

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 1977

Mr. W. Carter.

in the LaScie plant we were not required to engage a double shift until June 30 last year when in fact they are engaging a double shift in that plant because of the increased landings.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us here are delighted to hear that the Minister of Fisheries has now become a prophet, he is prophesying from one year to the other. Capt. Dodd has lost his place in forecasting. However, Sir, we are very pleased that the fishery has gotten off to a good start. But there are some disturbing matters arising from the fisheries, and one is the situation which we find along the Northwest Coast where the fishermen have just started to fish, and they find, through storms and ice, they can no longer fish their gear because much of it is damaged and the government does not seem to have any programme to take care of them. And there is another disturbing matter, Mr. Speaker, and that is the fishermen along the Northeast Coast have been notified that the price of fish is down four cents per pound this year.

MR. W. CARTER: That is the salt fish.

CAPT. WINSOR: Well, it is the price of fish. Whether it is fresh or salt, it affects the fishermen. So even though the minister paints at this moment a very bright picture as far as catch is concerned, there are, as I say, some disturbing factors about the fishing industry, but we hope that these will be resolved, Sir, and I am sure that we all look forward to a very successful and prosperous fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make the following statement concerning the establishment of national parks in Labrador.

Mr. Hickey.

As members of the House are aware my department has for some time been holding preliminary discussions with Parks Canada with regards to the possible establishment of two national parks in Labrador, in the Mealy Mountains area and the Torngat Mountains.

MR. NEARY: Any telephones?

MR. HICKEY: The amount of information available at this time is not sufficient for government to make a decision on the desirability or otherwise of having parks established in either of the above areas. In view of this the following course of action has been approved by government to obtain the necessary background information to further consider this matter. Both Parks Canada and my department will continue with a programme of public involvement to determine the attitude of the people of Labrador to the establishment of national parks. Particular emphasis will be placed on how the establishment of any park might affect traditional lifestyles. During the coming Summer months discussions will be conducted within the communities. I have requested Parks Canada to provide me with a definite development plan for each area, namely, the Mealy Mountains and the Torngat Mountains area, by the end of this year. This plan will provide details as to the type and level of proposed development and the economic impact to be expected. Appropriate departments of government will be requested to do an assessment of the impact of national parks being established at Mealy Mountains and Torngat Mountains. These assessments will be considered by government in arriving at a decision with regards to the net benefit of establishing national parks in the areas mentioned. When the above has been completed, government will have adequate information on which to make a final decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: The minister must have guessed that I was going to question him in the Question Period so he comes out and gives us a ministerial statement on it. Our feelings are very similar to the minister's that we do not have sufficient information from National Parks in Ottawa to make any decision or to get involved any further down the line in the

Mr. Strachan.

setting of the two national parks, but predominantly the one in the Torngat Mountains. I should inform the minister that there was a fairly large meeting in Natin last night discussing the essence of what he stated here.

MR. STRACHAN: And I should inform him that although Labrador people in some cases have been negative towards parks, the meeting last night, apparently of many representatives including the Inuit Association and the council and elders, indicated that they are not against the parks totally as such; in fact, in some cases they are very much for the parks provided there are guarantees of preserving the traditional hunting rights and being able to carry on their life-style as in the past. And so we welcome the statement from the minister. I should add that there was some question that the Province - and maybe the minister can dispel the rumour - there was some question that the Province did not want to allow the national parks to have that park in the Torngat Mountains because of possible future mineral development and there was apparently some question there. So later on, possibly in Question Period, I could maybe elicit a response from the minister on that.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Mount Scio.

DR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Glouster Place in the electoral district of Mount Scio. Glouster Place is a road approximately a fifth of a mile long running north off Ridge Road. It is just on the boundary of the Pippy Park proper and it is in the Pippy Park control zone.

The prayer of the petition is as follows: We the undersigned supporters solicit your representation in our plight for the paving of Glouster Place. The conditions of Glouster Place, which is one of the few unpaved roads in the greater St. John's area, is deteriorating to the point where it often makes for hazardous driving and is causing great inconvenience because of dust conditions.

Mr. Speaker, this petition was signed by all forty-three residents of Glouster Place over nineteen years of age.

DR. WINSOR: I know the road well. It is in a deplorable condition and I pledge my support that -

MR. NEARY: Many of these people must live on Ridge Road, not on Gloucester Place.

DR. WINSOR: Most of them, I believe - on the corner.

MR. NEARY: Only three or four families live in there.

DR. WINSOR: Oh, no, you are wrong,

MR. NEARY: There are not that many houses.

DR. WINSOR: There are quite a few new homes in there in the last three or four years, some lovely homes. And it is in a deplorable state and I do pledge my support that we will be able to get this paved by the end of the summer, and I refer the petition to the Department of Transportation and Communications. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to support the petition and to say a word in support of it on behalf of those of us on this side of the House. I cannot claim to be as familiar with the Ridge Road and Gloucester Place as the hon. gentleman from Mount Scio or the hon. gentleman from LaPoile district (Mr. Neary) but you know, it is obvious there is a need and I hope the need will be met.

In saying that, Sir, I want to say again that there are many such needs throughout the Province. And I would hope this year the government will endeavour to provide pavement to a number of parts of the Province and will endeavour to provide it - and I think the hon. gentleman from Mount Scio (Dr. Winsor) would agree with this - in accord with the needs, with the priorities. Because there are areas of this Province, Sir, where it is not just a question of one road not being paved; there are areas of this Province where there are still no municipal roads paved at all, or next to none paved.

And along those lines, Sir, it might be of interest to Your Honour and to the petitioners to note that I have



MR. ROBERTS: had some analysis done and I do not know the reasons for the state of affairs, although I can certainly take a hazard at them, but in the last year on the average there was - I have come by, I should say, a document that has been hitherto held secret and that is the analysis of exactly what work the Department of Transportation and Communications have done in every part of this Province in the last three or four years. And this has now come to me and I will be making it public. But on an average last year for every dollar spent in a district represented by a member on this side of the House, of provincial money as opposed to DREE money, there was three dollars spent in a district represented by gentlemen on the other side. And I find that a very interesting figure indeed. The Minister of Transportation is not here or I would ask him how this can be.

MR. DOODY: What is the breakdown on DREE funds?

MR. ROBERTS: I have a breakdown on the DREE funds although I do not have the figure in front of me. The DREE funds will heavily favour the areas where the DREE roads are.

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised.

MR. PECKFORD: It seems to me that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is either in the realm of debate or very close to it, and I would just direct Your Honour's attention to the fact that it seems like he is fringing on breaking the rule if he has not already done so.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I submit I had not trespassed into the realm of debate and

MR. ROBERTS:

that I was not about to trespass into the realm of debate. The hon. gentleman for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) would be well advised to take heed of the old legal maxim that every dog is entitled to his first bite. And I would permit further, Sir, that Your Honour does not need any direction on the rules of the House. The very most that the member might wish to do is to draw to Your Honour's attention what a member believes might be a breach of the rules, and request Your Honour to intervene, but I think it is presumptuous of the hon. member for Green Bay to direct Your Honour to take any steps one way or the other. I do not think I was out of order, Sir. If I was then I will certainly apologize and withdraw any offensive remarks. I do not think I was out of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The point raised raises two questions, one of relevancy, one of debate. Certainly the hon. Leader of the Opposition's remarks in my opinion were relevant, and I would not be prepared to rule that he had entered into the realm of debate. He was making reference to what he considered to be statistics on expenditures for road paving between various districts. That could obviously have developed into a debate on government transportation policy. In my opinion it did not, and is not at this moment debate.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was replying to a question asked to me by the Minister of Finance. And my figures, as I said, did not include DREE. The DREE figures are very heavily concentrated in the areas where the DREE roads are, including St. John's here, the district of Kilbride and so forth, the arterial road, and also of course the DPEE money is spent under a federal-provincial agreement to which our government is party and in respect of which in fact our government calls the tenders and awards the contracts.

But the fact remains that out of provincial money for every dollar spent in a district represented by gentlemen on this side, three dollars is spent by gentlemen on the other side, and it is amazing. And I say this for the benefit of the gentleman for Mount



MR. ROBERTS:

Scio (Dr. R. Winsor) if he wants to know how he can - and I am sure he wants to have the road, Glouster Street, paved, I am sure he does - and I tell him how he might help to get this paved if I give him but one figure; in 1965 there was spent in a district, a district represented in this House by a member, about \$150,000 in provincial money on roads; in the next year there was spent \$1.466 millions, about ten times as much. And if I say to the gentleman for Mount Scio that that district was the district of Ferryland I know he will understand and I know he will know what steps he has to take to ensure that the road on Glouster Street is paved.

I support the petition, Sir, and I hope, as I have said before, that the government this year will do that which they have not done before, and that is not be narrowly and miserably partisan in attempting to make people suffer because they have expressed their free political preferences in a secret election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition presented by my hon. friend, the member for Mount Scio, on behalf of the residents of Glouster Place. I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, that a number of the names that appear on that petition are not really residents of Glouster Place but Ridge Road - they may live on either side of Glouster Place - because I do not believe there are forty-odd people living in that area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I am very familiar with the area, Sir, because I once lived on Fox Avenue which is right next door, and when I moved from Fox Avenue I was seriously considering buying a house in Glouster Place. It was a beautiful spot. It is one of the most beautiful areas of this city, Sir. It is right on the boundary of the Pippy Park. It is in the control area but it is not in the Park.

DR. R. WINSOR: They put eight new homes up there in the past year.

MR. NEARY: Eight new homes in the past year, which goes

Mr. Neary:

to show, Sir, that it is a very popular area. The whole Ridge Road and Glouster Place area is absolutely beautiful, Sir. It is an ideal location to build a house; it is a controlled area and the boundary of the Pippy Park goes right along Ridge Road. And I think before the last election when my hon. friend was running I believe the government paved part of the Ridge Road, they paved it from either end, but it is not paved in the centre because I drive up there every Sunday morning going to mass up on Nagle's Hill, and the road is paved along by the houses in the lower end, then there is a break, there is no pavement because there are no houses, and then as you get up near the houses on the other end the road is paved again, but there is no pavement on Glouster Place.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are working on it.

MR. NEARY: They are working on it? The hon. gentleman is working on it. Well I think the whole stretch of Ridge Road should be paved. And it is a pity,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that whole area is not upgraded. It is one of the most beautiful parts of St. John's. Gentlemen, go up there at night and you get a beautiful view of St. John's and of the harbour.

MR. ROBERTS: There is a great view from up there, is it not?

MR. NEARY: It is really an outstanding area and I would like to see that particular - I would like to see, first of all, orderly development take place in there in Gloucester Place because it is a beautiful area, and in order to do that you are going to have to put down curb and gutter because there is no curb and gutter there now, pavement and so forth. Does that not come under the city of St. John's?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. NEARY: No. It is no man's land. No man's land.

Well it must be right on the boundry, the city boundry.

DR. WINSOR: It is in the Pippy Park control area but not really in Pippy Park.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Well sometimes I wonder about that Pippy Park, Sir. Do we know what we are doing tying up all this beautiful land when people are so desperate for building lots for housing development? We got this huge area tied up - I think it should be released - tied up for this crowd over at the university so that they can trot around on their leisure time.

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised.

MR. PECKFORD: It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman in supporting the petition to do with road improvements is now talking about the Pippy Park area and the commission and it seems to me that he is both irrelevant and debating.

MR. SPEAKER: The subject matter of the petition has to do with the paving of a road in a specific area and any detailed or developed remarks on the wisdom or otherwise of having a Pippy Park Commission and its operation would be irrelevant. A comparison, or an allusion

MR. SPEAKER: for purposes of comparison as long as it was not developed would, I think, be understandable. The hon. member.

MR. NEARY: The hon. acting Government House Leader seems to be awfully sensitive today, Sir, for some reason or other. He must be still smarting under the attack he got in putting his estimates through yesterday. But, Sir, it is a nice area. I believe probably now it is controlled by the Metropolitan, by the St. John's Metropolitan Board. But I would like to see the area developed in an orderly fashion and I am all for paving that stretch of road because -

MR. NEARY: Is there a private meeting or something going on here?

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. CANNING: I am trying to listen to the hon. gentleman who is speaking but with the conversation going across the House I just cannot hear him. I think they are out of order and I wonder if we could have order here so we can listen to one another in this House?

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: I am one of the offending parties, I confess. I apologize. I was just asking when the real House Leader would be back, Sir, and the hon. gentleman opposite was trying to help me because it is in the interest of all concerned that we have the House Leader back. But I am sorry. I was guilty.

MR. PECKFORD: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. gentleman.

MR. PECKFORD: I was one of the offending parties too and I want to apologize because I was communicating across the House to find out who the Leader of the Opposition was.

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order has been disposed of and the raucous atmosphere has now subsided.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is getting to be a hard place, Sir, it will soon be time to close her down now. It is a good thing we only have about another week or so to go or she would be

MR. NEARY: like one of the taverns downtown. All they got to do is bring the dart boards in now, Sir. I do hope that the member will have success, Sir, in getting this piece of road paved because I think it is a very deserving case. It is only - what?- a few hundred yards?

DR. WINSOR: One-fifth of a mile.

MR. NEARY: One-fifth of a mile. Well I am sure that the Minister of Transportation can dig down in his pocket if he has to and find that much to pave one-fifth of a mile for these people that live up in Gloucester Place. ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS TO WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister of Public Works & Services.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yesterday the hon. member for LaPoile posed a question to me as Minister of Public Works which I undertook to check on. I have referred and discussed the matter with my colleague, the Minister of Tourism, who with leave will reply to the question.

MR. NEARY: Is that in connection with the golf course? Is the minister going to give me an answer?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the question as I understand it was what cost to the Province the golf -

MR. NEARY: What involvement, what connection financial or otherwise does the Province have?

MR. HICKEY: Which is what cost to the Province.

MR. NEARY: Well not necessarily. I have not been able to find out what the cost is of the Norma and Gladys.

MR. HICKEY: I agree with my hon. friend, Mr. Speaker,



MR. HICKEY: that it is time we got out of here because now we are matching wits for sure.

The proposed golf course at Sandringham or in the Terra Nova National Park, wherever it might be, whatever site it might be on, will cost this Province nothing, not a red cent, not a nickel.

MR. NEARY: What about manpower in getting the land assessed and purchased?

MR. HICKEY: No, nothing at all, Mr. Speaker, except that a couple of my staff help out Parks Canada people. I am sure hon. members of this House would never object to that.

MR. NEARY: Who expropriates the land if necessary?

MR. HICKEY: We are always ready to co-operate with federal officials -

MR. NEARY: If the land has to be expropriated?

