the rest of it and all

MR. CROSBIE: the various projects are shown. Just to give one example of what the minister listed, one of the projects in here said to be water supply, Port au Choix. 1970-71 expenditure, water supply \$243,000. That is a grant of \$243,000. Loaned \$243,000, total \$486,000. Well this year, Mr. Chairman, looking through the newspaper about a month ago, what is in the newspaper? "Council Chairman claims Port au Choix gets run-around in request to DREE."

Now here is the programme of a year ago, shows \$486,000 we spent at Port au Choix for water supply. What are the facts? Here is the story according to Chairman, Ralph O'Keefe of the Local Improvement Council. Mr. O'Keefe says that the Regional Economic Expansion Department announced last April that Port au Choix was a special DREE area and would therefore receive \$486,000 for water and sewerage system. Now we know that Mr. O'Keefe is one hundred percent correct. Here is the minister's statement, a copy of it, in my hand. Plans for the system have been drawn up and were presented to the Government in August, at which time the community learned that half - they only learned this now in August, although the minister told us in April.

MR. ROWE, W.N. August 1970.

MR. CROSBIE: August 1970 at which time the community learned that half of the \$486,000 was a grant and the other half a loan to finish the programme,

The Municipal Affairs Department was willing to provide an amount equally that supplied by DREE," Mr. O'Keefe said.

The he goes on to say, "DREE representatives told the community, in October," now this is six months after April, "that the cost of the project was too high and they wanted it decreased, if this were possible." Then Mr. O'Keefe says, "We agreed to a partial sewer system and complete water system which cut the cost by \$90,000. This was very depressing, but we wanted to get the project underway. A meeting with representatives of DREE and the Municipal Affairs Department in February," that is February this year -

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: This is the Department that showed us that they had a \$31 million water and sewerage programme for last year, the minister said. The programme got scuffled when the election did not take place. So we will hear all about it again this year. So Mr. O'Keefe goes on, " A meeting with representatives of DREE and the Municipal Affairs Department in February revealed that the second plan was rejected by the Federal Government, because it required an amount of money too large to be spent in such a small community. "And we were asked to agree on a plan that involved the water system only. We were told that, if we accepted this plan, tenders would be called not later than March 1971," Mr. O'Keefe said. "We accepted this offer because there is every indication that, if we did not, we would get nothing. Our loan grant has dropped again from \$486,000 to \$320,000. The situation becomes more frustrating everyday. But we are still living in hopes

Mr. Crosbie.

living in hope of something to be announced for us by the end of the present month," Mr. O'Keefe said. That was in March.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): He referred to the Federal Government rather than the Provincial Government.

MR. CROSBIE: This Government here is the Government that yaks about DREE, that boasts about DREE, that talks about DREE, that announces DREE, that preaches DREE, that DREE's at the mouth. This is the Government who responsibility it is.

Another council spokesman said that Port au Choix seems indeed to be a special area under the DREE programme because it is the only one that has not received any benefits from the programme. That is what he says about the DREE programme. Now here is a programme presented to this House Mr. Chairman, April 30, 1970, listing the projects, (let me see what table it is. No it is not Table II), Table I-A shows related Federal Government commitments. Table I gives a general summary of the projects in this year's agreement. There is a total commitment for municipal and industrial infrastructure, \$26,520,000, of which \$17 million was spent this year. Then all the projects are shown, DREE Initial Project Summary, Associated and Supplemental Federal Commitments, Initial DREE Financing Projects in Newfoundland and Labrador, and all these other projects, Water Supply, Port au Choix - that is not qualified, grant \$243,000, loan \$243,000 - \$486,000. What happened in Port au Choix? What happened in Port au Choix is the run around that the council chairman at Port au Choix described. Now that is unnecessary Mr. Chairman. The delays may be excusable but what is not excusable is a government that announces these projects as facts before they are facts, for the cheap political impact that has. It does not care how disappointed the people are, does not care how confused they are, just try to fool them, just try to bluff them, do not wait until everything is settled, the "t's" are crossed and the "i's" are dotted. Bring

Mr. Crosbie

forth the big programme and announce all these projects and then as month by month goes by Port au Choix finds out what the real facts are. What is the rush to announce all this until it is all settled and agreed? The only reason of the rush is the political reason. It is clear, Mr. Chairman, that if the Federal Government had not instituted this DREE programme the Government would not have a chance in this world of being re-elected, not a chance. It has a chance now, a simple one, and it is because of DREE. Goldfarb shows no chance, but I am giving the benefit of the doubt. I say, a slight chance - a slight chance. Did I hear the hon. member for Bonavista South gaggle? I said yesterday that he was one of the seven who is going to get re-elected.

If the Newfoundland Government did not have DREE to hang on to, to cling on to, to hug, to squeeze, to blow about, it would have nothing. The trouble is that it blows, squeezes and hugs and shouts about DREE too much before everything is all settled. People all over the Province get disappointed, get a run around. Here is another article here about Corner Brook. Here is another one. Corner Brook is here in this programme, the minister announced last year: Residential Sites Programme, Trunk Sewer Improvements, Corner Brook, Water and Sewer Trunk Main Extensions, Extension to Water and Sewerage System, Corner Brook. I do not know how all these fit in but here is an article from the Evening Telegram, May 6, 1971: "DREE will not finance a water supply system for Corner Brook. It seems that the City cannot get DREE financing for the \$350,000 improvement to the current water supply to which, as Mayor Noel Murphy said earlier, the City had to divert all its own funds because we had to have water." A letter from an official of the Provincial Community and Social Development Department who acts as - what does he act as? Just listen to this: this is a hard one to beat, Director of Infrastructure Development for the Regional and Economic Expansion Department. He is the I.S.D. man for the R.E.E.D. Department. So council



Mr. Crosbie.

and DREE had ruled that the pump house required in the supply system was an integral part of a project already underway. This disqualified it.

MR. MURPHY: What district was that in?

MR. CROSBIE: That is in Humber East or West or both. The member never goes to his district. I have forgotten who the member is. The director said he could not convince any one in the department. All I can say on that is: (I am quoting Deputy Mayor Bill Hann) "It is a damn poor show." You are right Deputy Mayor Hann. Councillor Farrell says: "It seems the City cannot get anything from DREE. There was so much red tape that there seems no way to cut through it." "Keep trying anyway," was the slogan out in Corner Brook. "Keep trying." Another article from Corner Brook, Mr. Chairman: "West arterial road plans must be ready this month, May 6, 1971. The City found that at a recent meeting in St. John's that the proposed arterial route may not be started this year, if the plans for it are not prepared by the end of this month," says Deputy Mayor Hann." They were lucky to discover that in time.