MR. HICKEY: - on any issue, on any project which is of benefit to the Province, especially at a time when jobs are required and jobs are needed.

MR. NEARY: Well if you are going to create jobs-

MR. HICKEY: I am sure no member of the House, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: - you can do a better job than building a golf course.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I should like to be heard in silence. I stand on my rights.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has the right to be heard without interruption.

MR. HICKEY: As I said, I am sure no hon. member of this House, and by now not even maybe Mr. Rodriguez

MR. HICKEY: in the House of Commons, would object to this golf course which is necessary and which is a project which will -

MR. NEARY: How many people can afford to buy golf clubs and golf shoes and go in and lean on the bar of a golf club? How many in Newfoundland?

MR. NEARY: Are you going to discuss this tomorrow as you said?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. HICKEY: Then why do you not wait?

Mr. Speaker, what a job I am having trying to answer that question. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, it was not my intent to make a speech, but may I repeat for the benefit of my hon. friend who is interjecting and interrupting me, the golf course wherever it might be, at Sandringham or whatever part of the Terra Nova National Park, as required by the Gros Morne agreement of 1972, and I might say, a concept, a great imperial concept conceived by the former government of which the hon. gentleman was a part.

MR. NEARY: That is not so.

MR. HICKEY: Not so? It certainly was so. The former Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, Mr. Callahan, signed the initial agreement and insisted on a golf course.

MR. NEARY: Let us get something in its place.

MR. HICKEY: Never mind getting anything! Where was my hon. friend then?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

I am not sure if the hon. gentleman has finished his answer, but there should be no debate during this period.

MR. HICKEY: I could not agree -

MR. SPEAKER: There should not be interruptions from hon. gentlemen sitting on my right and the hon. gentleman should not debate but merely give his answer.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I could not agree with Your Honour more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: You are very tolerant, Sir. I will repeat again for my hon. friend, because he keeps interjecting, the golf course will not cost this Province one single, solitary red cent.

MR. NEARY: Can we get something in place of it?

MR. HICKEY: No, we will have a golf course.

MR. NEARY: We will have a golf course for the elite.

MR. HICKEY: No.

MR. NEARY: For the aristocrats.

MR. HICKEY: No, the ordinary fellows like me can go and play golf.

MR. NEARY: The ordinary fellows could not even afford to buy a golf club.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: In the absence of the Premier and the Minister of Justice -

MR. CANNING: Where is he?

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know where the Premier is. I never know where he is. He may be playing golf, it is a nice day. I had a question for the Minister of Transportation, who is not here, and for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, and they are all the same

MR. ROBERTS: question. Perhaps I could address it to the President of the Treasury Board who, in the long run, not only has to pay the shot, but is responsible for the administration of contracts. My question is this: Has there been any change made by the government in the standard contracts form which I understand is in use, in effect, in respect of highways contracts, contracts for highways projects? The particular aspect in respect of which I am enquiring is, is there now in effect a requirement by government on a contractor that a contractor must hire locally owned trucks in an area rather than bringing in trucks from outside? Is there any change in the contracts?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: I honestly cannot answer it, Your Honour. I will have to take it as notice.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the minister and, you know, I am satisfied that all he can do is take it as notice, but would he also, since there has been no change I suspect, would he also enquire as to the status of a promise, a commitment made by the gentleman from St. Barbe, as he now is, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, at a meeting held in Maynard's Club in Hawke's Bay in the Summer of 1975, when he announced and undertook that such a change would be brought into effect in respect of the 1976 year, which it has not been or was not been in respect thereafter. It is a very current and very live issue on the Northern Peninsula right now, Sir.

Mr. Roberts.

But the commitment was made by the gentleman from St. Barbe.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile followed by the hon. gentleman from Burin - Placentia West.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance, the President of Treasury Board. Would the minister tell the House or bring the House up to date on the current negotiations between the Police Brotherhood, the Nurses' Union and any other groups that the Treasury Board are negotiating with for contracts at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Yes, the Police Brotherhood contract has been - the conversations on that particular contract were suspended last week, and I would not be at all surprised if I were to personally meet with some of the Brotherhood officials today to see if we can resolve or at least hear the outline of the outstanding differences. The nurses' contract has gone to conciliation, and we have not anything from that as yet. We do not know where the conciliation stands.

MR. NEARY: What about NAPE?

MR. DOODY: Which NAPE?

MR. NEARY: Are you negotiating with NAPE right now?

MR. DOODY: There is always some unit or other under negotiation. But there is nothing close to a crucial area. The Waterford, we are still waiting for the report from Mr. Hart. He was scheduled to get us in his mediation report yesterday or today but as yet we have not hear from him. So everything else seems to be fairly calm.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Do I understand correctly or interpret the minister's answer correctly that negotiations had bogged down with the Police Brotherhood but will be resumed again this afternoon, and would the minister indicate if there is any possibility of settlement, or at the parties too far apart at this particular moment to get an agreement?



MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: I do not think that the parties are too far apart to get an agreement, Your Honour. The record of Treasury Board's negotiation on behalf of government during the past several years with the forty-some units of the public service has been a remarkable one. I think the only strike has been the unfortunate Waterford one which has been very spectacular and one that has lasted far too long. Generally speaking the negotiating capacities of both sides have been excellent and we have managed to achieve agreement, as I say, in all these areas during the past several years. There is absolutely no reason to suspect that the same cannot be achieved with the Brotherhood in this particular area.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: In connection with the Waterford strike,

we have not had an updating from the minister now - the minister was away for a rest, so we were told by the hon. Premier, for a couple of weeks, and we really have not heard too much about the strike at the Waterford. I did hear a release on the radio the other day that the number of police, members of the Newfoundland Constabulary who were doing duty at the Waterford, has now been wound down I believe from thirteen on a shift to nine or something on a shift. I do not know if this is correct or not, but perhaps the minister might take a few moments and bring us up to date on the situation at the Waterford seeing that we have not heard anything about it since the minister took his rest two weeks ago?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Yes, Well, I have naturally checked since I got back from my rest, Mr. Speaker, and the situation at the Waterford, in terms of patient care according to the administration and the medical people and the Department of Health here, is excellent. The security staff has been reduced as the hon. member indicated. There are fewer policemen on duty there now than there were prior to a couple of weeks ago. And everything seems to be quiet and calm and things are working quite well and there is nothing to report that has changed in any way. Things are going along as they had been. And hopefully with the help of Mr. Hart we will get

Mr. Doody.

the thing resolved and the staff back to work and the strike settled as soon as possible. But right now things are going on fairly well.

MR. NEARY: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister indicate when he expects to get Mr. Hart's report? I drove by the Waterford yesterday. The picket lines are still up. I find it very difficult to believe that everything is going along normal at the Waterford when 450 of its workers are out on strike and have been out on strike for several weeks. Could the minister give some kind of an explanation for this?

MR. DOODY: Are you finished now?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. DOODY: Well, sit down like a good fellow.

MR. NEARY: All right, okay.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: It is really no surprise to me, Your Honour, that the hon. member finds it difficult to understand this problem. I notice that he has the same

Mr. Doody:

difficulty with most problems that confront him. But the simple truth of the matter is that the situation is as I described it and I cannot help but once again reiterate the fact that things are going along extremely well in there.

MR. NEARY: There must be something wrong.

MR. DOODY: You know, I can issue an invitation on behalf of government and on behalf of the administration, on behalf of the staff to the hon. member to drop in there at any time and take a tour if he feels like it.

MR. NEARY: But the hon. gentleman will take me on a guided tour.

MR. DOODY: I would be delighted. Well as soon as the strike is over I will go in with you.

MR. NEARY: If we went in now we might be mistaken for -

MR. DOODY: That is right. And as a matter of fact, I think I would prefer to wait until this hon. House is adjourned before I go in because the tendency is to keep people like us in there.

MR. NEARY: You would only need one doctor now.

MR. DOODY: It is probably too much for the administration to avoid.

MR. NEARY: I might -

MR. DOODY: But I can assure you that things are well. If they were not you would hear about it.

MR. NEARY: But it is hard to understand it.

MR. DOODY: There are only ~~as~~ half as many patients there as there were before the strike for one thing.

MR. NEARY: But where are the patients?

MR. DOODY: As the hon. member has mentioned before there are extra staff, nursing people brought in from outside St. John's.

MR. NEARY: How about volunteers? Any volunteers?

MR. DOODY: There are a number of volunteers. It is not as great as it was in the beginning because there are more professional people in there now. My wife, for instance, still goes in there from time to time. And this is a firsthand report that I got from her only yesterday, she came out -

MR. NEARY: Is this going to cause the government now to take a whole look at the way that Waterford is being operated?

MR. DOODY: Yes, I think that the administration is going to have to take a serious look at the whole situation. But then again, as I say, the number of patients in there is not as large. But the out-patients area in the other hospitals has obviously -

MR. NEARY: It is unbelievable.

MR. DOODY: - their workload has picked up considerably.

MR. NEARY: It is unbelievable, you know.

MR. DOODY: But it is true nevertheless. +

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. P. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, the question I have I address to the Minister of Industrial Development. I think he is in either the corridor or in the office outside. I am hoping he will return to his seat by the time that I preface my question. And my question is based on this, that in the last few days, last week or so, there have been, according to the media that dockyard officials are about to clamour to Ottawa to have a synchronized lift for the dockyard in the West End of St. John's. They have reported that they are losing, I think, several millions of dollars worth of work, maintenance and suchlike owing to the fact that they do not have a synchronized lift. What I want to ask the minister is this: Number one, should the federal government, the bigger Crown corporation accede to the wishes of the dockyard here and install a synchronized lift, what does he think the effect is on the one at Marystown? And number two, the fact that they say they are losing quite a lot of orders because they have not got that facility - we got it at Marystown and it is not working to its full capacity - what does the hon. minister suggest would happen when the greater Crown corporation with more money behind it sets up the same facilities and then the lesser - not the lesser corporation, but the corporation with the lesser money, the Provincial Crown corporation - has to compete with the Federal corporation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Industrial Development.

HON. J. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the hon. gentleman's concern over this particular matter because at this stage, and until now really, there has been a problem of adequate work for Marystown let alone further competition. We have been pretty closely in contact with the CN and particularly Industry Trade and Commerce as it relates to the facilities here in St. John's. There is definitely a need for improved facilities on the East Coast of Canada for heavy artillery, I will call it, the heavy ships, the heavy shipping, and we feel ourselves that as a department of government that there has to be improved facilities right here in the CN dockyard.

Just to give the member one indication of the reason for it, which will provide no competition for Marystown as we have now supported officially as a Province the Canadian National's efforts to have the Soviet fleet serviced in the CN dock in St. John's. Up until recently, the last two years, when negotiations took place between the Soviets and the CN the federal government were very, very reluctant to allow the turnaround of the Russian ships here because of the fact that we did not have control of the 200 mile limit. Of course, now that we do have control that reason is eliminated and we see no reason why CN or a Russian crew should not be allowed to turnaround through Gander,



MR. LUNDRIGAN: if you want, or indirectly through CN here in St. John's and we support every effort to have that type of servicing done. If that can be achieved then of course the facilities are inadequate. Aside from that, the synchrolift, a capability that has been requested, we perceive it to have no real competitiveness with Marystown, the type of work we are doing in Marystown. And we are confident that with some of the new activity, such as the announced programme by Mr. Barney Danson yesterday with something like \$36 million - was it? - in work to be appropriated for just the navigational design work to be done for the military, that these types of yards, like the CN here, will have a much better future if they have better facilities. So in a nutshell, it should not provide any unfavourable competition for Marystown. And I think that with the new emphasis in the shipbuilding industry by fisheries and some of the new military aims as well, there should be plenty of activity down the road for both the shipyards.

MR. CANNING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. CANNING: That was a long answer, Mr. Speaker, But number one, the first thing that comes to my mind if I may preface my question is the fact that the modern shipyard built at Marystown was one of the most modern in the world when it was built. I think it was the second shipyard that had a synchronized lift. We could take up ships in a few minutes. If, say, St. John's is asking for modern facilities to be able to meet that demand of the extra work, could the minister tell me if his government would consider extending or expanding in Marystown where they have already people who are familiar - you know, we have a good staff there, everybody knows that; we have good work from welders up who are already familiar with repair of draggers and the maintenance of ships and whatnot. Again, on the other hand, the other question I would like to ask the minister is what he thinks of it - it has come on him like it has come on me - the fact that the CNR, as everybody knows, is subsidized by millions and millions and millions; money does not mean anything to

MR. CANNING: CNR. So all right, when they get the dockyard going up there and get a synchronized lift and they start competing with the provincial one at Marystown, I do not think we have a chance in the world to keep that yard going up there. I mean, you know, I respect the minister's opinion - I just want an answer to it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker -

MR. CANNING: It is by no means any criticism, you know, of him or the operation there or anything else. It is just that I want to know at the moment what we do expect to happen.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, if the CN had taken the proper initiatives and interest in the dockyard here we would have had much more modern facilities today than we have. And we feel it would be negligent on the part of the government not to support the CN and Industry Trade and Commerce who I believe will be taking some initiatives on the East coast of Canada with new capability in docking and the type of facility that we have here in St. John's. So we do not feel it is going to provide unfavourable competition for Marystown.

Now just to indicate - the situation in Marystown indicates whether there would be need for expansion. We have just had the Ambassador from Norway to Canada who visited the shipyard to inspect the tugs that have been under construction for some months now for the Norwegian company and he could hardly believe - he was so impressed with the skills, the capability and the efficiency of that relatively small facility by world standards. And I will say to the member that with the new dawn of activity on the horizon for shipping and ship related activities, marine related activities, even though we will have the ups and downs and the peaks and the troughs that Mr. Burgess talks about and Mr. Barclay talks about we will still have, we think, quite a bit of activity over the next decade or so in shipbuilding and ship related activities. And I hope that if the kinds of building programmes get off the ground in the next number of years that we think

MR. LUNDRIGAN: will get off the ground, I would not be surprised if we are going to be looking at increasing the capability out of Marystown.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I am just not clear, I do not have my question answered as this moment.

The main part of my question is this, that the dockyard, the CNR at St. John's are - I mean, there are people demanding now, suggesting and demanding, and they are about to make representation to Ottawa for a synchronized lift. One of my questions is if there is a synchronized lift there and Marystown has to compete with the CNR, I ask him what effect does he think it will have on Marystown? And number two is that this business of what business we have or what you have coming up or anything else, or this business about the Norway tugs, you know, that is not too good a -

Mr. Canning.

contract. I am sure he is aware of that. We are not going to make any money on them. We are probably going to lose money. I do not know if we will get any more tugs or if it is going to be economical to do it. But, Mr. Speaker, why I am asking the question, to me at the present moment, to get a syncrolift for St. John's, get the CNR backing it, and then the provincial government - I mean, we will call it a Provincial Crown corporation, backed by the provincial government. If you have not got enough money to keep hospital beds open this year, what is going to happen to the yard at Marystown? That is my question, and I would like a straightforward answer. The question is simple and plain. I would like an answer to the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. minister.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see the hon. gentlemen having a bit of spirit. That encourages me somewhat.

MR. CANNING: I am concerned about this.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I hope it sort of manifests the spirit he finds in Marystown. Last year there was a substantial loss in Marystown. This year we hope to break even on an operational basis, which is a substantial improvement over the past year. Number two, last year, Mr. Speaker, we were able to out bid the CN dockyard here on a number of contracts, competitive bids. And I have got confidence that with increased facilities here - and assuming increased facilities which is a long way down the road if there is a go ahead on new capability - I have got confidence that we can compete in Marystown. We will get our share of work.

MR. CANNING: We are losing bids up there now. We got a ship the other day turned away from Marystown because they could not compete. So, I mean, do not talk to me about winning. We are losing.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is manifesting a level of pessimism which is certainly not in tune with the attitude in Marystown Shipyards today.



MR. CANNING, No!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We will compete. Already we have shown - and last year I was surprised there was not a fuss out of the shipyard when we competed favourably for contracts that were bid on mutually by both the yards, and we competed over several of the Atlantic yards as well down in Marystown.

MR. CANNING: For what?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Last year we did something like \$4 million worth of repair activity; \$8 million worth of new construction. There are 350 full-time jobs down there at the moment. And I do not think the member should really get too uptight.

MR. CANNING: The yard did not inspire -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We have a prejudice in favour of Marystown Shipyards, because it is our own Crown corporation. And as a department we do not feel that it is unnecessary or that it is going to be a disadvantage to Marystown if there are improved facilities at the CN dockyard right here. That is the position we have taken. We have analyzed it very carefully. We have sat down, and we have taken almost a prejudiced position in favour of Marystown. Now we said that is our first concern because it is our own Crown corporation, our own government Crown corporation. And we have concluded as a department that it is not to her disadvantage at all, it is to her advantage to improve the capability that we have overall here in this Province which is to support any activity. And we are complaining that there is not enough aggression being used by CN and Industry, Trade and Commerce to improve the facilities at the CN dockyards in St. John's.

MR. CANNING: A further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay followed by the hon. gentleman from Eagle River.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Social Services. I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not he is aware of the news reports today, I believe it was, that a lady and her daughter had to spend some time sleeping in a truck because they could not get assistance from his department for shelter? I wonder if the minister could tell us if he is aware of it and what his department is doing about it?



MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I believe that that information came out yesterday evening or yesterday afternoon. Actually it is a seventeen year old unmarried mother and her two year old child who allegedly spent a night in the cab of a truck and another night in a shed somewhere. She was in a boarding house here in the city, and her board was paid up until June 20, so there was no need for her to be out in the street. I understand that there was some minor trouble at the boarding house. However, our staff was not aware of the fact that she had left the boarding house until they heard it by way of the electronic media, and they had no idea that she was out in the street. Apparently she has been after the staff, the city welfare, for some time to set her up in an apartment. And, of course, it is not the policy of the department to provide apartments for unmarried mothers and their children, not if we can find some alternate means, so she was refused an apartment. She could be using this as a leeway to put pressure on us. I am not suggesting that she is but it is possible.

MR. BRETT: Somebody may be wondering why she could not go home. Now this is a real problem case. The girl was at one time a ward of the director and probably does not have any place to go other than a boarding house. But anyway the case is in hand and we are looking after it right now, Sir.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister check into it to see if the young lady has been told by her social worker some time ago to find an apartment and the department would pay the rent? Did the minister check to see if that fact was authentic and correct because that was in the news report and I have done a little bit of checking on it myself. I am familiar with the case and have been for a couple of days. The young lady was told to find an apartment. Why does it take so long? Why is it such a long procedure for a social worker to make a decision after sending people out to look for apartments. They hunt sometimes for weeks and months on end and then when they find the apartments they cannot get the application processed or they cannot get the decision taken quickly. By the time they get the decision the department is probably gone to somebody else. Why does it take so long to make these decisions? Has the minister checked on that?

MR. SPEAKER: The on minister.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of what the staff at city welfare told this particular case. I would estimate there must be hundreds like this going through welfare in any given month so I am not sure what they told this particular girl and neither am I aware that it takes all that long to get approval from the director. It may take a long time to get an apartment, and of course I have told this House many times why that is. The fact is that people would prefer to take independent people into their apartments rather than people who are on welfare. I am not aware that there is an undue delay. There are a large number of cases going through so you know going through the bureaucratic

MR. BRETT: system there may take a week or so but I am not aware of any undue delay.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Eagle River followed by the hon gentleman for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. STRACHAN: Could the minister of Tourism tell us whether if everything goes all right and people are consulted, they agree to an national park in the Torngat Mountains that his department and the administration are eager, enthusiastic about setting a national park in there provided everything else is okay?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I can only give a general answer to that because I think I should first of all say that the administration is interested in whatever is best for the people of Labrador. My statement today indicated that the total economic impact of a park would have to be established and the economic benefits would have to be well documented before we would take a final decision. The hon. member mentions the mining aspect and I can only say to him that my statement again refers to assessment by various departments. Certainly the Department of Mines and Energy and my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy will be totally involved in any development of parks in Labrador because of the possibility of minerals or what have you. And before any final decision is taken with regards to transferring territory to the federal government all of those things are taken into account. I can say to him that finally, with regards to the other part of his question, all other things being equal if it is shown that the development of the park in Labrador will preserve the traditional lifestyles, or take into account that and certainly not ignore that, and at the same time show some real economic benefits then certainly this administration is anxious and eager to see park development take place.

MR. STRACHAN: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: A final supplementary. Could the minister indicate clearly to us whether he would favour, and his department and hopefully the administration would favour a national park as an economic development in the Torngat Mountains rather than any mineral development which may occur there. Because as you can imagine any mineral development occurring in the Torngat Mountains will have a worse effect on the lifestyles, and the park is certainly more favourable of the two. Could he indicate?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, obviously this is a question which requires a great deal of information being made available. And as I said earlier, the economic benefits of course are not always considered in terms of dollars and cents. In taking into account the total economic impact, one certainly does take into account the damages, if one could put it that way, changes in lifestyle, etc. I am sure that it is the desire of this administration to see jobs created, to see areas such as that part of Labrador developed. However, it might well be established that the declaring of an area as a national park and the transferring of a fair tract of territory to the federal government would not produce—and I say it may show this—that it would not produce the kind of economic benefits that the passing over of such a large tract would warrant. So there is a whole host of things involved and I do not think that anyone at this time can give a definite answer to the hon. member's question. I think it is safe to say that this administration will do whatever is in the best interests of the people of Labrador taking into account all aspects and all facets of the proposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. There are some small, unincorporated areas in the Province, one in my own district, proposing to go to Canada Works to make application for funding for water systems basically, in particular.

MR. J. DINN: Unincorporated areas?

MR. FLIGHT: Unincorporated areas. And it would seem, Mr. Speaker, it would seem probably the only way that they are going to bring this about, and it seems it is there and it is a programme that we can take advantage of. The question is would the minister's department, Municipal Affairs, make available to those communities the kind of expertise that they would need to put together the kind of a package that Canada Works has got to have? You know, in unincorporated areas there is probably no expertise, there is no way of determining what that system would cost in labour and otherwise, labour and materials, so as to put together the package and make the application. I am wondering if the Department of Municipal Affairs would assist those unincorporated areas in putting together that package by providing the expertise, the engineering services or what have you, out of the department?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, there are limited resources down in the department, but if you are talking about a few communities certainly I will see what I can do to make the expertise available. If you were talking about 500 it would be impossible, but if you are talking about a few communities I will certainly have a look at it and make them available if it is at all possible.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. FLIGHT: I am just wondering if the minister is aware of any of those unincorporated communities that we are talking about that are badly in need of water systems having made that type of an application to his department for that type of assistance that I have asked about?



MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: We, Mr. Speaker, have a few Water Committees that have gone that route, yes.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Along the same lines, Sir, as the question put by my hon. friend, if we are going to have on stream pretty soon the St. John's regional water supply, and they are under no jurisdiction at the moment, and I believe that is going to force the minister into a position to set up a regional government or some aspect of regional government in the area. What procedure will the minister use to set up this regional government?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: He will take your application now.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we would get legislation through the House in this session to set it up.

MR. NEARY: But what procedure? How will they be appointed or elected?

MR. DINN: Well, through the legislative procedure, We have not got the draft bill or the draft legislation ready yet. But it will be through the Legislature. It will be done in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte, followed by the hon. gentleman for Bay of Islands, time permitting.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance, the President of Treasury Board. And I ask the question as a result of an ad that I saw in yesterday's edition of The Globe and Mail with respect to a new top level fiscal officer for the Province. And I wonder if the minister could tell us what it is all about? What the position is all about?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: I do not know if that is the same position that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was enquiring about a few weeks ago, that of the ADM, Assistant Deputy Minister, who has resigned. The other gentleman who is leaving us is the Director of Fiscal Policy. This may be the gentleman whom you are referring to, Mr. Brown, Joe Brown, who has been with us for about two years, He is from Calgary and he is unfortunately going home, and so we have got to replace him. Ads have been placed in all of the various newspapers.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow one supplementary.

MR. WHITE: The supplementary is sort of doubled-barrelled. I wonder if the minister could tell us whether or not the ADM's position has been filled, and whether or not the government will be advertising in local papers for those positions, particularly the one that I saw in The Globe and Mail because I have not seen it locally?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: To the best of my knowledge they all are advertised in local papers, certainly the directive is to that effect. Whether or not this actual one has, obviously I have not pursued all of the newspapers, but the policy is that they are advertised in the local papers. On the first part of your question,

MR. DOODY: the ADM position has not been filled. It has been narrowed down to about three people now and the Civil Service Commission and the Interview Board are working on which of these three will be most acceptable.

MR. SPEAKER: A final question, the hon. gentleman for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I informed my hon. colleague, the Minister of Tourism, that I would ask him this question. In view of the fact that our provincial parks are overcrowded and the people are encouraged by the Department of Tourism to build private parks, if 'build' is the proper word to use here, would the hon. minister tell the House if any loans or grants are available or will be available for this purpose?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, we are very anxious to see development of this kind take place. There is no programme at the moment, and no subhead in my estimates at the moment, to provide any financial assistance.

During debate on the estimates I indicated that we are negotiating with the federal government, with DREE, for an agreement and we would hope that if we are successful in reaching a successful conclusion in those negotiations that an agreement might have some kind of programme whereby we can provide some assistance. Certainly it is our desire. We do not have anything at this moment. We are anxious to see something like that happen and we are working towards that end.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Members' Day, motion 7.  
The hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: I am looking at a different Order Paper,  
Mr. Speaker.

The purpose of putting on this motion, Mr. Speaker - and I will read it in a moment because it has been on for a long time; it has not been before the House though - is really to serve as an annual reminder and request of the government to bring in compulsory legislation requiring pension plans to be provided by private businesses for their employees. Now over the past two or three years I have mentioned this and had hoped perhaps to have seen this type of legislation come before the House for consideration, and unfortunately it has not as yet. Now perhaps first of all I could just read the resolution to refresh the House's mind as to what exactly is involved in it.

First of all it says that, "This Province is without legislation compelling private enterprise to provide pensions for employees." Then it goes on to say, that, "There had been many people who after working for many years have found themselves at the end of the years retired or discharged from places of employment without the benefits of adequate or in many cases any pension at all." And it goes on to say that, "This is obviously a hardship to many persons being retired at the end of their productive years without the right to the pension." And the operative part of the resolution says that, "This House urges the government to take immediate steps to introduce legislation compelling employers to provide adequate compulsory pension plans for employees, such plans to apply to the broadest possible categories of enterprises and employees and to have the

MR. MARSHALL:       maximum range of portability feasible."

Now this resolution - I cannot think of any more important legislation that could be brought into this House - is aimed to remedy a very distressing and grievous circumstance which has occurred from time and again in the past in this Province and will occur again in the future unless steps are taken to protect these people, that is the employees in private businesses





MR. MARSHALL:

And he was paid this pension for two or three years and then he received a letter from the employer stating that 'Very, very sorry, but due to circumstances beyond the employer's control the pension could no longer be paid.' And that individual, that particular individual - and he was not the only one in that business; there were a large number of them - was unfortunately cast upon really the welfare of his own family. He had to actually pick up and move away with his daughter. What he was looking forward to in his years of retirement was no longer possible. And certainly one does not need to go into the details one can certainly imagine what kind of a traumatic experience that was to the individual concerned. Now I say this not by way of casting and heaping blame upon the company concerned or the employer concerned - and it was not just one company, there were others as well - because at the particular time there were certain business reversals; mainland companies came in, there was more competition, they had to make attempts to look after the people who were then in their employ - nothing they could do about it, just economically they could not do it. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that particular individual, those groups of individuals should not be in that particular position. What should happen is there should be a pension plan to

Mr. Marshall.

which the individual, the employee, and the employer, will contribute an equal amount; that this money is not to be held either by the employer or the employee, and it is not to be within their control, but it has to be paid into a third party, has to be paid into a trust company, a life insurance company or any of the other agencies which provide for the investments of funds, the provisions of annuities and the provisions of pensions over a period of time. Because if that were done what would have happened is that the employee who was pensioned at the time would not be cast upon the mercies of the company. His welfare would not depend upon the continued success of the business of the company. His welfare would not dependent upon the gratuitous payments by the directors of the company, but he would have an absolute right to that pension, it would be protected insofar as any pension could possibly be protected, and he would have the security of knowing that in his final years he would get a just return and be able to enjoy the benefits of a pension in the same way as a person who had been pensioned from the public service, say, or from a company which in fact maintains this type of pension. He would not go through the agony that these people went through years ago. Neither, I suggest in all fairness, would the employer at the time who had to take this step go through the agony of having to take it, because it was not at that particular time done, I know, with any particular belief or any particular intent or desire to hurt the employees or any lack of recognition of responsibility of the employer to provide for the employees in their years of retirement. But it was purely and simply done as a matter of necessity that that business could not continue to bear the heavy amount of liability that was cast upon it by having to pay out these pensions.