MR. MURPHY: I think they are going to run that down the centre of Corner Brook.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not know where they are going to run it. It may be something like the southside access road that we heard today was going to be changed - the hon. the Premier said that if they could get the plan changed. Whose plan is it, if it is not the plan of the Government of Newfoundland? I do not doubt that the Premier can change his own plans once there is a political fuss kicked up about it. Mr. Hann said that the Committee commissioned Project Planners, and they were done away with. They were told to hire somebody else. There was a new consulting firm hired by DREE and so on and so forth. Now the price tag is too high and so on and so forth. That is the arterial road in Corner Brook. Now every community in Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman, that needs something and there are hundreds of them that need it; water and sewerage, paved roads, etc., there are dozens of things, schools and the rest of it, they are told about this wonderful DREE, this

Mr. Crosbie

DREE programme, this pie up in the sky that is going to rain down blessings on the people of Newfoundland, pie in the sky. There is no overall development plan. It certainly has not been announced yet. It is just a series of projects. The ones that are announced will get started, grand. It is grand to have the money. It is grand to have the roads built. But look how many dozens of communities are fooled and put off by the Government's constant reference to DREE. I will bet you anything, Mr. Chairman, that the delegation just up from Bay d'Espoir, that were going to picket the power station down there, were told that DREE is going to provide everything for them down there - DPEE called on again.

MR. WORNELL: Wrong.

MR. CROSBIE: It is wrong. I am glad to admit I am wrong, if the hon. member says I am wrong. DREE was not mentioned.

MR. WORNELL: Well it might have been mentioned.

MR. CROSBIE: I withdraw my withdrawl

MR. WORNELL: I do not think the hon. gentleman has any right to refer to something on which he is not privy.

MR. CROSBIE: On which I am not what? I accept the hon. member's admonition. I will speak on nothing to which I am not privy. I certainly was not privy to that meeting. It is the privies we are trying to replace. These are just several examples. Now there is no need for that kind of exaggeration, if it were not for political purposes. Then we come to a statement that the minister made on May 19, 1970. We were pleased with statements. "In view of the fact that there seems to be a lack of understanding and some misunderstanding about the water and sewer projects, the minister decided to outline the programme." Now we had the Minister of Municipal Affairs, he was firing out - you know, you felt that there was not going to be a grave left that would not have a water and sewer pipe going through it last year. The Minister of Municipal

Mr. Crosbie

Affairs, he had \$30 million to \$40 million to whack away on water and sewerage. Now the Minister of Community and Social Development is ready to explain his part.

MR. COLLINS: I am wondering where they are going to get all the men to do the work.

MR. CROSBIE: "They are moving father's grave to build a sewer." That was the song here last year. They are moving it regardless of expense. They are removing his remains to put in proper drains. Here is the minister, May 19, 1970: "In the first place I cannot emphasize enough the simple fact that the DREE programme itself is not yet ready, is not yet signed, not yet ready to go into operation." (Imagine that, after the three previous statements telling us all the projects that were going ahead!); "All of this will happen later in the present year and all that we have up to this moment is a temporary DREE programme for merely part of the Province." It was certainly temporary for Port au Choix, very temporary, and it got more temporary and more temporary as the year went on. "In the second place the water and sewer programmes, even for the part of the Province, covered by the temporary DREE programme, was anything but complete. The actual number of projects that are firm and final for the present season are eight in number. They are as follows:

(1) (Can the hon. member guess what No. 1 is? Firm and final for the present season are eight in number) "Port au Choix, on the North West Coast, a water system." "It was firm and final," the minister said, in May 19, 1970. "At Hawke's Bay also on the North West Coast, there is a water and sewer system. At Holyrood there is a water and sewer system. At Bishop's Falls, there is a water system. On the south shore of Conception Bay, there is a first step in a water and sewer system." That is the first baby step, it turned out to be, because this was hiring consultants to look at the whole area. "On the south shore of Conception Bay, there is to be a water system, also: St. Lawrence, a water system, Arnold's Cove, a water system, Corner Brook, there is to

Mr. Crosbie.

be an extension to the water and sewer system. All of these projects will go ahead this year. We have every hope that we can get all of them completed and put into use well before the end of next year." This was May, 1970, last year. "I must say a special word about the south shore of Conception Bay." We can skip that. "I wish to lay great stress that these projects, eight projects are anything but complete and final. It must be obvious to every one that there are within the present temporary DREE areas a number of other water and sewer projects that are as badly needed." The trick is, do not miss anything. When there are eight special areas, imply there are going to be another three areas or there are going to be another eight areas, another sixteen areas. Do not leave any one out. When you list eight water and sewer projects, you know that there are another 200 communities in Newfoundland who do not have water and sewerage, so you give them hope. You say that it must be obvious to every one that there are within the present temporary DREE areas, a number of other projects badly needed. Do not miss anything. Use the old semantics so when they come in from these communities you can say to them that our statement did not leave you out. You were included in the number of others that are badly needed. "I have been making representations to DREE on behalf of the Government of this Province for inclusion of such needed projects in the main DREE agreement to be announced later this year, 1970." It is not announced yet and this is 1971. Some of these systems are as follows:

Water and sewer system in Bay Roberts, not a peep nor a squeak about their water and sewer system in Bay Roberts. It was mentioned when the hon. minister resigned in the letters that had passed between the Premier and him, I believe. There is also Brigus, Kilbride, Spaniard's Bay, Upper Island Cove, Now I may have missed it, but I have not heard any of

Mr. Crosbie

them announced yet. They will be announced in this House again before this session ends. I have no doubt about that. The minister will not slip up, now that I am reviewing these documents for him and I am recalling them to his memory. Now you do not want to miss anything now. You mentioned some places in the upper part of Conception Bay. Also there is need of extensions to water and sewer systems in Carbonear, Harbour Grace and the St. John's Metropolitan area. All of these needed projects are in the St. John's special area. Do not miss any area. We did them pretty well all. There is the Metropolitan area, Carbonear, Harbour Grace, Upper Island Cove, Spaniards Cove, Bay Robert's, Brigus, Kilbride. Then the minister dealt with other special areas. There is an extension in the Corner Brook special area. There is a mention of that needed extension to the water and sewer system at Corner Brook to supply existing and new properties. That is the one that DREE (1) financed I assume, May 6, 1971. Happy Valley, special area, there is a water and sewer system needed in Northwest River.