So that is the situation that this particular act is aimed at. And I am not asking either, Mr. Speaker, for something which is unknown, which has not happened before. Some seventy-five per cent

Mr. Marshall.

of Canadian citizens are protected by acts which are somewhat similar. The Province of Ontario has a Pension Benefits Act. The Province of Alberta and Saskatchewan also have these particular acts and also the Province of Quebec. All of these acts are fairly uniform and actually people can transfer from one province to the other, from one place of employment in the province to another and enjoy the benefit.

Now what has got to happen, Mr. Speaker, is, as I say, there has to be legislation brought in as soon as possible in this Province to provide for compulsory pension plans in private industries. These plans have to be paid for. It is not a case of the government having to pay for it. It is the case of the employer pays part of it and the employee pays part of it. The monies are taken, and they are put outside the control of both of the parties, and they are there for against the time when that person retires and that person then will be assured and have the security of a continuing pension. I have certain material here on this particular resolution relating to pension plans as there are certain other aspects that ought to be included in the proposed act. For instance, there ought to be what is called an actuarial evaluation of the soundness of the pension plan itself. And this would not only apply to the pension plans being brought in by virtue of the legislation instituting the compulsoriness of the plan, but it would apply to all pension plans, because I think it is a matter of concern for the state to see that the individuals concerned are not resting on false hope in the security of having their pensions. And the monies that are paid in should not be invested in speculative investments, and thereby risking a complete if not absolute depreciation of the capital of the funds so that the pension as envisaged would not be able to be applied; but there ought to be in this Province a machinery whereby there is an evaluation of the soundness of the pension plans themselves. The pension plans, the compulsory plans that are brought in, as the resolution indicates should extend to the broadest body of persons

Mr. Marshall.

that you can possibly have, the broadest body of description of employees. Now in Ontario, which was the first Province to bring in an act of this nature, the Pensions Benefit Act - in 1962, 1963 that act was brought in - and it had a provision requiring employers with fifteen or more employees to set up and maintain a minimum standard pension plan. Subsequently, that particular provision was eliminated in favour of creating a plan that had complete and absolute portability and, you know, other stringent regulations. But that is one of the ideas that this resolution connotes that it should apply to the broadest possible categories



MR. MARSHALL: of employees, that there ought to be inspection of the plans. The plan should come into effect, as most of these do, after a person has been in employment for six months. The plan should provide that after a person has been in the employ of a company for a period of ten years and reaches the age of forty-five, that the plan itself is what they call vested. In other words, the contributions are locked in and then when he reaches the age of retirement, even though he leaves his employment, that he will be able to get a pension at that particular time based on the amount of the reciprocal contributions.

The legislation should also provide the plan be portable; that if a citizen goes from A to job B that he should be able to take that particular pension with him. In other words, it should not depend upon his continued employment in the firm that he is in at the particular time.

This is what we are aiming for, Mr. Chairman. I am not going to speak for any length of time on this because, as I say, this resolution is brought before this House, really, to serve as a way of urging the government to bring in this legislation, to remind them that it has been discussed in this House and there were sentiments passed that it was a good idea, and to express the fervent hope that the pension legislation would be brought in at the earliest possible moment. Because I know and we all know that there are many people now in this Province who have been employed by businesses, who have been retired either with no pension or with a pittance of a pension, who, if they receive anything at all receive it by way of gratuity from their employers whose security is linked with the fortunes of the business with which they have been employed over a period of time, who are subjected to the agonies, and this is all you

MR. MARSHALL: can call it, the complete agonies of not having any security whatsoever in their age of retirement. I think that that is a social evil that has to be remedied, and the only way it can be remedied is by this Legislature taking an introducing and passing the appropriate legislation.

It is also, Mr. Speaker, unfair, as I say, for one class of business or one company to maintain a plan and another company not to maintain a plan, because it is really unfair competition. In fact there are many firms in this Province now who are maintaining plans, and adequate plans, for the provision of pensions, and others that are not. The others that are not are in competition with them and that in itself is unfair.

Now I realize, Mr. Speaker, that in the present economic situation you cannot always just rush in and bring in legislation without determining its consequences. But I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the consequences of bringing in legislation of this nature can only be beneficial, that it ought to be phased in as quickly as possible. I know regard has to be taken to the economic consequences on the economy but I cannot see

MR. MARSHALL: how ,balancing whatever detrimental consequences there may be against the social benefits, how anyone can come in with other than a ringingly affirmative "Ave" to this type of legislation. I am not proposing something which is really an airy - fairyidea that has not been done before. Governments are wont from time to time to ask, Do they have this in other provinces ? Why they have to make that request from time to time I do not know, but I suppose it is for their own security. But the answer to it in this case is yes, seventy-five per cent of Canadians, approximately seventy-five per cent of Canadians, are protected by pension legislation of the type advocated here and it most certainly should be done. As I say then in conclusion, I would hope that the government - and if the government does not next year, I will myself bring in a private member's bill in the hopes of really pressing the matter because I think it is an urgent one , it is a matter of grave urgency, and the longer it is put off the greater the agony and the misery to people in the years to come; that I will bring in a bill myself, but really it is the job of the government to bring in legislation of this nature and I hope they will. So I ask then, Mr. Speaker, for the support of all members of the House to this resolution which urges the government to take immediate steps to introduce legislation compelling employers to provide adequate, compulsory - in other words, compulsory pension plans, to the categories provided. It is a condition of their continuing business in this Province that they carry this pension plan for employees, such plans to apply to the broadest possible categories of enterprises and employees and to have the maximum range of portability feasible.

It is only, as I say, by passing this legislation that we can redress the agonies that have been experienced by a large body of people over the years and it is only by passing

MR. MARSHALL: legislation like this that we can give security to a large body of people who have worked for an employer or a set of employers for a long number of years and are entitled when they come to the age of retirement to the security of pension benefits kindred and similar to their associates who happen to be employed in other companies which maintain these pension plans.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will vote for this resolution and I rise now really to congratulate the hon. and learned member for St. John's East on his action in bringing this resolution before the House. His action in this matter is an excellent illustration of what is known in English political history as Tory democracy. And it was the Liberal party of the United Kingdom that fathered virtually all of the social reforms that England has known; virtually all, but not all. There were reforms introduced into parliament and adopted by parliament, introduced by Tory governments in the United Kingdom, particularly and especially under the leadership and the inspiration of the great Benjamin Disraeli, Lord Beaconsfield. They were known as the Tory democrats. Lord Randolph Churchill was one of them, the father of the great Sir Winston Churchill, and they were others, so that it is not true to say that all social reform brought into the parliament of the United Kingdom or brought into the parliament of Canada or brought into the legislature of Newfoundland has been brought by Liberals. Most of it, nearly all of it, yes, but not all. And today we have a very good example of an hon. member of this House whose record, whose ideology, whose philosophy, whose frame of mind, whose habits and whose precedence all indicate that he is Conservative, not necessarily Tory but pretty Conservative. So when an hon. member who is so conservative in most matters brings this kind of reform before the House, it deserves attention and he deserves the congratulations of every

MR. SMALLWOOD: thinking hon. member. I know that he does not mean the House to adopt the principle that if you work a month or a year with some firm you should thereby become entitled to a pension at pension age. I know that he must surely mean, as he rather indicates in the preamble to the resolution, that what is intended is that if a man or woman has worked faithfully for a substantial



MR. SMALLWOOD: period of time for a private employer then that employee, as in the case of a public employee, one employed by the government or any kind of elected authority, ought to be entitled to a pension. In other words, it seems to me that what the hon. gentleman is suggesting is that part of the income of an employee of a private employer ought to be a prospective pension when he reaches pensionable age, and that private industry, private enterprise establishments - commercial companies, industrial companies, financial companies - ought to be required by law in a civilized country, and one might even say in a Christian country, required by law to set aside as part of the running expense of the business, not merely the wages or salary paid week to week or month to month to the employee, but an amount over and above that to provide for a pension for that employee when the employee has served a given number of years and reaches pension age. If the number of years with a given concern be not quite enough then the years served with some other company may be added. That is what I think the hon. member means by portability. If I work for five years with a firm and eight years with another and ten with another and so on until I reach pension age then all these years are put together. Now I do not know who would pay the pension. The resolution -

MR. NEARY: That is a good question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, the resolution does not indicate that, but perhaps there could easily be set up a fund just as you have an unemployment insurance fund.

MR. MARSHALL: If the hon. gentleman would yield a moment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, and I will be anxious to hear this from the hon. member if he would let me first pose the problem. And then having posed it I will be happy to hear the hon. member's answer, his solution.

Just as today with regard to unemployment insurance a man can work a year with one company and ten with another and six months with another and eighteen years with another and then finding himself unemployed can resort to the unemployment insurance fund, a fund

MR. SMALLWOOD:                      nationally administered and built up by contributions from the Government of Canada, from the employers and from the employees. So it really does not matter who was the last employer, the fund takes care of him. And similarly I would imagine there could be a fund created, maintained and operated for the purpose of providing a pension to the person after he has served the requisite number of years and reached pensionable age.

Now that is the problem. Where would the money come from to pay a pension

Mr. Smallwood:

at pension age to a person who has worked with a number and variety of companies. And if the hon. member can give us an explanation of that I am sure the House will be pleased.

So I will relinquish my place merely for the purpose of hearing the explanation.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood). What would happen would be this money paid by the employer and the employee would be paid into a fund, like a trust company and insurance company, in the same way as pension funds are paid now. And these contributions would be what we call after they get a certain period of time in, locked in; in other words, they could not be taken out of that fund but if he went to another company where there was a similarly approved fund, the funds could perhaps be transferred to that other fund, that other trust company, that other insurance company or what have you.

And in answer to the question, the thing I thought I made clear - I was not explanatory enough when I was speaking, obviously - when I said it should be beyond the control of the employer and the employee to be paid in to the trust company and as a part of their duties they would be the ones that would pay out from the earnings and the income on the fund to the employee. So it would not in any way depend upon the fortunes of the company or any control at all of the company over that employment -

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. member serious or just pulling our leg?

MR. MARSHALL: No, that is the way it would work.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I thank the hon. member and learned gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall). Perhaps this would work, perhaps with a lot of careful adjustment and care it could be made to work. It would seem to me at first flush, without going into the matter in any detail, that a national fund to which all employers-whether they employ one, two or six persons, or 600 or 6,000 or 30,000-would contribute. So that what you would have would be a national fund, nationally administered and portable, applicable in the ten provinces

Mr. Smallwood:

into which every employer, large and small and medium would pay annually as now they pay for unemployment insurance.

After all, Mr. Speaker, I think what the hon. gentleman has in mind is insurance, that there ought to be a fund. There was a time when Workman's Compensation had no fund. There was no fund. If you worked for an employer and you got killed or injured there was no fund which would pay you any kind of compensation. You could go in court, you could sue your employer or, if you were killed in his employ, your wife, your widow, your dependent could sue the employer, but it was up to get you yourself to get the money from the employer.

When I took over the administration of the new Province I brought legislation in creating a fund into which every employer paid regularly at certain rates that were laid down by law, the rates depending on the degree of risk in the kind of employment. If you were working in a printing establishment you were not under such risk as you would be in certain other employments, and so the rates varied according to the degree of danger in the employment, and the payments out of the fund depended in no degree on the will or the desire or the wishes of the private employer. All the private employer had to do was to pay into the fund, and his concern ended there just as it ends also when he pays into the unemployment insurance fund which is an insurance fund just as workmen's compensation is an insurance fund. I would assume that the best thing would be - if we could not have it nationally across Canada which would be the best thing, but which could only be done by the Parliament of Canada - if it is to be a purely provincially thing then it has to be across the board within the Province and one fund exist into which every employer of any number, from one up, would pay regularly every week that that person or those persons was or were

Mr. Smallwood.

employed by that employer, and they would have nothing to do with the payment of the pension. That would be the function of the fund which could be administered by a trust company, as the hon. gentleman suggests, or by a state appointed board such as the Workmen's Compensation Board, or as national insurance on the national scale. I would be interested to hear the hon. gentleman's reaction to that thought. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there is nobody here in this Chamber at this moment who is going to vote against this resolution. It is a resolution asking the government to introduce it immediately. They are not going to introduce it immediately. It is getting too late in the session. But if we adopt it as our feeling that it ought to be done, I have no doubt that the government in due course will be guided by our opinion. They would be pretty short-sighted if they did not. It will not cost the government anything. It will not cost the Treasury anything, and it will be a piece of social justice, a piece of good solid old-fashioned Liberalism brought in by a Tory democrat. And the government, which is alleged to be Tory and which in my opinion is not Tory, I think that the government are nondescript. I think that perhaps all political parties in Newfoundland today are more or less nondescript, and I do not draw a sharp distinction. I wish I could. I wish I could say, There are the Tories and here are the Liberals. I wish I could say, but honestly I could not say it with a feeling that I was honest in doing it, that I was intellectually honest. I wish these distinctions could still be drawn. I wish that the people of Newfoundland would not need to have it pointed out to them. I wish they would recognize instantly who is a Liberal and who is a Tory.

Now the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is perhaps one of the only two Tories - genuine, honest to God Tories - there are over on that side of the House. The other one is from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). His neighbour is, I believe, genuinely a Tory.



MR. PECKFORD: Are we further from the left than the hon. gentlemen on the other side?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: More to the left?

MR. PECKFORD: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: When it comes to socialism and nationalism and nationalization and communism, yes. The government over there are far more communistic, far more socialistic than the party over here. After all, it was they who nationalized Churchill Falls. We built it. They nationalized it. We built or caused the building of the great paper mill. They nationalized it. We helped the building of the plant in Burgeo. They nationalized it. They are far more to the left than the party here on this side. I do not know whether they should be proud of that. And, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if Your Honour would consider that I have been wandering a little aside from the main topic so admirably introduced by the hon. and learned member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) for whom on times I have profound respect and admiration, and on times quite a contrary feeling as I am sure must be his experience as well. I must confess that the number of times when he has seemed to be rather incapable of restraining his admiration for me, the number of times has been strictly limited, but there have been many times when like his colleague from St. John's North he had no difficulty at all in showing the other kind of sentiment.

Anyway I congratulate him. I am going to vote for this. I hope that everyone here will vote for it. It is voting in principle. That is all we can do here today. We are not the government. The government can bring the legislation in, and in due time no doubt they will, but we can support it in principle by voting for this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, now that the mutual admiration society for today, Sir, has concluded its meeting, I would like to have a few words on this resolution and probably get down to brass tacks.

MR. Neary.