Now the minister did not think that was complete - that was not complete. He went on to say: "This list of present needs in the eight special areas designated so far is by no means an exhausted one. I have given it in order to indicate the volume of some of their requests and needs for municipal water and sewer systems merely within the present special areas designated by DREE." So he has covered everything - everything. He has listed all kinds that should have it. Now he has covered everyone else. The minister is not to be outdone. He moves on to a more significant point. Tune in in thirty seconds for the next dramatic development. "In addition to the eight special areas which have already been established by DREE, this Government has negotiated with the Federal Department to have other portions of the Province to become special areas in the future. As a result of these negotiations, DREE has already indicated willingness to add at least



Mr. Crosbie.

three more special areas to the list? (Now the minister can tell us whether they have agreed or not, I do not know.)" Port aux Basques to Rose Blanche, portions of the Baie Verte Peninsula and portions of the Bonavista Peninsula." The person listening would think that that is marvellous. There are to be three more! But that is not enough. The minister has more surprises for us. "Moreover, during the course of this summer, we shall be presenting strong cases for the inclusion of further areas in the Province." The minister is not satisfied with just those three. He will present a stronger case for the inclusion of further areas. Not only that, as communities are brought into special areas, Bat Man and Robin will bring further water and sewerage services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: The minister ends up, Mr. Chairman, saying: "I have given this statement in the hope of clarifying further the nature of DREE assistance contained in the first year's agreement insofar as water and sewerage projects are concerned and to indicate what we are attempting to get the Federal Government to include in the main agreement presently being negotiated." This thrilling drama is not yet over. That was May 19, 1970. The minister is fighting the terrible Federal bureaucracy to get all these areas.

Now we come to something significant, June 8, 1970. The minister tables in the House a paper which he has written entitled, "A Social and Economic Development Programme for Newfoundland and Labrador in the 1970's." I hope the minister did not write this, Mr. Chairman. I hope he is covering up for his Civil Servants and that he is taking ministerial responsibility. I am sure that they would not want to be found responsible for this document. I could not summarize it. It is ninety-four pages of socio-economic phraseology. There are lists of projects: Main Gut Bridge, Barachois Brook Bridge this bridge and that bridge,

Mr. Crosbie.

this water and sewer system and that water and sewer system, table after table, after table, integrated developing programming, substructure, infrastructure, superstructure, etc. There is no water and sewerage for Hogan's Pond.

After all those statements, the minister wanted to clarify the position. One June 15, he made another statement in the House to explain his estimates. Some of his officials left and formed the Non-Profit Consulting Company. Anyway this statement went on to explain that detailed planning was not done for a five-year agreement but for a one-year agreement only. Now, Mr. Chairman, if there were 1,000 construction companies in Newfoundland, employing each 1,000 people, they could not have carried out the minister's programme that he described in his statements so far. They would not have a chance of carrying it out even in five years. But he has left nothing to chance. So the planning is not for five years, it is one year planning. If the minister ever starts planning for five, we are going to be inundated. He will not be able to move on this Island for bulldozers. The minister is getting on his department staff, his own team of planning experts. What for? Everything you could think of sounded like it was planned. He goes on to explain his field services division, field workers, community water services. The next subhead is that relating to rural development. There was a five year ARDA agreement in 1965. There were different associations formed. Then the minister makes a significant admission. "Last year's estimate of over \$1 million for grants-in-aid to rural developments was based on actual proposals which were to be made to the Federal Government. Not all of these proposals were accepted by the Federal Government." That is a strange admission for the minister to make. In other words in the last year's estimates, they were based on proposals that had been made and the Federal Government later turned them down. Then he went on to say that these were tentative estimates and we are

Mr. Crosbie.

not like royal Ontario. He mentions the resettlement agreement with great pride. He mentions that so many families moved, hardly any of them on able-bodied relief. They are all doing well. - community amenities. One of his colleagues will move that the total vote be increased by \$600,000. That is from \$13,801,000 to \$14,274,000. That was a comparatively mild statement for the hon. minister.

So he knew that, when the House met this year, there would have to be a further statement. This statement was made in April 19, 1971. The minister says about the one-year agreement which amounted to \$82 million, (He forgets to mention that old \$16 million was spent last year) "it was an entirely new kind of an agreement. There was a liaison committee. We were able, with the greatest effort, to get \$16 million worth of construction actually completed during the 1970 construction season." Would the minister anticipate this year, that there will be a lot more of it? I hope he is right. There is \$40 million of work left outstanding from last year.

MR. MURPHY: Was there not \$7 million for the arterial road?

MR. CROSBIE: The arterial road, I am not sure. I do not know where that is included. Now to get to the meat of the statement. "During all last year, we were actively negotiating a new DREE agreement with the Federal Government. This agreement is expected by both myself and Mr. Marchand to be signed during the next few weeks." This is May 18. It has not been signed early in the month of May. This is the agreement that the minister has had us waiting for with bated breath ever since his first statement of April 15, 1970. We are still waiting. "The short delay on what I earlier announced to be the signing date is accounted for by the fact that a large part of our energy and time was consumed in getting the present agreement actually underway." I would say that a large part of the energy and time was consumed in making ministerial statements. That would be more like it. "The new agreement to be signed next month will

Mr. Crosbie

be extremely flexible and will indicate the general direction to 1975. The accent is on flexibility." It certainly is. In the Government the accent is on flexibility. If you are flexible enough, nobody can pin you down. "The infrastructure is going to be balanced with public service projects." The minister says in this statement that he expects other rural development agreements to be signed later and then he lists a lot of other projects: Roads, St. John's Harbour arterial, etc. He lists here, costing altogether - I think the first part of it is already out, McNarmara Construction over \$7 million for the first part of it. Carbonear to Harbour Grace road and so on - the roads are all mentioned. The schools are mentioned. The Stephenville water supply is mentioned. That is important because it is for the Javelin Mill. Arnold's Cove water supply, St. Lawrence water supply, Bishop's Falls, Corner Brook water and sewerage extension, Hawke's Bay water system, are mentioned but there is no mention on the minister's list of the Port au Choix water system, for some reason. That was finished in 1970, yes. Mr. O'Keefe does not realize it yet, the Chairman up there. In March, 1971, he was waiting to hear from the minister by the end of the month, with respect to the water and sewer system he was promised last year. It is now not on this list here at all. This is the minister's latest list. I do not know what the minister can tell us when he speaks, what status that is?

So what does it all mean, Mr. Chairman? Wait now, I missed out one. Golly! I missed out a statement the minister made last year. It was June 8, but I will not go into June 8. What does it all mean Mr. Chairman? It means this: Instead of the Newfoundland Government developing an overall plan for the development of Newfoundland, with the Government of Canada, and deciding where the best economic advantages are and what areas offer the best opportunities for economic development and where the two Governments' money can be spent and an overall development plan for the Island. all is happening is that in

Mr. Crosbie,

the election fever, as the Government expected last year that there would be an election and the Government know that this year there will be an election, that all kinds of promises are being made to everyone under the sun. Whenever any community tells the Newfoundland Government it needs financial assistance for any projects the Government mention DREE. It claims that DREE can do it. There are only eight special areas but it is going to be increased by three and there area may be included. Instead of these funds being really used to develop our Province in an overall manner, there has been all kinds of promises made. There is money being spent on highways. We all know that and that is good. There is money being spent to build schools and in some places for water and sewerage. The minister still does not have any overall programme for the development of Newfoundland. DREE means: Department of Regional and Economic Expansion. That is what it means. Where are the economic expansion projects, under this programme? I cannot recall one being announced yet, unless it is the electronics factory in Stephenville, if you could class that, because it is going to get a DREE grant. Infrastructure is what is being done - roads, water and sewerage. But the economic expansion, projects that actually create permanent jobs, they have not been announced yet, except for the electronics factory. There is a linerboard mill underway over in Stephenville. There is no grant from the Federal Government for it. I notice that in the "Globe and Mail" today that in Saskatchewan they are expecting a grant of \$10 million, I think it is, from the Federal Government. It is for a pulp mill being built in Saskatchewan. Why is there not a grant of \$10 million for the one that is being built over in Stephenville? Why was there not a grant for the chip mill and other facilities up in Labrador? There are none of those kinds of grants mentioned



MR. CROSBIE: by the minister in any of this programme. Where is the industry incentive that we are suppose to get from DREE? We have not heard much about that. An earlier speaker mentioned resettlement programme. I remember a time, Mr. Chairman, when the Premier was going to resettle Burgeo, Ramea and Gaultois. Three years ago, he was going to move them all out of Burgeo, Ramea and Gaultois into Bay D'Espoir, put the fish plants in there. That is the kind of planning that this Province has got and the minister is in charge of this Department of Community and Social Development, I do not know, two years anyway, there is still no overall agreement entered into by the Government of Newfoundland with the Government of Canada for four years or five years. It is a department with the highest paid Deputy Ministers in the Government. It has got two of them, one Deputy Minister getting \$34,000 a year and another special advisor getting \$28,540, who used to be the Deputy Minister.

The votes in all categories this year are up for planning and the rest of it. Where is the planning? Where is the overall plan? Prince Edward Island has got an overall development plan. New Brunswick entered into several plans for parts of New Brunswick. Where is the plan for Newfoundland? It is good to have this money spent that is being spent, but what is the end of it all? Where is the main objective? The minister said in one of these statements that Newfoundland needs created 6,000 permanent jobs each year. Where are they being created? Where is the sign or evidence of 6,000 permanent jobs being created each year under this programme or any programme of the Government?

The people in the Placentia area get in trouble. Placentia is in trouble. They asked to be included in DREE. They are not included in DREE. they are an area where people were resettled into the area, The programme they called the disaster, the most irresponsible social action of our times. Placentia is not among the eight special areas announced recently in the programme for DREE assistance. And it is still not. It does not seem to be in any programme for a great deal of assistance that we can hear and what we see, the Placentia area, in the facility areas down in Placentia.

MR. CROSBIE: Where is the overall plan for the development of this Province?

It is not just paving a road here and paving a road there and doing water and sewerage there and here, all of which is grand. But the whole co-ordinated approach is not just there. The minister makes these all statements, listing all kinds of projects and he gets the hopes of people up all around the Province and then they fall into this snare which they think is red tape, but which really just means that the Federal Government have not agreed to all these projects before they were announced. If the Federal Government had agreed to the Port au Choix project before the minister listed it last year, then all these troubles could not have arisen.

MR. ROWE, W.N: There is a booklet put out by the Government of Canada telling us what happened.

MR. CROSBIE: Well the minister can tell us then what happened. Is the Federal Government crossing the minister up or approving projects and then disapproving them?

The people of Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman, are in many cases having their expectations aroused in an unjustified manner, and that should not be the case. In my view, he should only announce a project when he knows that the project is approved by everyone and it is ready to go. Then there cannot be any disappointments. They cannot be disappointed and feel fooled, like they do on Fogo Island, like they do in all kinds of areas in this Province.

Now this year we are going to hear a hurricane of announcements, a veritable hurricane. It is going to be typhoon-Joey in Newfoundland this year, in the announcements that we are going to hear, of every conceivable project, aided and abetted by the minister. How many of them, when we are back in this House next year, on the other side of the House, will we be able to actually say have been carried out? That is what I would like to know, Mr. Chairman. I am sure this is what the House would like to know. I would like to know from the minister when he and Mr. Marchand are going to sign the four year agreement and when he is going to give us details

MR. CROSBIE: of it?

MR. ROUE, W. N. Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Anyway the minister did not have a word in his cheek, but perhaps he will now. Perhaps, he will answer some of these points for us, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, there are a few points arising out of this vote for General Administration. The hon. the member for St. John's West asks what it is all about, and where is the planning? It is rather alarming to note and to see an admission by the Leader of the Government, and presumably the Minister of Community and Social Development is in the same boat, to the effect that DREE was in effect for two years before the Government or the Leader of the Government, the hon. the Premier, admitted that it was the first time that he had found out how DREE was suppose to operate. He recounted the fact that he had thought, that he had been under the misconception. (And I quote his words) "the misconception that DREE operated in only special areas." The Development Conference that was called for the purpose of dealing with those areas in Newfoundland which were not encompassed under his understand or the Government's understanding of the DREE agreement.

We remember a statement in the press, on February 2 last, to the effect that the Premier admitted he was embarrassed to have to admit that he did not know how the Federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion worked until last week. That was a week before the Development Conference took place. He said and I quote, "I did not really know or thoroughly understand what DREE is." He remembered that he had addressed St. John's Rotary Club earlier in the month on the subject of Economic Development, in which he expressed his bitter resentment that Newfoundland should be divided into haves and have-nots, and those of us who heard him on the radio at the time remembered the vivid descriptions of the function of the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion, to aim at areas like aiming a gun and to take specific remedies with respect to these areas. And hence we are told this Economic Conference was convened for the purpose of dealing with

MR. MARSHALL: those areas which the Federal Government had left out. Then following on, we see at the Development Conference Mr. Marchand appeared and he told us that DREE does not only operate in just special areas but it operates all over Newfoundland and gives emphasis to certain growth areas but it is available throughout all of Newfoundland. It is rather disturbing really to see that this is the position, that the Government were operating under this misconception. Make no wonder that the department concerned has not been adequately able to provide adequate planning in this Province with respect to the rural redevelopment that is necessary.

This is a matter that really, this is rather a serious matter. Here we have a major development that was announced by Mr. Marchand some two years ago, almost two years ago, and the Government apparently did not know how this very vital and important programme was suppose to operate in this Province, in this Province which needs it probably more but not only probably but definitely more than any other province in Canada - did not know how DREE was suppose to operate. Called a Conference for the purpose of determining how we were going to make up for the deficiencies in the DREE programme and during the Conference, or a little bit before, finds out that DREE can apply to all of Newfoundland. This makes us wonder, this makes one ask the question whether or not the department is fully taking advantage of DREE? Also one has to ask the questions, what co-ordination (and this is suppose to be a co-ordinating department) what actual co-ordination there is between the Provincial Government and the Federal Government?