And the hon. gentleman in winding down his remarks there referred to the administration as being more to the left than hon. gentlemen who sit on this side, and I must say that I was rather impressed with these words, Sir, coming off the lips of a gentleman who spent several weeks down in Cuba waiting for Fidel.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, I came away. I did not stay.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. DOODY: You turned left and visited the Great Wall.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to knock the resolution. I can see that it would be a very, very difficult plan indeed to put into effect. As a matter of fact I am amazed, Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that the hon. gentleman who just took his seat, who was praising up the hon. gentleman for bringing in this great reform which he compared to some of the great Liberal reforms of Canada, that the hon. gentleman forgot to mention the Canada Pension Plan. The Canada Pension Plan does precisely what

- MR. NEARY: the hon. gentleman was talking about.  
The Canada Pension Plan gives everybody a pension across Canada, everybody.
- MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, I am getting \$80 a month.
- MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is getting \$80 a month - and completely overlooked the fact that what the hon. gentleman is asking for in this resolution as far as the private sector is concerned has already been done and implemented by the Liberal government up in Ottawa, the Liberal government of Canada.
- MR. SMALLWOOD: Brother Trudeau.
- MR. NEARY: No, not brother Trudeau. It was done -
- MR. SMALLWOOD: Brother Pearson.
- MR. NEARY: Brother Pearson.
- MR. DOODY: He needs his privacy.
- MR. NEARY: But, Mr. Speaker, this resolution raises the whole matter of pensions. And, Mr. Speaker, every magazine, every newspaper that I have read across North America for the last year or so now - every one - every magazine, every newspaper, they have a theme for the last year involving two words. You will find it in practically every newspaper. I am surprised my hon. friend has not seen it, who is so well read, better read than I am, although my father used to read everything he could lay his hands on. I read a fair amount of things myself. I am not a heavy reader, but I read the newspapers and magazines, I get them off the newsstands.
- MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. member must realize that if that is all he reads, the newspapers and magazines, he is one of the great illiterate ignoramuses of Newfoundland.
- MR. NEARY: I realize that, Sir. I realize it that I am an illiterate ignoramus.
- MR. SMALLWOOD: If the hon. member's reading is limited to -
- MR. NEARY: But at least, Mr. Speaker, I can say this, that I think I am fairly well informed on what is going on in North America and in the world today.
- MR. SMALLWOOD: And especially Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Well, not only in Newfoundland because what goes on on the mainland of Canada and down in the United States usually goes on in Newfoundland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Ends up here.

MR. NEARY: And two things that have been outstanding, that have stuck out over the last year - number one is productivity. Everybody but everybody, every administration, every government today, everybody in authority today, business and industry, are talking about productivity, especially in Canada.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And rightly so.

MR. NEARY: And rightly so. And you will find that theme in practically - you will find feature articles written in huge numbers over the past year or so. And President Carter, one of the first things that he did when he was installed as President of the United States, called labour and business and industry together to try to solve this problem of the work ethic and productivity. And in Canada we have an even worse problem. We have the worst record of productivity in the industrialized world. And Prime Minister Trudeau and the Government of Canada have been struggling with that problem now for some time. And I have suggested in this Province long ago, two years ago, that we establish a productivity council in this Province. So that is one theme, one word that has become common practically to all governments in North America and I suppose pretty well, in the free world. And if we do not do something about it in Canada we are going to price ourselves out of the market.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is the lack of it that is causing most of the inflation.

MR. NEARY: The lack of productivity. And, Mr. Speaker, the other thing that is starting to rear its ugly head, as the Minister of Finance is probably more aware than anybody in this hon. House, is the matter of pensions and the problems that are going to be created five, ten, fifteen years from now by lack of actuarial -

MR. DOODY: Soundness.

MR. NEARY: - soundness of the pension plans that we have in Canada.

Mr. Neary:

We have, Mr. Speaker, three levels of pensions in Canada at the present time. Well, we have four, actually. We have the private sector. And as my hon. friend points out in the resolution all of the private sector are not covered under pension plans. There are private pension plans. But all business and industry is not covered, and in some cases the employees are at the mercy of the employer. But everybody today is guaranteed to get a pension.

I remember when my late father retired from DOSCO after working for twenty years - he was working on a farm before that - he worked with DOSCO for twenty years, he got a pension of \$22.50. That was his pension.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A month?

MR. NEARY: A month. Twenty-two dollars and fifty cents a month. And so I am well aware of the problem that my hon. friend is trying to focus attention on, because there are retail clerks, people who work downtown who got \$30 a month. Some got nothing. They were just given the golden handshake and put out to pasture and had to resort to welfare, had to resort to the dole. I know what the problem is that my hon. friend is trying to focus attention on. And it was big in my hon. friend's district, but it is not a major problem today. It may be a bit of a problem. There are probably still a lot of employers - and I would submit, Sir, that all the big employers in this Province, like Bowaters, Price - I remember we had our own private pension plan when I lost my job in 1966 with DOSCO when the mine closed. They refunded me my pension plan money.

MR. DOODY: Your share of it, but not their share.

MR. NEARY: Not their share, no. They gave me back, they refunded my share, plus compound interest, and that is where I got the downpayment for the first house I bought in St. John's. Although it was a big problem a few years ago, my hon. friend seems to think that it is still a major problem, and it could be. You may have a lot of employers in downtown St. John's who today have no private pension



Mr. Neary.

plans. These pension plans, as the House knows, are contributory. They are funded by the employee contributing so much and the employer contributing so much. In some instances unions have managed to negotiate pension plans which are a little more generous where the employer contributes 100 per cent, but that is very rare indeed. So that is one level of pensions.

The other level of pensions is the pensions in the public service, both in the Government of Canada and the people in the Provincial Public Service. And then you have the old age pension, and you have the guaranteed income supplement that my hon. friend made no reference to, two more great Liberal reforms, the old age pension, and the guaranteed income supplement. And then you have the Canada Pension Plan. So we have a variety of pension plans. At least from what I can read and from what I can hear and from what I can observe the soundest one of all is the pension plan, the privately funded pension plans. The pension plans in the private sector which are funded -

MR. DOODY: Fully funded.

MR. NEARY: - fully funded are the only ones today that are considered to be on a sound financial basis. They are the only ones. And people in authority are becoming very, very concerned about pension plans in the public service, whether it be the Provincial Public Service or in the Canadian Public Service pension plans, especially those that are not funded. They are becoming very concerned about them. And to add to the trouble. Sir, people in authority are becoming very concerned about the Canada Pension Plan. Now the Canada Pension Plan, as members know, was set up, I think, about eleven or twelve years ago - I do not know, a little over ten years ago, I believe. After ten years you were considered to have paid your maximum in the Canada Pension Plan. You get maximum benefits although you still contribute so that everybody was guaranteed a pension. And

Mr. Neary.

everybody thought it was a bottomless pit. They were talking about reserves of \$500 million, \$1 billion, a couple of billion dollars. When it was introduced there was no thought, no thought at all of the Canada Pension Plan fund ever drying up, no thought at all.

Mr. Neary:

It looked like a real pot of gold at the end of the rainbow with all kinds of money, As a matter of fact there was so much money going into the Canada Pension Plan that the Government of Canada, the Canada Pension Plan people, decided to loan, to give loans to the provinces and that is where a lot of the money that is being borrowed by this Province, by all the provinces come from the Canada Pension Plan.

Now all of a sudden there has been a rude of wakening. There was never any acturial study done, Sir, to see what the drain on the Canada Pension Plan would be over the next ten, fifteen or twenty years. And the real danger now, Sir, what people are afraid of, including the Government of Canada and the Canada Pension Plan people, what they are afraid of, Mr. Speaker, that ten years or fifteen years from now not only will the fund, this huge \$500 million fund, will have had evaporated, but money will have to be taken from general revenue and put into the Canada Pension Plan fund to pay out pensions to the number of people that will be retiring at age sixty-five over the next ten or fifteen years. Does my hon. friend realize that, the member who just spoke.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. NEARY: My hon. friend realizes that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am just writing a piece on Liberalism for the Laurier Ball,

MR. NEARY: I see.

MR. SMALLWOOD: so I am in complete agreement with every word the hon. gentleman is uttering even when I do not hear him, and I hear every word of it.

MR. NEARY: Well I just made what I considered to be a very - it is the first time it has been made in this House-what I consider to be a very startling statement, and it is not original,

MR. SMALLWOOD: Say it again.

MR. NEARY: - I am not the author of it. My hon. friend may not realize it, my hon. friend was Premier of this Province when the Canada

Mr. Neary:

Pension Plan was introduced by the Government of Canada ten or eleven or twelve years ago. At that time the people of Canada were lulled into a sense of security the likes of which they had never known, that there would be so much money going into the Canada Pension Plan that it would never dry up. As a matter of fact, the Government of Canada decided to make loans to the provinces. My hon. friend will remember when the questions used to be asked by the Opposition, Where are you going to get the money? My hon. friend used to say, We will borrow it from the Canada Pension Plan because they got barrels of it; it is running out of their ears. But does my hon. friend know that ten to fifteen years from now that these reserves will have dried up and that money will have to, unless they do something about it, that money will have to be taken from general revenue and put into the Canada Pension Plan Fund.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Which was done once, had to be done with the Unemployment Insurance Fund.

MR. NEARY: It had to be done more than once with the Unemployment Insurance Fund; it had to be done a number of times with the Unemployment Insurance Fund. And this could be a disaster, Sir, unless something is done about it, and it will be a disaster in this Province, Mr. Speaker, If the Minister of Finance, and the minister indicated it, I believe in his budget speech, unless this House, especially the minister, and I believe the minister is very conscious of it because, Mr. Speaker, Your Honour is probably aware that on two or three occasions recently the problem that arose in negotiations with various groups of negotiating with Treasury Board, the main problem with the teachers was pensions, the main problem with the Waterford Hospital strikers at the moment is pensions, and it is going to get worse. Because, Mr. Speaker, there is no relationship, there is no relationship between what is being contributed to the pension plans, and they are not funded, and what is being taken out. There has never been a study done to see what the drain will be on the plans five, ten, fifteen years from

Mr. Neary:

Whereas now the minister may be a little bit ahead of the game, there may be more revenue coming in than is being paid out, that will eventually come to an end, and it will come to an end as far as the Canada Pension Plan is concerned. And if something is not done about it, and it is going to be a big issue in the future, there is going to be a disaster. If they have to start taking money out of the general revenue to pay pensions - if this Province has to do it, if the Government of Canada has to do it - it is going to be a sorry day. And the young people, the generation that is coming behind us will be the ones that will be taxed to the hilt to pay for our stupidity and to pay for our blunder.

We have a chance to do something about it now, Sir. In this Province we have to have an actuarial study done as quickly as possible, at an early date as possible as far as I am concerned, to see where we stand concerning the pension plan for the public service in this Province and how we can go about funding it - if we can fund it. Maybe it is too rich for our blood now, maybe it is impossible to fund it.

MR. DOODY: It is partially funded.

MR. NEARY: It is partially funded.

MR. DOODY: I will tell you in a few minutes.

MR. NEARY: Well I would certainly like to hear the minister's comments on this matter, Sir, because hon. gentlemen may not be aware, but they will be aware over the next few years,



MR. NEARY: that the big issue, the big controversy, the big problem for the future will be pensions. Nobody has ever stopped to realize the number of people that will be retiring over the next ten or fifteen years.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, that there was never a study done before the Canada Pension Plan was implemented? That it was a political decision, an idea that was brought up, that was thought to be good for the Canadian people. A great Liberal reform and no actuarial study done to see if it was sound, how long it could operate in the black before it would become a drain on the public treasury. Does my hon. friend realize that? But it was done.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not at the time, no.

MR. NEARY: It was done. They still have time to do something about it, fortunately. But if something is not done quickly then I am afraid we are going to be in trouble, that we are going to mortgage the generations coming behind us and they will pay through the nose.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that not the basis of the trouble at the Waterford?

MR. NEARY: Yes, and it was the trouble with the teachers. And there is going to be trouble with the public service. And it is going to get worse. It is going to keep cropping up, not only here in Newfoundland, but right across the whole nation. So, Sir, not only do we need the kind of legislation my hon. friend is striving to bring in here, and I do not want to knock this, it is motherhood. I know what the gentleman is trying to do, focus attention on the problem that he has probably in his own district, trying to get a little -

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is trying as a Tory to win over the Liberals of St. John's East.

MR. NEARY: - trying to get a little political mileage and you cannot -

MR. WOODROW: Both of you would be hard employers.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is trying to get a little political mileage and you cannot blame the hon. gentleman for that. It is not the first time the hon. gentleman brought this resolution in. I believe this is the second time. This may be the first time it was debated. I am not sure if we got to debate it before or not.

But the hon. gentleman's heart is in the right place. He is well intentioned, but it would be a real jungle to try to bring in a piece of legislation to compel all employers in this Province to have a private pension plan with their employees. It would cut across the trade union movement, it would cut across just about every jurisdiction that you could name. It would be a jungle. It would be almost impossible to administer. The hon. gentleman says, No. The hon. gentleman may be -

MR. WOODROW: It would help the ordinary people in Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: What would help the ordinary people?

MR. WOODROW: What he is talking about. And I would like to recall the expression The Water Street Gang. They should have brought it in years ago.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What did they ever bring in?

MR. WOODROW: Nothing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We know what they took out.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is the Water Street Gang, it is the - what? - The Waffle Iron-

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Waffle Iron Merchants.

MR. NEARY: - the Waffle Iron Merchants -  
MR. DOODY: The Rags Merchants.  
MR. NEARY: Yes - what do you call them? - Rags -  
MR. DOODY: The Rags Merchants.  
MR. NEARY: - the Rags Merchants that my -  
MR. SMALLWOOD: Ah, that is enough of that.  
That is enough of that now.  
MR. NEARY: - hon. friend is getting at.  
That is what my hon. friend is getting at and I cannot  
say that I blame him. Because -  
MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).  
MR. NEARY: No?  
MR. DOODY: Or exercise books.  
MR. NEARY: My hon. friend is trying to get  
at the Water Street Gang that exploited the workers. If  
they gave them a pension at all it was a very small  
pension. Ten, fifteen, twenty dollars a month, the  
golden handshake, good bye! So long! You were a nice  
employee! Good bye! So long! We will see you! But all  
that is -  
MR. SMALLWOOD: Sometimes they gave them a  
watch too.  
MR. NEARY: Well, yes, that is right. Is  
that not the golden handshake?  
MR. SMALLWOOD: The watch was not always golden.  
MR. NEARY: No, sometimes the watch was a  
cheap imitation. They would say, Well, we presented so  
MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right.  
MR. NEARY: They would say, Well, we present  
it to So-and-So And you would have your picture taken. I  
can see it now, Sir. As a matter of fact, they used to do  
it with DOSCO when I first went to work in 1945, when I  
first went on the payroll of DOSCO. They had

Mr. Neary.

no pension plan, no pension plan for their employees. And every time some poor old fellow retired after twenty-five or thirty years or thirty-five years of service - bent over, arthritis, emphysema, just able to get along - they would take him in, the manager would appear on the scene, probably the first time for the year, and they would have a few words and a few sandwiches and a cup of tea, and they would present him with a watch, and they would put a thirty-five or forty year pin in the lapel of his coat, and he would get up and make a speech and say, what a wonderful worker he was and what a great man he was, a great family man, a wonderful producer, he produced for his country and then they would send him off, and he would have to go down to the dole office and get dole the next day.