We have heard announcements from the hon. the minister, that have come from time to time, and they have been recounted by the member for St. John's West and there are inconsistencies there. Make no wonder there are inconsistencies the minister, the Government itself, do not know the reason for its existence. That is a question that has to be answered.

There is another situation that has to be noted with some interest, because this is an election year, to the effect that the Government now intends to develop the entire portion of all of Newfoundland, the whole of the Province. Before this election year we were obsessed with resettlement, we were obsessed with the fact that there could only be a few growth centres in the Province

MR. MARSHALL: and the rest of the Province would have to paddle on its own. Now we find, now we find in this election year that all of Newfoundland is going to be taken care of. We are delighted to hear that fact. We hope that the Government are sincere in its expressions of its desire and at the same time will admit that it made a mistake in previous years in abandoning so many of the outports of this Province.

I note that by the employment, I think, employment of Mr. van Es I think of the special adviser to the minister. Mr. van Es, he is the Deputy Minister. Well he is certainly a very close adviser to the minister, he was involved, I believe, in this Mid-Canada Corridor Development. Here we have, I presume that this would be his very, very special interest or one of his special interests in the Mid-Canada Corridor concept, encompasses all of Labrador and the northern portions of Newfoundland. It is a very interesting concept. It should have been gone into by this Government many months ago. Many of its programmes ought to have been implemented. But we see here a Deputy Minister who was wedded to this idea of Mid-Canada Development that we all applaud and agree with, and yet we have the Government of this Province telling the people of Labrador that, with the exception of certain smaller centers, DREE does not encompass Labrador. I would imagine that a special adviser of the Deputy Minister of the Minister would have found this rather hard to take. But he really does not have to find this hard to take, because the fact of the matter is that, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion can apply to all of Labrador and not just a certain segment, as it was represented to us before or to the people of Newfoundland.

It seems to me to be utterly incredible that a department of Government can be set up for the purpose of implementing a policy which has been laid down, as set down by the Federal Government, and yet two years after this policy was set down by the Federal Government and two years after this department was established for the purpose of integrating and co-ordinating this programme of the Federal Government, the Government turns around and says; "we did not really know what DREE was all about."



MR. MARSHALL: Now if this is the type of planning that we have experienced in this Province over the past twenty years, the people of Newfoundland will well welcome the change which is about to come in the country.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Mr. Chairman, I will try to deal with a number of the points which were raised here tonight, although they probably more properly should be dealt with when we come to the various sub-heads which are listed in the estimates.

The member for St. John's West, Mr. Chairman, you hardly know how to take him at all. He screams, he yells for information from the Government, more information on this, that and the other thing. He makes statements on various programmes in which the Department of Community and Social Development is involved. He stands up and decrys the fact that too much information is given, that the Government are trying to engulf him, and probably by extension the people of Newfoundland in too many facts, too much information. A man who always takes the fairest the hon. member always takes the fairest possible ground whenever he is criticizing Government policy. His motto would be; "you would be damned if you do, and you are doubly damned, if you do not." You cannot satisfy him, Mr. Chairman, no matter what you try to do. His attitude, I suppose, Sir, is easy to understand, because he realizes, I would submit, that the Government through the Department of Community and Social Development, having received a commitment in the very first year of operation of the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion, of \$82 million, far more than any other Province in Canada, large or small including the Province of Quebec, which is surely dear to the heart of the Minister of Regional and Economic Expansion, this Province was successful in getting, I believe, \$20 million more of a commitment from the Federal Government under DREE than that Province, which was the second highest, and many more millions of dollars more than any other province in Canada, which indicates to the hon. members opposite, St. John's West and other hon. members that this Government does no planning, that the Department of Community and Social Development does no planning.

MR. ROWE, W.N. I suppose it is easy to understand his attitude. As I mentioned on the T.V. programme that brought some fire from the hon. members opposite, he is undoubtedly involved in his swan song in this House, and he realizes that these announcements, which are made by myself on apart of the Government, on behalf of the Government, each one of these announcements is another dong in the bell which is ringing out his death knoll politically in the Province.

He likes a statement, again on firm ground, taking the fairest possible position, an objective position and mentions one particular project Port au Choix. Here he is again, Mr. Chariman, we will hear another swan song. He was a dead duck last year, he is a swan this year. At least, his looks are improving somewhat.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He was an ugly duckingly.

MR. ROWE, W.N. He was an ugly, duckingly, he is a swan this year. And we are hearing his swan song.

Mr. Chairman, he singles out one particular project or two projects really, one the Port au Choix water supply, out of all the projects with which we have had some trouble. There is no denying that. We have had trouble trying to get the detailed planning done within the estimate. The best estimate available at the time the agreement was signed, then approved by Ottawa as an estimate, we had some difficulty bringing the detailed planning within that estimate and further costs developed and further planning had to be done to try to reduce the cost of the water and sewer system and to try and bring the DREE grant or the DREE commitment up to an acceptable level. He singles out one project and condemns the whole programme as a result. Then he singles out another one, the Curling water supply system, which had no more relation to the DREE programme as announced than a water and sewer system in some other part of Newfoundland or some other part of Canada. It simply was not included in the DREE agreement, and the Council of Corner Brook were desirous of having it included. We made, on their behalf, representations to Ottawa to have that water system included but it was not part of the original DREE programme. And how that can be singled out again by the hon. member for St. John's West as a blanket condemnation of the DREE programme, is beyond me.

MR. ROUE, W.N. The arterial road, I believe, he mentioned as well, in Corner Brook, which has caused some difficulty. The main difficulty being that DREE is not involved and will not become involved in internal traffic problems in an urban area such as St. John's or Corner Brook. What they are concerned with is the economic development of a particular area and a free flow of traffic directly into and out of that urban area, and they are not concerned with internal traffic problems. This was one of the major bones of contention, as far as the council in Corner Brook was concerned, they wanted to have some other additional linkage made to that arterial road to look after their own internal traffic problem.

We have had delays in getting the DREE programme implemented. No one can deny that. I mentioned it in one of the statements which I made in the House two or three weeks ago. I would also like to add to the hon. gentleman's statement that Nova Scotia as well has been involved in some incredible delays in trying to get their DREE programme implemented. We have isolated some of the problems, one of the major problems would be the fact that it is an entirely new programme, entirely new procedures, entirely new committees of officials, Federal and Provincial officials were set up in order to try to implement the programme and as they went guidelines and procedures had to be developed. Nova Scotia is behind us, I am told by Mr. Miller, the representative from DREE in this Province, is behind us in getting their programme implemented. I believe one other province, without naming it, because I do not remember the name, but I know one other province is also behind us and one province is ahead of us in getting their DREE programme implemented. So to single out this Province as being responsible or as being suffering from lack of planning or any of these usual opposition accusations, Mr. Chairman, just goes beyond the realm of fact altogether.

He mentions the, the hon. the member for St. John's West mentions the DRFE incentive, which applied to this Province and other designated areas in Canada. DREE incentives, Mr. Chairman, is a purely Federal programme. It is administered solely by the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion from Ottawa, just like any other purely Federal programme, like the

MR. ROBE, W.N. building of wharves, or the putting in of coastal boats or some transportation systems or communication systems. We have no legal obligation nor no legal right to become involved in that purely Federal programme. We have, of course, through the Department of Community and Social Development and through the Department of Economic Development, headed by my hon. colleague, we had tried to facilitate wherever possible the availability of DREE incentive funds into this Province. We had done so with some success in some cases and a lack of success in other cases. We have even taken on members and added members to our staffs, of my department, the hon. member's department, in an effort to try to facilitate, to get this thing going quicker and to try to avail of the DREE incentive which are administered by Ottawa and by Ottawa alone,

To condemn us as a Provincial Government for the lack of implementation of DREE incentives is like condemning us for the Department of - the post office or communications, not getting a satellite up into space. We have no more to do with it, legally, than we have with that other department which I have mentioned.

One other point that I would like to bring out concerning DREE, Mr. Chairman, and I do hope it is taken in the right light, taken in the right spirit. The Department of Community and Social Development has on staff five or six highly qualified specialist in their field, planners who have been devoting full time and I do not mean merely working hours, I mean full time to getting plans together for this Province in co-operation with every other "line" department, Highways, Municipal Affairs, Public Works, Education full co-operation to try to get plans together for presentation to Ottawa and to work along with the officials in Ottawa and bring these plans to a final fruition or realization.

As against the five or six officials which I have on staff in the Department of Community and Social Development, DREE had, at the latest count that I was able to get, 1500 employees. I heard from another source, a day or two ago that, that figure had gone up to 1800 employees by one department in the Government of Canada. Eighteen hundred, that figure is

MR. ROWE, W.N.: being confirmed I understand.

Now, Mr. Chairman, look at that situation, 1800 highly qualified, highly paid planners, assorted long hairs of various types, I would imagine, some good, some undoubtedly bad. Each one of them anxious and eager to prove to their minister and their superiors that they are worth their money, That they are providing their monies worth to the Government of Canada. And pit against that, a small, a pitifully small in many ways, a Government of Newfoundland or P.E.I. or Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, the have-not provinces, pit their resources against that kind of human resource that they have in the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion, and ask yourself, Mr. Chairman, whether you would think that any delays would be involved, any unnecessary red tape or fettering bureaucracy is going to be involved in the attempt to develop plans and not only develop plans but to have implemented plans which have already been developed.

MR. COLLINS: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, W.N. What is that, Mr. Chairman?

MR. COLLINS: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Mr. Morrison, we are certainly not ashamed of what we did there. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Morrison M.P., John Morrison, a very much respected M.P. in the House of Commons, was the head of the Commons Committee on Regional Development. His was the committee which was responsible for watchdogging



MR. ROWE (WILLIAM N.): the DREE and for making suggestions to DREE.

We were successful in having him come with our Department while the House of Commons was closed and act as a consultant, as a liaison with Ottawa and to help us in this Province get the plans going, get the plans implemented.

One of the hon. gentleman's colleagues in the House of Commons had the temerity, indeed the unbelievable stupidity, in my opinion, to come out and condemn this man and by inference condemn the Government of Newfoundland for hiring this man, for availing of his services, and he used some specious argument, conflict of interest or some such thing, when the man was doing what he was supposed to be doing, that is trying to get regional development going in Canada. Albeit for one specific part, for two or three months, and with a tremendous help to this Government in our dealings with Ottawa.

One MP, one Tory MP, in Ottawa, made another one, had the face to condemn this man and the Newfoundland Government for entering into that kind of a relationship. That will give you an indication, Mr. Chairman, as to how naive, I think, the hon. gentlemen opposite are in many respects. It could do us no harm, it could only do us good and we did derive some benefit from it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Burin brought up one or two points. He mentioned development councils, he mentioned that finally the Government is starting to become involved in helping these development councils and these rural development associations.

For a number of years past, Sir, the Government of Newfoundland, through this Department again, have been lending advice and assistance and financial assistance, by ways of grants to hire rural development workers for these councils. It is not something, as he implied, that was forced upon the Government or the Department. This Department and the Government actually went out and encouraged, for years past, this type of a development, in order to make sure that there was good representation at the local level for the development of rural plans, plans for rural areas, and to help

MR. ROWE: implement the rural areas. I announced, on behalf of the Government, during the Development Conference which was held recently, that the Government were going to go further and to make \$10,000 grants available to each of the rural development associations, which would qualify them to meet certain conditions as to how they were going to spend the money and that the Newfoundland and Labrador Rural Development Council would be recognized as a body which would have overall surveillance of this situation, and that they would get a \$25,000 grant. There would probably be a total of close to \$500,000 spent by the Government for this purpose alone, when the whole programme got under way.

I was interested in his comments concerning the Fogo Island Rural Development Association and again he states or quotes the opinion of one man, a partisan writer for a newspaper.

MR. CROSBIE: How is he partisan?

MR. ROWE: How is he partisan? Did you not hear the hon. member?

MR. CROSBIE: But what way is he partisan?

MR. ROWE: He is partisan, politically partisan.

MR. CROSBIE: The man who wrote...

MR. ROWE: I do not know the man from Adam but I can only assume from his writings as to what political position he is taking. He is talking about turning out the Government and this sort of thing. That is a nice objective.

Another member of the press was at that meeting, the hon. the Premier attended, the hon. Minister of Economic Development attended and Mr. Van Es, my Deputy Minister, attended and the hon. member for Burin would be well advised to go and talk to that gentleman who is on the staff of "The Evening Telegram" in order to get a more objective idea as to exactly what went on at that mini-Conference and not rely, Mr. Chairman, on one man's writings, even if the man were not politically partisan. To come into the House of Assembly and to rely on one man's opinion, written in an editorial fashion, as to what went on at the Development Conference, and pass it off as a fact, in my opinion, Sir, is somewhat beneath contempt.

MR. CROSBIE: Like the file down in the Department of Welfare. That is all right.

MR. ROWE: This is the Department of Community and Social Development now. We do not keep files down there.

MR. EARLE: Do you file files that will be found?

MR. ROWE: The hon. member for Burin also mentioned certain aspects of the resettlement programme and again in his usual and typical clear minded fashion, he does not look at the general picture affecting resettlement, the successes or the failures generally affecting resettlement or the resettlement programme. He seizes upon one instance, one marginal instance, as related to him by a gentleman who undoubtedly underwent the suffering or facts, as he put it in his letter; and uses this again as a blanket condemnation of the resettlement programme.