MR. CANNING: Go home and starve to death.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

And I have great sympathy for the people that are victims of these employers who would exploit them. But I can see that there are a lot of problems. And my hon. friend says, Well, what about the poor people? The Government of Canada have tried to cure that with the Canada Pension Plan. I do not know if my hon. friend has been here -

MR. BRETT: They are not making a very good job.

MR. NEARY: The Government of Canada, my hon. friend says, is not making a very good job. Well my hon. friend should remember that it was the Government of Canada that brought in the old age pension. Okay?

AN HCN. MEMBER: Right.

MR. NEARY: It was the Government of Canada that brought in the guaranteed income supplement.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Liberal Government.

MR. NEARY: The Liberal Government.

MR. NEARY: And it was the Liberal Government of Canada that brought in the Canada Pension Plan.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And unemployment insurance.

MR. NEARY: That is universal. All three plans are universal.

MR. WOODROW: Any other government would have done the same thing.

MR. NEARY: Any other government did not do the same thing.

MR. WOODROW: If they had in power they would have.

MR. NEARY: These three plans, Sir, are universal.

MR. DOODY: If they get their way now they will bring in a guaranteed annual income and sink the nation right under water.

MR. NEARY: No, they will not. Now there! That is Toryism. That is Toryism, Sir. If the Government of Canada had any sense -

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is probably true.

MR. NEARY: - if the Government of Canada had any sense what they would do is bring in the guaranteed annual income and link it to the Gross National Product.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, that would make sense.

MR. NEARY: Ah, my friend, do not shoot it down too quickly.

MR. DOODY: Have you heard the hon. Minister of Public Health and Welfare, Mr. Lalonde - or whatever his name is - mention anything about productivity?

MR. NEARY: No, I have not.

MR. DOODY: I have heard him talk about the guaranteed annual income to a certain extent, and I ran out of the room with terror.

MR. NEARY: Your own Minister of Social Services went up to Ottawa and was one of the few ministers - I believe the only one, I am not quite sure now - was the only one - there may be one other - who objected and would not participate in the guaranteed annual income.

MR. BRETT: That is wrong. That is wrong.



MR. NEARY: Well, why does not the minister set me straight. How many provinces?

MR. DOODY: They were all against -

MR. NEARY: This Province said no that I am sure of.

MR. BRETT: We did not say, No.

MR. NEARY: I do not know how many other provinces.

MR. DOODY: This Province said no to the financing procedures.

MR. NEARY: This Province said, No.

MR. BRETT: They did not say, No.

MR. NEARY: They did say, No.

MR. PECKFORD: No, you are wrong again.

MR. NEARY: I am right there.

MR. BRETT: No, you are not right.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy may not realize it, but I am the godfather of the guaranteed annual income.

MR. PECKFORD: You are the godfather of everything. I am not arguing that.

MR. NEARY: When I brought it before my colleagues in Cabinet - and I do not know if my hon. friend remembers it or not, because every time I brought in a great Liberal reform in to Cabinet, a great social welfare reform in to Cabinet, there were three or four of my colleagues who would dance the jig, who would go up in the ceiling, who would say, take them all down the harbour and drown them, and it used to take me six months sometimes to get a very minor change in the department that I was representing. It took me - do you realize, Mr. Speaker, it took me six months to get the name of the department changed which would not cost the taxpayers of this Province one red cent. And I believe I told the House how I accomplished it one night. I was talking to my hon. friend here about it several times. I had three or four reforms that I wanted to bring in. I wanted to get rid of the voucher and pay people by cash, by cheque. I wanted to change the name of the department, and I wanted to bring in all kinds of other reforms, the only

Mr. Neary.

reforms brought into that department since Confederation. And I kept after it and after it and after it, and I was getting frustrated and I was reaching the stage where I was saying that if I do not get these reforms through then I am going to throw in the towel. And one night I came into Confederation Building, and my hon. friend was in his office, but I did not know the gentleman was there at the time, and the security person came up to me and said, The Premier's daughter is looking for him, and they think something might have happened to him up in the office. Could you go up? Do you have a key to get in? Well, I went up, went up in the private elevator, went in to the

MR. NEARY: Cabinet room, went in and knocked on the door and my hon. friend was having a snooze, I woke him up and when I woke him up he had on a dress shirt and he was in his shorts and he had a pair of suspenders on, I remember, and his socks and I said -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do not go into such detail.

MR. NEARY: I said, "Your daughter is looking for you!"

He said, "Yes," the hon. gentleman said, "Yes, she is always looking for me!" So he said, "Come in," and I went in and while the hon. gentleman was getting dressed to go out to a Masonic degree, I think it was, the hon. gentleman was going out to, he was trying to get all his degrees in one year or a couple of years and he was getting the thirty-second or thirty-third that night if I -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Thirty-second

MR. NEARY: Thirty-second that night, and he said "How are things going in the department?" And I said, "Well they are going fairly well, Sir, except that I am getting frustrated trying to get these reforms through Cabinet." "What reforms?" he said, and I told the hon. gentleman about them about ten times before that. I outlined them and he said, "These are great Liberal reforms. Bring them up at the next Cabinet meeting." Well I brought them up and I said, "Well now you better be prepared because So-and-So is going to dance a jig, So-and-So is going to go off his head, So-and-So is going to go out of his mind, So-and-So is going to suggest they are all going to be shot." He said, "That is all right let me handle it!" I brought in my proposal and thanks to my hon. friend between the two of us we managed to get it through despite the opposition that morning, and we almost started a third World War.

MR. DOODY: If I can catch Premier Moores in his shorts I can get the budget balanced.

MR. NEARY: The moral of that story, Sir, is if you wanted to get anything done when the hon. gentleman was Premier you had to catch him with his pants down. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, with all due respects, Sir, the gentleman's heart is in the right place and I am not going to knock him, I am all for it. But I am going to say this, Sir, that we should during this debate take a few moments to ponder over this matter of the problems that are arising with all the pension plans especially in the public service across this nation.

It is virtually impossible, Mr. Speaker, for the government of Canada to even think about at this moment reducing the old age pension age from sixty-five to sixty. That would bankrupt the Canada Pension Plan overnight and that is why they have not done it as much as they would like to do it and as much as the Trade Union Movement and the Canadian Labour Congress and everybody else would like to lower the pension age so that it would allow young people to get into the employment market. It is virtually impossible to do it, Sir, because if they did they would bankrupt the Canada Pension Plan overnight. Your Honour, my time is up. I wish I had more time to talk about it but I believe I have made the point and I look forward to hearing from what the Minister of Finance has to say about this whole matter of pensions.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I just cannot resist the invitation from the hon. member. The resolution that the hon. member for St. John's East has introduced to the House, Your Honour, is obviously a very well thought out resolution and one which has great social benefit. I can see that there are many people in the Province particularly, as has been mentioned, in the St. John's area who would undoubtedly benefit from such a plan. It does occur to me, and I think that the hon. member from LaPoile has touched on it, but those people who

MR. DOODY: would be in the greatest position to benefit from it would be in the smaller employment units which may make it that much more difficult to implement. But since government is so deeply involved into the books and records of all the various companies and bull's-eye shops and stores and so on around the Province now I guess one more auditor coming in with a little black bag and another set of regulations is not going to overburden the small businessman to any great additional extent.

The benefits of a pension plan are something that has been unknown to me personally and to a large extent that area of the Province from which I came. My background, the old part of downtown St. John's, the great criteria down there when I was growing up was the jealousy over a family that had a steady job. If they had a steady job it was on the sufferance of the employee and they had to be very thankful and very grateful that it was available. There was never any suggestion of pension and if somebody did manage to



MR. DOODY: qualify for a pension it was through the benefice or good intentions of the employer. The \$30 a month pension which the hon. member opposite mentioned comes back to me very clearly. I know many, many people of my parents' generation who are now retired and in the various old age homes around St. John's and in their own homes who are subsisting on, or would be subsisting on that sort of pension, and some of them on a great deal less than that if it were not for the Canada Pension Plan.

And so it does appear that there is a great deal of social benefit to be gained from the introduction of such a resolution. By the same token, I wonder how necessary is it for government to have to legislate all these things? Is it really the function of government to bring in all the social advances or social benefits that are necessary through legislation? Is there not another way of doing it? Can it not be done perhaps through persuasion or through education or through conversations or through discussions with various groups? I have a sincere and abiding fear that government in its zeal and anxiety to help the populace of the world is going to legislate and regulate it out of existence and in the long run will probably turn us all into a bunch of automatons or a bunch of people who will spend most of our living days and nights filling out forms and obeying rules and regulations.

You certainly cannot knock the idea of a universal pension or universal portability or full funding or complete vesting, but is it really properly government's function to look after every facet of the life of every individual in the Province? Perhaps it is. It is a principle that I have great difficulty in subscribing to.

The idea of a pension plan - a universal pension plan, a compulsory pension plan legislated from the top down - certainly has particularly great merit and particularly great attractiveness at this point in the history of the Province. Never before have pensions been such an important part of the everyday thoughts of the working populace in our Province, because it has been only fairly recently, Your Honour, that the

MR. DOODY: level of salary in the Province of Newfoundland has reached the level whereby people have stopped, to some degree at least, thinking about their day to day, or worrying about their day to day existence and have started to be really concerned about their retirement and about their security. And to that extent pensions, as has been pointed out earlier by previous speakers, have become even more important in collective bargaining today than salaries: Security in the future is more important than income today. And it was pointed out that the major problems that government has had in its collective agreements and its discussions with the unions during this particular year - with the public service unions - has been in the pension area, and the teachers and the Waterford group have been mentioned as examples. I think it is only fair to point out that there is a vast difference, although the pension plan is the basis for the disagreement in both cases, there is a vast difference in the root disagreement. The teachers were concerned about the shape and structure of their pension plan - about the rate of payment, the rate of contribution and about the funding of the plan, and about government's request that they have the right to consult with the teachers or at least have the right to change the contribution rate. The teachers insisted on their right of veto over the level of contribution. The Waterford people on the other hand are interested in a particular type of pension plan. They are not interested as much in the amount of contribution or in the level of payment; they want a particular shape plan and the soundness of the plan, the actuarial soundness of it and so on is a secondary consideration.

In this particular context I think that we are talking about today, the teachers' concern probably highlights the difficulty that the Province is experiencing and will experience to a greater degree during the coming years. And this is the first time, as it has been said, that government has looked at and recognized the seriousness of the problem. I think that there was

Mr. Doody:

something like a \$12 million surplus, as was pointed out in the negotiations, in the pension fund. This of course was the great bargaining weapon we have paid \$12 million more into the fund than has been paid out and therefore since you are in a surplus position why should you even consider changing the rate of payment, the premium.

Mr. Speaker, the last actuarial study that was done in this Province on the civil service pension plans showed an actuarial liability and accrued pension liability for existing employees and pensioners be in excess of \$160 million, and that was back in 1974.

Now since 1974 the salary scales in this Province, particularly in the public service, have increased substantially. And in direct proportion to the increase in salaries go the increase in pension contributions and an equal liability on behalf of the Province to meet that liability. So that \$160 million liability of 1974 I have no idea, quite honestly, what it is right now. We have undertaken to engage a group of specialists to do a study for us because it is a very frightening state of affairs. It is a contingent liability on the Province - it is a real liability on the Province. The size of that liability is something that should be known to the people in the Province, to the taxpayers of the Province as well as to the investors in the Province.

MR. NEARY: Especially to the generations coming up.

MR. DOODY: And these people who are coming up behind us, and those people who are paying - there are two groups of course who are concerned and should be deeply concerned; one of them quite obviously is the group of people who are paying into a pension plan without giving any thought to the fact that this government and the previous governments, indeed all administrations have been using the pension

Mr. Doody:

contributions as current revenue without any thought to tomorrow at all, which is unconscionable and unreasonable and not sensible, It has to be funded, at least partially funded; certainly that amount which the employee pays into the fund has got to be set aside and has to be identifiable as the pension contribution. It may be that the Province's responsibility, their half of the pension plan, need not be funded. It could very well be that the amount of liability of the Province can be easily identified from the amount of funding in the contributors side and in that way it can be controlled. As it is today it is an absolutely disgraceful situation and one that has to be changed.

The teachers very wisely recognize this, and knew very well that this situation was going to come about. I think that the contribution rate now is considerably less than is necessary to justify the benefits which will be paid from the fund as those people who are eligible become of age to take advantage of the pension fund.

MR. NEARY: And at that you will wind up paying them out of current revenue.

MR. DOODY: And if the plan is not funded, and if the thing is not sensibly arranged in terms of payments, in commitments from the Province, actually identifiable commitments from the Province and actually funded commitments from the people playing into the plan, then as the hon. member says, one day the Province is going to wake up and find that it has got a huge current account commitment on pension plan payments which is completely outside the spirit of a pension plan. And so we recognize that and we feel that something has to be done about it, and this is the year that it has to be done. Government, as I say, itself has got a long ways to go with pension plans and this is the first year that we have really grappled with them. And we have got to do a great deal of study on it, and a great deal of study and work has got to go into it, and I think that during that time we could take advantage of the opportunity to study the proposition or

Mr. Doody:

the resolution put forward by the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and see if there is some way these things can be locked or interlocked.

I do not know if it is complicated as it appears to be; or maybe it is a very simple thing, maybe those people who are not covered by a pension plan can be done so under legislation. Maybe they cannot, maybe it is too complex. But it certainly, in my opinion, is something that is deserving of study. I would like to see the legislation from the other provinces and see how they do it. I do not know what the cost to business would be, I do not know if this is the year that it should be put into effect, these are all imponderables-or ponderables really, things that should be studied and looked at.

The CPP was mentioned here as a great example



MR. DOODY: of a pension plan which appeared to be invulnerable and one which was a bottomless oasis of wealth that could be tapped at any time.