There are, Mr. Chairman, in every programme certain areas of difficulty, problematical areas which we hope to solve, we fight to solve, we battle to solve and hope will not recur in the future. But unfortunately there are areas, marginal and grey areas in the programme, which always cause difficulties and this would apply to any active ongoing programme of any Government.

In the case of the resettlement programme, Sir, it is the policy of this Government, as announced by the Premier and myself on many occasions, not to deprive people of this Province or settlements in this Province of services in an effort to get them to resettle to other areas of the Province where perhaps services could be provided more cheaply. This is the stated policy.

What happens in some of the marginal areas, and I have had it happen in my own district of White Bay South, what happens, Sir, is this - the Government has a list of priorities of how it can spend monies for public services, say, for example, electricity, or water services, wells, this sort of thing. The larger problems have to be met first and you gradually work your way down to smaller problems.

MR. ROWE: At the same time, the Resettlement Programme is going on in parallel and at some point in time these two programmes will meet. There you see a number of people having moved from an area, probably because they could not get service, they voluntarily moved, because the Government did not have the money during that particular year to provide the services, they moved leaving behind a certain number of people, for whom the government, a couple of years later, is able to provide some basic services - electricity, wells and this sort of thing. Undoubtedly this is extremely annoying to those people who have left. But it is not the type of thing that happens generally, but the type of thing that happens very exceptionally, and it is the type of thing that we try and try to avoid in the Department of Community and Social Development.

Mr. Chairman, there are one or two other points which I could answer, if they are raised again, but if I remember to answer them as we go down through our Estimates I will deal with them at that time, in the hope of saving some time and possibly getting through the Estimates tonight, if that is possible. I will now sit down and if other questions are raised I will be glad to deal with them.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, I have just a few short remarks to make on this particular heading and, while DREE was brought up, I would just like to mention some of the points made by previous speakers as to announcements made over the two year period.

It reminds me of a story of a politician who said a bridge is good for three elections, you promise it in the first one, the second one you start to draw the plans, and in the third election you call tenders. Now this is what our DREE programme is something similar to, although not over a period of elections because this election has been a kind of drawn out.

But I was rather interested at the great Disarmament Conference, as the hon. member calls it, to hear the hon. G. Marchand, he only gets about six lines in this, the great Minister and Mr. Jamieson gets about two paragraphs each, with reference to this great DREE that we have been

MR. MURPHY: listening about, the millions and millions of dollars that were projected to be spent and I was listening pretty attentively and I see that this here picked up perhaps the significance of some of his remarks.

He said, "I listened carefully to the Premier, of course I heard much good news for my Department and I have heard some good news for some of my friends, as his colleagues in Government, I will telephone them when I get home." I think that the goals which were defined are the goals which are legitimate, there is no doubt about that. This is the millions and millions and millions. How they are going to fit into our budget I do not know? We will have to discuss that."

Now these were, as I gather from his remarks, the great promises of millions that were made for all these programmes, but apparently they have not yet set money out in the budget for these great projects and the budget, as I understand it, will not be brought down until some time the middle of next month. So when we get these programmes all under way, I doubt if it is going to be in time for the election, unless there is some great haste made.

I was rather interested too in a remark with reference to the Editor of "The Fogo Profile," The hon. Minister said that was only one man's opinion. Well I think that every man has an opinion, Sir, But it reminds me of a story in the early years when we brought baseball back here, We were professional on the rules, and we had one dispute which we could not settle ourselves, our umpires, by the rule book. So I wired the President of the National Baseball League at the time, we set everything out, the complete story, in this telegraph, asking him to reply as soon as possible. So I received his reply and I called together the Executive and I put forward his reply to settle it and one guy said, "that is only one man's opinion," So, you know, he was President of the National League, so what could I do about it.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is one significant thing that I see, and we are under general administration and I feel very much like the



MR. MURPHY: Premier does insofar as our Newfoundland people are concerned. We were quite concerned yesterday, quite upset, when there were two hundred and ninety-nine jobs at Churchill Falls that were available for our Newfoundland people, or to some Newfoundlanders, but apparently they did not have the qualifications to fill these jobs which I thought was rather a terrible state of affairs in view of the great advances we have made in education and technology and everything for the past twenty-two years.

But as a friend of mine often used to say, in Newfoundland you have to have one degree, one degree is enough to get ahead, "C.F.A.," that meant you came from away, to get ahead in Newfoundland.

Now I look at the salaries here and I think it has been mentioned briefly by some of the previous speakers, we have Deputy Minister getting \$34,000 a year, and then the previous deputy minister, whatever happened to him, has been relegated now to just a Special Adviser, demoted.

HON. MEMBER: Promoted.

MR. MURPHY: Promoted at \$6,000 a year less. That is some promotion. He lost the title.

If I could just carry on, just for a moment, Mr. Chairman, on the trend of thought I am trying to establish. The Deputy Minister's salary is \$34,000. There is one Special Adviser \$28,540. Now both these gentlemen are not Newfoundlanders, all right, but when I look through the rest of the salary scales and I look at the Department of Health, where we have a medical doctor, Deputy Minister, getting \$25,000 a year, I believe. Deputy Minister - \$30,540, and Assistant Deputy Minister - \$28,000 and then I looked at the Department of Education and Youth - \$17,790, Department of Justice, Deputy Minister, I presume he is a lawyer with his degree - \$25,540 and the average other Deputy Minister - \$16,000, and the big Department, I suppose you can call it the big Department - Finance, I think Mr. Peper, I believe he gets \$25,000.

MR. MURPHY: I am just making comparisons here, the Deputy Minister of Highways - \$17,790, there is an engineer.

I am just wondering where the emphasis is placed on these deputy ministers, these senior Civil Servants. When we look at men like Mr. Channing, and Mr. Coombs and the rest of these men who have served this Civil Service for thirty, thirty-five and forty years and see people brought in here, and we take the Minister's word for it that

MR. MURPHY: they have very special qualifications for this job.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: Well they will still get the money whether it is contract or not. But the great difference -

MR. ROWE, W.N. There is a lot of difference.

MR. MURPHY: There is a difference.

MR. ROWE, W.N. There is no pension, no security measure, no tenure.

MR. MURPHY: What tenure has a Deputy Minister got? If someone decides to fire him tomorrow?

MR. ROWE, W.N. They are going out in droves, are they not?

MR. MURPHY: Not at all. Not going out in droves, but there is nothing to guarantee that half a dozen will not be fired in the next year.

But, Mr. Chairman, the point which I am making is the great salaries that are paid to this Community and Social Development. We have others, when we come to them, Sir, I will also bring them forward. But, I am just wondering why this great emphasis is put on two gentlemen, \$34,000 a year and a special advisor \$28,540 a year, Mr. van Es, I think, is the Deputy Minister.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: I do not know. Well, there are different categories, I am only dealing with General Administration.