The government of Ontario has recently done a study on CPP and it would frighten you. As a matter of fact, Darcy Keough, the provincial treasurer, has issued a paper on the CPP - how sound - and has called a meeting of provincial finance ministers to discuss that very subject. He feels that we are exhausting the fund and that we are jeopardizing the future generations and we are overtaxing it, and we are depriving the successive administrations of a convenient source of funds simply by over-exploitation. And this is now to be brought to the attention of the Government of Canada. I have no doubt that they are aware of it and are probably working on it.

MR. NEARY: The loans that were given the Province were supposed to be to increase productivity in the Province, economic development and so forth and monies that were -

MR. DOODY: Yes, but there was never any control or any - they were just loans.

MR. NEARY: Well, it has been used for current revenue -

MR. DOODY: That is right.

MR. NEARY: - and that was not the spirit of it.

MR. DOODY: The theory was as the member says, but once they left Ottawa nobody ever followed up on it or worried about it or thought about it since.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. DOODY: And that is something that is a concern in Ottawa and in the provinces right now. Things get more complex as society becomes more affluent, I suppose, and as society becomes more educated and as people start thinking. And unfortunately, as has been pointed out, security, wages and so on become far more important than the productivity or contribution, and it is very difficult to have one without the other. I do not know how any government or any country, no matter how wealthy - I guess Canada must be the example of the wealthiest country in the world

MR. DOODY: because I do not think there is anywhere in the history of the world that such waste of resources - human resources, money, energy, waste that is absolutely incredible. I suppose some day, somewhere a record will be written of it. Why the rest of the people in the world put up with the attitude of the people of Canada is an absolute mystery.

MR. NEARY: Our pension plans, by the way, in Canada are considered to be the sloppiest in the world.

MR. DOODY: There is absolutely no control over them at all. As a matter of fact, it might be a very wise idea if we were to take a leaf out of a suggestion of the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and ask one of the trust companies to take over the Canada Pension Plan or take over the Newfoundland Government pension plan and administer it properly and -

MR. NEARY: That would not be a bad idea.

MR. DOODY: - and see that it is properly handled.

I can see great merit in having a pension for everybody. Enough after toiling for many and faithful years have found themselves destitute at the end of their productive years. You know, how many years and how productive and how large an employment unit, how big a company - these are all questions that should be answered and have to be answered and looked at. Obviously, these questions cannot be answered here today. The principle of the resolution - who can quarrel with it? It is absolutely delightful. I wish that such a thing had been in existence many years ago when it was really needed, I suppose, a great deal more than it is now. Certainly it is needed by people now. There are some fully funded plans, I should have mentioned earlier, in the government of Newfoundland. The Memorial University quite naturally has a fully funded plan with the contributions by the employer and the faculty all neatly squirrelled away with a trust company picking up their interest and so on. And they have been trying to get some of it out to use for one reason or another.

We also have some partially funded plans, but the vast majority of the public service plans are not funded.

MR. DOODY:

There are so many social problems that resolutions could be brought today into the House and brought to the attention of government and immediate action be urged and asked that corrective measures be taken. I do not know how to do it. I can visualize a resolution tomorrow urging the government to handle the alcohol problem in the Province today. That is a huge problem and it is one that should be tackled and handled. I do not know how to go about it. I do not know how to start. We are trying - we have inter-governmental, inter-departmental committees working on it now in conjunction with outside agencies and trying to find ways and means to handle the rapidly increasing alcohol problem in the Province. It would be delightful to be able to put in a piece of legislation to take care of it, but it cannot be done that simply.

I was looking at The Evening Telegram while some of the hon. members were speaking here. And there should be some way of controlling some of these movie houses that are

Mr. Doody.

in the city of St. John's today.

AN HON. MEMBER: And Corner Brook.

MR. DOODY: Yes, Well in the Province generally. They are probably in Corner Brook, too.

MR. NEARY: The Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation financed the drive-in theatre out in Corner Brook when they show these x-rated movies, these restricted movies, financed by the government.

MR. DOODY: That is one of our contributions to industrial development, is it?

MR. NEARY: I suppose to the tourist industry.

MR. DOODY: The tourist industry.

MR. NEARY: Developed like the golf course.

MR. DOODY: Certainly there are not Newfoundlanders going to see these things.

MR. WOODROW: And giving fifteen jobs to Bay of Islands district.

MR. NEARY: Yes, and contaminating and polluting and corrupting the minds of 15,000 people.

MR. WOODROW: That is questionable.

MR. DOODY: There is one thing about it, that it is an obvious problem to recognize, but it is a problem that can be handled once again by legislation here in the House. Mr. Speaker, the principle of this resolution I certainly support. Obviously government is not in a position to bring forth legislation this year. I cannot commit government to bring forth legislation in this area at all. What I would like to do is give government an opportunity to study the problem to see the legislation from the other provinces, and see how they handle it. Is this pension plan stacked with the Canada Pension Plan or are they separate?

MR. NEARY: No, another level.

MR. DOODY: And what about people with several jobs? Do they get several pensions?

MR. NEARY: Portable.

MR. DOODY: That would be double portability. I do not know. There are many questions.

MR. NEARY: Let us lay it on the table of the House.

MR. DOODY: That may be one way of handling it.

That is up to the hon. member from St. John's East. But the principle of the resolution obviously is a very sound one. Whether it is practical or not, Your Honour, I am not in a position to say. And I can say though that government will not be in a position to take immediate steps this year to introduce compulsory pension plans for employees. It does need a great deal more study that it has been given. But I congratulate the hon. member for bringing it in. And I do hope it has the effect that the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) suggested. Then you will be able to convert both the Liberals in St. John's East.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, it is twenty-eight minutes past five in the year of 1977. I find myself sitting in the House with a resolution brought in by one of the backbenchers on the government side being debated this afternoon. We come here this hour in the evening in this lonely House with a few people in the galleries, a few people on the government side, fewer on the Opposition side, and I get up after spending twenty-five years here and, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a record. This is going to make history. There is no Premier here in his desk. There is no Leader of the Opposition. I got four of the best members who ever came into this House, the people who have given an account of themselves since they came in here, people who came in to represent their district, represented them well. It has encouraged me after so long to find them here. It is too bad that there is not one other - I guess he cannot help being here - member who came in here, and in the last months in this House gave a good account of themselves under terrible circumstances seeing their districts going down or their area going down. And here I am getting up to speak to this all important resolution that was brought in by a man who had courage enough to do it, had guts enough to do it. He is only young. I guess he remembers enough of the past. He knows the history of Newfoundland well enough to know that the people in this Province who have worked for merchants and worked for government and worked for whatnot - he comes in, he brings in a



MR. CANNING: resolution to see if there is any way to see them protected. Mr. Speaker, I am going to give just one example at the present that is going to put my message across here this evening. When I read this resolution that the hon. member had brought in- I do not mind giving this is my district. I have a big district so probably I am not making it personal, or I do not want to make it personal - when this resolution came on this paper there was a young man in my district who at the age of eighteen, a son of a fisherman, who had made his grade eleven, entered a business firm. A conscientious young fellow, a good worker and I would say since he was eighteen, and he is probably in his fifties now, there was not one morning that that young fellow, and as he grew older, a little older fellow, who did not turn up at his work. His employer made millions. I say millions and I mean it; he made it. That young man worked there, worked his way ahead and made that business what it was. He was the brains of it. There are so many examples we have in Newfoundland where some fellow starts a business, robs and overcharges and whatnot, has not got brains some of them, many of them, and by any by they pick up some fellow in the village who got the brains and who has the ability and got the industry to run the business, and he has gone in there and he has run it.

In this instance I am going to give now this young fellow is one of the finest Newfoundlanders that I know today, and I know a lot of them. This business has been taken over by outsiders coming in, by supermarkets, by the mainlanders who are coming in, giving nothing to the Province, again scalding the people and overcharging them and whatnot, and he was retired about two or three or four weeks ago and he went home. He did not have one thing! No severance pay, no nothing only given his notice that your services are no longer required. If I could bring him in and introduce him to the House and tell what a man he was in his lifetime! No pension; he has to depend on the Canada Pension. Wait until he is old enough to get the

MR. CANNING: old age pension or else after - wait until I see, because I am not going to be too far out because I know him so well; he was eighteen when he went to work, thirty years, I would say, so he is probably forty-eight; for thirty years working in this Province, a faithful servant for a fellow who made a couple of million, two or three. I guess his estate is worth two or three million today. That man this afternoon is home in his house with nothing to do and has to depend on the Canada Pension and has to wait - forty-eight, he has to wait a long time before he gets his old age pension. He has to go out in some other field or has to go look for another job. So, Mr. Speaker, if this is not a resolution that should have been brought into this House in 1949 or 1932 or 1928. And that is out in my district and down on Water Street where they give them a watch.

You know, the best men that ever worked on Water Street, they got that watch. It was not the crowd who owned it, the family name who owned the business - half of them were no good anyway and their sons were no good to take over when the old fellows went out. Who carried on Water Street?. The ordinary people of this town.

MR. CANNING: And to the Minister of Finance, I say at the moment their names were Doodys and there were Murphys and whatnot. They are the people who carried on the business, they are the people who did the work and they are the people who are going it today, and what have they got down there?

We come in here in 1977, a crowd of young men over there and young men here - a little older man here, not very old. I hope to be here a little while yet to back up the member who brought this in. I hope I am here another three years or another ten years. I am not that old. It is about time we woke up. I know what was in his mind. Water Street was in his mind. I have told of one instance in my district, and we have it out there, of people who work all their lives, the people who run this - who ran this country or who keeps it going? I do not keep it going now, I am getting a government salary. A lawyer who is scolding people for three or four hundred dollars for a few letters to look up an old grant or something, you know, they are not keeping it going. I am not keeping it going. I have not turned very much in to this Province. I have not earned very much for it. I have been twenty-five years here getting - I will tell you it was pretty small at first. We are not going to tell you about it.

MR. FLIGHT: It is pretty good now though.

MR. CANNING: It was less than the fishermen were getting. In the last ten years I have been getting less than the fellow I have been getting work for is getting, but even so. Then, as I say, I come into the House at twenty-five after five o'clock in the evening in 1977, and I see a handful of people. No Premier. He is not here. I heard that hon. gentleman this afternoon -

MR. FLIGHT: No House Leader.

MR. CANNING: - on radio saying that the estimates went along very good but some members of the Opposition held them up. Good God! Members of the Opposition held them up? We have leaned over backwards. This time last year I was begging. I brought in a resolution here last year asking, Will we have unlimited time for the fisheries of Newfoundland? Mr. Speaker, that did not even come to the fore last year. What I wanted was to hear from the fellows here who represented fishing districts to see if they had new ideas that I did not have. I would accept them and toe the line and go along with them. Now here we are this evening, there is no Leader of the Opposition. I do not know where he is. He did not tell me where he was going. I do not know where he is and I am sure the members on that side do not know where the Premier is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, Sir.

MR. CANNING: No, you do not. You do not know where the Premier is.

MR. PECKFORD: He told the Whip before he left, and he informed me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes! Yes!

MR. CANNING: Because I will tell you, if you do you will have to tell the people of Newfoundland about an awful lot of times the Premier was not here since this House opened. He has not been in that seat. He has come in and spent ten minutes there. Ten minutes at the most or fifteen and then he has gotten up, put his hands in his pockets and strolled through that door.

MR. FLIGHT: Hear, hear!

MR. CANNING: He has not risen in his seat to defend his ministers.

MR. FLIGHT: Hear, hear!

MR. CANNING: He has not risen in his seat to defend a policy.

MR. FLIGHT: Hear, hear!

MR. CANNING: I pity the Minister of Finance who had to bring in his finance speech, or the speech he made the day he had to bring it in. He was there. To me he looked pitiful, he looked sad, he looked a little bit embarrassed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: He still does.

MR. CANNING: He looked a little bit embarrassed when he had to tell there was a billion and-a-half or what not. And this is the situation, we are broke. We got two hundreds beds closed in the hospitals. We cannot open them this year. He was embarrassed. He felt it. He felt it. Do you know there are 5,000 people in Newfoundland today who will not get hospitalization this year? I do not know what is going to happen to them. I do not know if they are dying but according to the number of beds that are supposed to service people that is what it is, 5,000 people.

Mr. Speaker, here we are.

There is only one thing I can do and that is challenge the crowd in the House now. They know as well as I do the merits of this. There are not many of them left and they are getting scarcer. They know the merits of this. The Minister of Finance knows it, the Minister of Mines and Energy knows it, and I am sure the member for Kilbride knows it. The hon. doctor over there knows it. He knows. He understands it, and I think the other members know it. I am sure that the members on my right, Sir, they know it. They know what is happening. People employed in business, some ordinary fellow nobody hears about, go look to see where he is. He is down on Water Street running the business while the owner is down South. We have people running



Mr. Canning:

fish plants in my district, wonderful men who worked fish plants. They know how to operate fish plants. They know how to handle their people. They know what a dragger is. They know where she is. They know what it means. They know what they are turning in. The owners of the fish plants are down South. The people, I think, that the hon. member had in the back of his mind when he bought in this was time to get some protection for them. They are doing the work. I am sure the Minister of Finance, and I am sure some others. some older members in this House who knew Water Street know what happened, and who ran it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this resolution dies on the paper the people of Newfoundland are not going to know about it. Do you know there are not five people in my district this evening, I will say there are not ten anyway at the most who knows this came in, why it is in, you know. Now if I got up in this House this afternoon, you know, and called the Minister of Energy a damn fool and I got called to order by the Speaker, which he should do, or if I said he was a rogue, the papers would have that this afternoon. But I will tell you what will not be in the papers this week, the answers to the questions that I gave the Minister of Public Works. I have them here somewhere, hundreds and hundreds of buildings across Newfoundland and in St. John's that are rented with exorbitant rents. You know there are people in this city at the moment who have buildings rented with twenty years contract, who will walk out with that building paid for and all he has to do for the next twenty years, if he is forty - no, if he is thirty - at fifty years of age he can retire he is going to have it paid off. He is going to live off it in the meantime. He is going to have it paid off, at fifty years of age he is going to be able to retire, and haul in \$30,000, \$40,000, \$60,000 a year. We have the buildings filled up with civil servants. Who is in charge? I do not know how long they are gone home. They are probably gone home since four o'clock. It would be worthwhile for the members of this House to get that list and see who owns them, and who is there,

Mr. Canning:

and who knows if they are working or not, some of them are doctors, you know, medical places, Ayres. There is no need of me saying Crosbies because everybody in St. John's knows that every foot of space that Crosbies got. And something else, this week I hear they are going into Atlantic Place.

MR. FLIGHT: What?

MR. CANNING: The government are going to rent buildings down in Atlantic Place.

MR. SIMMONS: Go on!

MR. FLIGHT: Is that right?

MR. CANNING: Yes. So I hear, I do not know. I heard they are going to bail him out, He is having some difficulty down there. with a great big building has something to do with shipping or something to do with the fishery or something to produce for this Province before we go to the board.

MR. RIDEOUT: Is there any truth to that, 'Bill'?

MR. DOODY: Get your bearings, 'Pat'.

MR. FLIGHT: He got them before.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, if this resolution - I brought in the resolution last year asking the House, humbly asking from a fishing district, from the Burin Peninsula, humbly asking the members of this House to discuss the Department of Fisheries. No.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. CANNING: The new minister got up and for three or four minutes made a grand job of it for the length of time he had; and everybody knows he made a good job of it this year. Last year I walked out of this House. I did not know what the opinion of the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) was, I did not know of anybody behind me here to back up the fishery and try to save it or to try and do something about it, because we did not discuss it.

Mr. Speaker, if we go out of this House, throw it to one side, and I will challenge the press now to tell the people of Newfoundland what this resolution is, what it means. And what it means to me is that the people who are running this Province or somebody

Mr. Canning:

asking in their name that they will get some kind of a decent pension that they will not have to go out on the dole when they are finished working after twenty-five or thirty years.

Mr. Speaker, this is - all right there is nobody here, and I am here yelling -

MR. FLIGHT: Oh, yes we are listening to you.

MR. CANNING: I am here yelling. I mean is there any sense to it? Does anybody believe me? You know what I mean; sometimes you feel like throwing your hand in the air and saying, Okay let us go. Go our merry way. Let us have a government that have not got a Premier in his seat, and then we have another fellow who is looking for the Premiership, not here.

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible).

MR. CANNING: I do not know where he is this evening, I do not care.

AN HON. MEMBER: I know where he is.

MR. CANNING: I care, yes. He should be here. Perhaps he can come in tomorrow and tell where he was.

AN HON. MEMBER: We know where he is.

MR. CANNING: My God, Mr. Speaker, after twenty-five years in the House! You know, it is a long time. I can tell why I am here; because I had the guts out in my district, the guts with the other government to stand up and to defend the ordinary people -

MR. CANNING: not ordinary, no. I never know what to put on the people in the street, the people who keep this Province going, the people that we got to depend on to keep us going, the people that pay our salaries. I do not know what to call them; the supermen, perhaps, of the Province I should be calling them. And here we are; there is one bit of encouragement here, there are four members here this evening-and this is not politics. From my experience, and what I have listened to, I have sat and judged the crowd, I have watched the former government appoint a St. John's crowd to the Cabinet, you know, all of that, St. John's running Newfoundland, I have watched all of that, I was big enough not to kick up a fuss or go in and crash his door and tell him, "I will not run again unless you make me a Cabinet minister." I was big enough for that. But there were times when I would hear watched what was going on and all this. You know, when I hear somebody up talking about the fishery, some magistrate, some- I do not know what they were-schoolteachers or whatnot coming here and he telling what you should do. And I would sit over there knowing that he did not know a punt from a trap-skiff, knowing he did not know a trap-skiff from a schooner. You know this one here, this schooner we got, what do we call it again?

MR. DOODY: Norma and Gladys.

MR. CANNING: I have to remember it - Norma and Gladys. You know, that is the biggest joke we ever had in Newfoundland. I am going to tell the House this evening what she is. She is a Labrador schooner, she draws eleven feet. A Grand Bank schooner is thirteen or fourteen feet draft, Now why she is draft was that when they were built as Grand Bank schooners they had to have the draft because they had to sail, they did not have the motor. If she had eleven feet the damned ever she would get to the Grand Banks, she would drive away, but she could go down to the Labrador. She was built by a good Newfoundlander, a lovely boat, she is a nice boat, the purpose she was built for is perfect, but she is not a Grand Bank schooner. She is a Labrador schooner, a different



MR. CANNING: thing altogether. When she was built if she had gone to the Grand Banks without a motor she would not be here she would have been driven away. No, she may be back here because she was built well enough to drive across the ocean. She was built not by naval architects, no, she was built by Newfoundlanders who had built schooners, who had judged the seas, and over a period of time knew what way she had to be built, knew what draft she had to have, knew what keel she was suppose to have. You know, nobody in this world knows any more about building schooners than Newfoundlanders. And now, like I said I think it was yesterday or the day before, I think it is dying out, It is too bad we have not got them now, some of the people that build them. She is not a Grand Bank schooner. That is a fake; that is a fake and the Minister of Tourism makes me - well he does not make me laugh. I pity him when he gets up and thinks he is talking about a Grand Bank schooner. And then the Minister of Justice, I believe he thinks she is a Grand Bank schooner. Now there is no excuse for him; he should know as much about a Grand Bank schooner as I do, more because we did not have Grand Bank schooners in Merasheen, we had Cape St. Mary's boats. In Petit Forte and the places I know there are Cape St. Mary's boats. I wish we had a few of them now to convert into longliners to get out with the multi-purpose and rig them up because I guarantee they would not sink. And I wish we had the men who operated them. They would be the multi-millionaires.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, that is quite a plea, I mean every word of it, I have meant every word I have ever said in this House, and when I said it I think - the former Premier even gave me credit for it the other day; he said, "He was the voice of the fishermen!" Mr. Speaker, when I came into this House I came in, like I said the other day, with fairly good experience, sea experience, I had experienced poor times, I did not come in



June 1, 1977

Tape 3636 - Afternoon

AH-3

MR. CANNING: here a fool, you know. I came in here - I was not stupid or anything like that, but I came in here with all the good intentions, with Placentia Bay in my first breath where some of the greatest people - not in Newfoundland but in North America lived and slaved and strived. I did not come in looking for a Cabinet post tomorrow, "I want to be the hon P.J. Canning from Placentia West" and go to cocktail parties and look down the necks of the people. I came in here to represent them and to stay on their level and that is what I did and that is why I am back here now and if I keep it up and I want to and I am healthy enough

Mr. Canning:

I would be back here in three years time. If anybody wants to take a bet on that they can take it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CANNING: Because yet in this sophisticated world, in this age of sophistication, and in this age of robbery that we see, you know, and all the rest of it we still, the majority of people, Newfoundlanders, the majority of Newfoundland people are honest and sincere, and you know when a man is sincere, and you know when he is representing them properly.

But, I do not know - you know, the other day I said the system was not working. I have to get up here sometimes - and I may have to bawl hell out of the Minister of Energy tomorrow, but he does not deserve it. He will not deserve it. I think he is a sincere fellow. I think he is a smart fellow. I think he is a good worker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CANNING: - but the system he is with, the system he is with he is going to have to toe the line, and I pity him. There are others - too bad they are not bad they are not here this evening so I could throw a bouquet at them - who are going to have to toe the line, to go with this system. They are going to have to be sincere, like I was or loyal whatever in the hell you would call it. I had to be loyal. There were times that I was in that seat over there when the Opposition was over here, and looking across at them I said, "Why in the name of God do you not bawl hell out of this clique here for what they are doing?" I could not do it. It was not to my advantage to do it. It was not to the advantage of Placentia West to do it. It was not to the advantage of the party. It was the best conditions that I could live under.

And the other day when I heard the Premier talking about this great convention they held, or the great meetings they held it took me ten minutes to wonder what one it was, and by and by it sudden dawned on me. And, Mr. Speaker, when I got up in this House I did not bawl out the Premier, I was not getting after the Premier, a man seventy-seven years of age, he has done so much for Newfoundland that we all admire. The Minister of Energy admires him, the Minister of

Mr. Canning:

Finance, everybody over there, we will give him his due until we die, if we do not we are damn fools.

MR. RIDEOUT: Except the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter).

MR. CANNING: We will give him his due. But the point that I was bringing out was that at that convention the fishermen did not have the voice. Mr. Speaker, look I hope this government will not hold conventions -

MR. PECKFORD: The Fisherman's Union, is that the one you are talking about?

MR. CANNING: No, I am talking about a convention that was held over in the University in 1966 when I told this House the other day that the fish will disappear, they were being destroyed on the Grand Banks. I do not know if I got any morens in my district or not. I do not think I have, but if I have one up there he knew that the fish was being destroyed, and here we were in there with the hierarchy, you know, the merchants were in, up at the University - we are asking - I do not know where he said he asked him for, I do not know where they were from because it did not mean anything to me anyway - here they were up on the stage, the church was represented, I do not know who was there from my church, perhaps the bishop was there, I do not think he was, somebody represented him. We spent two days, you know, talking about the fishery.

MR. RIDEOUT: Three days.

MR. CANNING: Three days. He knows more about it now. Look here -

MR. RIDEOUT: I heard the former Premier.

MR. CANNING: - those meetings had got so insignificant, so hopeless to me that I have had no more interest in it, and probably the hon. member, who was then growing up wondering what it was all about he probably read it. All I know is what I bought out in the House the other day. I said -

MR. RIDEOUT: I heard the former Premier talk about it the other day.

MR. CANNING: - why did not somebody mention the destruction in the fishery at that meeting? It was not mentioned there. I remember enough about that. And I said the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Hickman) knows that the fishermen were coming up and saying, Mr. Hickman the fish is going out there, the foreigners are destroying it, we do not have room to fish, and so on and so on. No, that was not talked about there; I do not know what was talked. All I know was that there were - like I said there was nothing came out of it. What do you think the News bought out? The Daily News. Did you see a little column over in the back of The Daily News today? It is Wednesday, so it went to the Burin Peninsula, about a half a dozen words, where the two crossed swords, you know, I forget how it was, and there was one item there said, "Mr. Canning, I think, told the Premier he would not listen to him." Sure I said he would not listen to me. But what I was talking about you did not listen to the fishermen. It is too bad we have not got a press, we do not have people to report things as they are. We are all suffering here in this House with the press, with the reports, everyone; the Minister of Mines and Energy is suffering from this.

MR. FLIGHT: No, he is their darling. They think the world of him.

MR. CANNING: No, no they are not. They are not thinking the world of him. They know it. Let the Minister of Energy tomorrow get up and call the member for Burin-Placentia West a damn fool, call him a liar, which he is not allowed to call him, call him a rogue, let him get up tomorrow and say, 'The member for Burin-Placentia West yesterday evening

Mr. Canning.

spent thirty minutes or forty minutes or whatever I spent here roaring and talking nonsense' - you know, get up something like that and I bet you that minister will get more publicity tomorrow night and in the papers than we has gotten since he came in here. And yesterday he did not get too much publicity - the statement he made here the other day when we got guts enough to talk up to Ottawa and to demand - I did not know that the day would come when somebody in this House would say, All right, if we do not get a proper deal, let us leave her there. Thank God we have come to that time!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CANNING: Thank God we have come to that. Because I can assure the minister - not the minister who said it - who has done it or the government who has done it, you know - I mean I am not ~~going to back up the government - do not think that for one minute -~~ with the Premier not there. He has not been there while the estimates were being passed. He has not defended his ministers. He has not given any policy. I do not think he should be there. So do not think that I am up crawling to the government. But I will tell you this much, that I am going to give any minister or any member in this House his due. If I did not what would be the worth of me. Who in the hell would I be? I would be a fool up here making politics, trying to get a few votes and try to get in the next time. Who cares if I get in or not? If I do not perhaps somebody better will. Mr. Speaker, that is the situation. I do not know if it is within my limits, Mr. Speaker, to - I am afraid that I am going to step outside - but I am talking about this resolution. And the principle of what I am talking about, the main thing is there is nobody here listening to me and the way things are going. I think it is about time that somebody got up in this House, one side or the other, and told what has gone on since we opened the House last Winter, and what went on last year. It is not like a House of Assembly. Questions on the paper, - sometimes you ask, some member gets up, questions and questions on the paper. I would be two years asking questions. I have



MR. CANNING:

not got them all yet. I wish I did. I want to know them for my own information. I do not want to know them to get up and, you know, I do not want to make politics out of it. I would like to know. Because I will tell you what has happened in five years, from 1972 to 1977, the civil service of this Province has increased to a staggering number, you know. We do not need them. All right, they have increased, so it is employment. So if I get up and I bawl out and tell the government to cut them off, send them out, lay them off, we are going to have unemployment. But that is not the thing. Do you know what I am interested in? I am interested in where they are? Who is in control of them? Are they working for Newfoundland? Or is it a crowd of political heels who are making a big sum of the government? I mean do not blame me for being suspicious. Crosbie ran this government, Crosbie's ideas for awhile, and every foot of space that Crosbie has got in Newfoundland there are civil servants in today and the others. And then, of course, there are the others, you know. You have got the pharmacies. Did you see it? Did you see the list? Certain pharmacies, \$6 a foot, \$8 a foot, \$10 a foot. And some of the poorer crowds in the outports, you know, where you got a lesser area, where there are fewer people - that is the people who are keeping this Province going - they get \$4 a foot. I saw 270 - if I am a few feet out or a few dollars out you will have to excuse me; I have not got it before me, I did not intend taking it - 450 square feet of a building \$10 a foot or \$8 a foot. Mr. Speaker, I made it up last night, and if I could go down now and clear my house out, my wife and myself go off to an apartment, turn it into offices - it is a good building, it is not a \$100,000 building, it is just an ordinary house on Exeter Avenue - if I could turn it in, and it was in the proper place, and I could rent offices, Mr. Speaker, I could go home and retire. Not only retire but when I would be finished retiring, and when I die, I could sell it and pass along \$50,000, \$60,000, \$70,000 or \$80,000 to my children or my grandchildren or whoever I would have left. Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford that. That is why I am asking it. I wish it was debated in this House what civil servants

Mr. Canning.

we have taken on in the last five years and what they are doing, what they are doing. Why does it take now six and seven months to get something processed that we got in three weeks five years ago? This is going on.

MR. PECKFORD: Does the hon. gentleman want to adjourn the debate? It is almost six o'clock. He could adjourn the debate and carry on next week.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I will have to ask for your guidance because I came in here with the House empty wondering how we were going to put in the Wednesday afternoon and I said I could speak on it. And when I read the thing, I was surely interested enough to speak on it, and I meant every word I said, I compliment the member who brought it in, and I hope he is here to bring in others - provided he does not take enough people with him to keep me from getting on the right side of the House. Mr. Speaker, if I can adjourn, I would like to probably relax a little bit a few moments, you know, to get my thoughts together and bring some other points in on this all important resolution so I will adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has moved the adjournment of the debate.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Thursday, June 2, 1977 at 10:00 A.M.