There are twenty employees in that particular section, General Administration, with a total salary of \$183,100. That is an average of \$9,000 right there. It must be one of the best paid departments. When I look at, as I say the Department of Health, with the great responsibilities the Deputy Ministers have. Mines, Agriculture and Resources, men who have given many years of their life to this service, knowledgeable men they must be, to deal with mining, agriculture and resources. I wonder sometimes, Mr. Chairman, if in fairness to these long term-civil servants, when we talk about contracts or pensionable rights or anything else, just what the feeling must be among these senior civil servants. There are other areas of this department, Sir, I think, we can discuss as we come down to them. But, I feel at the present time that that was one item I would like to draw to the attention of the

MR. MURPHY: House, the very high salaries paid to the Deputy Minister and the special adviser.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 01 carry? Carried. 02 carried. Shall 2003-01?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, this is Planning and Programme Development. The salaries this year are doubled the salaries last year. Last year \$68,800, this year \$127,700. Could the minister explain why this has come about and who is getting the money and what they are doing?

MR. ROWE, W.N. Mr. Chairman, the difference between this year's estimates and last year's revised is accounted for by the fact that these officials were on contract, as I have mentioned, were not recruited until late last year. I think, Mr. van Es, for example, came in July or August, half the year was gone before these men got on.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. van Es is the last section.

MR. MURPHY: Who is the Director General of planning?

MR. ROWE, W.N. Mr. van Es, Mr. Chairman, salary carried last year into this, under the Planning Programme Development, has now been moved to General Administration.

MR. MURPHY: General Administration, yes.

MR. ROWE, W.N. There is now an assistant remaining there and an assistant Director of Planning, a director who looks after the infrastructure, so called, public services aspect of DREE, another man who looks after the so-called Human Resource Development, Education, Vocational Training Schools, Education of the various types. Another man, Dr. MacDonald, who is responsible for the Resource Development aspect of DREE Planning and Programming. One or two others who are assistance to these.

MR. MURPHY: Who is the Director General, at \$25,000?

MR. ROWE, W.N. There is nobody there. That post is not filled at the present time, Mr. Chairman, since Mr. van Es has moved to the Deputy Minister's job.

MR. CROSBIE: Why are the salaries doubled then? The salaries are still doubled.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Salaries are doubled from last year. They are not doubled, the revised estimate last year was \$95,000.

MR. MURPHY: Last year it was \$65,000, this year it is \$127,000.

MR. ROWE, W.N. The revised estimate was \$68,000, the original estimate was \$95,000. We expected there would be some savings because of late recruitment. The recruitment was later than we thought, so the revised was even less than the original estimate. This year, Mr. Chairman, they will be on all year and that accounts for the fact that the amount estimates for their salaries is doubled the revised estimate. Am I making myself clear?

MR. MURPHY: No.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Well what do you want me to do, draw pictures, Mr. Chairman?

MR. MURPHY: In the first instance the Deputy Minister, Mr. van Es has been taken out of here and put there.

MR. ROWE, W.N. So what? Mr. van Es, the present Deputy Minister, the then Director General of Planning, as he was called, is one man out of a-half a dozen, nine or something out of the whole Planning -

MR. MURPHY: He represents just about one-third of the vote \$34,000.

MR. ABBOTT: What is going on here?

MR. ROWE, W.N. He represents, Mr. Chairman, of the total yearly vote, his \$34,000 does not represent one-third.

Let me go through it again, Mr. Chairman, if I had some charts here I could draw a few pictures.

MR. HICKMAN: Well to simplify it, if you would indicate to the Committee when these gentlemen were hired last year?

MR. ROWE, W.N. Well, let me see here, here is a news release August 28, 1970, which says that these five appointments have been made, so they were made shortly before that, which left May, June, July.

MR. ROBERTS: Which was only seven months out of the year.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Half the year.

MR. HICKMAN: No, more than that.

MR. ROWE, W.N. If you look in the salary details, Mr. Chairman, it is all set out there. The Director General of Planning, \$25,000, that is not filled



MR. ROWE, W.N. presently.

MR. MURPHY: Not filled, that is right.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Assistant Director \$24,000.

MR. MURPHY: It usually has a dash there when it is not filled, but there is one in front of it.

MR. ROWE, W.N. I wonder just why? We expect to fill it within, we have authority to fill the post, why put a dash there? If we were going to drop it out, we would probably put a dash there or next year we would. But right now we have authority to fill it, and we intend to recruit for it.

The salaries set out there, Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the problem is.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, before this carries, I would like a full complete and detailed explanation of what this extra assistance \$59.00 is? Surely the House is entitled to an explanation of that.

MR. ROWE, W.N. That is for another poll Mr. Chairman, we did not like the last one, Mr. Chairman, according to the hon. gentleman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall OI carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Just before we leave OI, Mr. Chairman, could the minister tell us what Mr. Sametz is doing now, he is a special adviser, but special advisor to whom? And what does he advise about? I mean you have got a Deputy Minister, what is a special adviser advised by?

MR. ROWE, W.N. Well, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Sametz, who was the Deputy Minister and carried the load for the DREE Programme, Planning and Programming for the first agreement, largely himself, I do not mind saying, with some assistance by way of consultant fees and what not. We decided, after the two years he put in at that, that perhaps his forte and his desires and his forte as far as we were concerned were other activities of the Government, such as assisting the hon. my colleague here, the Acting Minister of Labour, on the Manpower thing. He is working on that, and generally co-ordinating various plans coming in from the other "line" departments, into the Department of Community and Social Development, and advising me on them, as the Minister. He also assists in, takes a leading part in the whole planning and programming of the DREE agreements and ancillary things. He is not necessarily restricted to the DREE thing,

MR. ROWE, W.N. as the other staff members are in that particular subhead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 01 carry?

On Motion 2003-01 through 2003- 02-08 carried.

MR. CROSBIE: 03 - Consultants. Who are the consultants, Mr. Chairman, this is an amount of \$224,000 for consultants, who would they be?

MR. ROWE, W.N. Well no consultants as such named right now, Mr. Chairman, \$200,000 of that subhead, \$224,000, I believe, is the subhead, \$200,000 of this subhead covers Federal/Provincial studies to be undertaken this year in an effort to qualify various other projects, Here I am on very dangerous ground because I am pulling the wool over the peoples eyes, according to the member for St. John's West. In an effort to try and qualify various projects in the Province for inclusion in the DREE agreements, Mr. Chairman. This will be \$100,000 recoverable from the Federal Government, 50-50 as can be seen from 2003-10-01.

On motion item carried.

On motion, that the Committee rise and report having passed estimates of expenditure ; Headings: XI, Social Services and Pehabilitation, all items, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair:

On motion report received and adopted.

MR SPEAKER: It now being 11:00 P.M., I do leave the Chair until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 19, 1971, at 3:00 P.M.