

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 8, 1977

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

o o o

I recognize the hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, before we move to Statements by Ministers, I move that the rules of this House be suspended for today to permit the coverage by radio and television of the proceedings of this House whilst the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), the hon. Premier and the hon. Leader of the Opposition are speaking in relation to a statement that has been indicated to me that the hon. member for Twillingate will make.

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

MR. ROBERTS: I wish to second the motion, Sir. My understanding is that it is in respect only of the opening procedures and that following the statements by the gentleman from Twillingate and the Premier and myself, and any other hon. member who wishes to speak in respect of that matter, we will then revert to regular procedure. Sir, we gladly consent. Sir, I think it would be wrong in every way of us not to consent. We gladly do consent.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must ask whether the hon. Minister of Justice has leave to move this motion?

MR. NEARY: The hon. Minister of Justice has my approval, Sir, to move the motion. I think that this milestone in our history should be recorded, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: No, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Boo! Boo! Boo!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Shame! Shame! Shame!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On a point of personal privilege.

Mr. Speaker, I am now in my twenty-fifth year as an elected member of this House, but long before I was elected, I had had a lot of experience of this House. For it is now sixty years, over sixty years, since as a schoolboy at Bishop Feild College and later as a working newspaperman, I began to sit in the gallery to listen to such parliamentary giants as Sir Robert Bond, Sir Edward Morris, W. F. Coaker, A. B. Morine, Michael P. Cashin, W. J. Higgins, John R. Bennett, Cyril J. Fox, James Mary Kent, W. J. Walsh, Sir Richard Squires, Doctor Arthur Barnes, L. E. Emerson, and others whose names used to be household words in Newfoundland and in some cases still are. When I first began to haunt the House of Assembly as a visitor there were still hundreds of people living in Newfoundland who remembered the coming of Representative Government in 1832. There were thousands still living who took part, who had taken part in the election of the first House of Assembly under Responsible Government in 1855. There were still living many of those who had campaigned in the 1869 general election that was fought primarily on the question of Confederation with Canada. My own grandfather, David Smallwood, was one of them.

I had had the honour to know personally every Premier of Newfoundland in the present century, the Right Honourable Sir Robert Bond, the Right Honourable Sir Edward Morris, the Right Honourable Sir William Lloyd, Sir Michael Cashin, the Right Honourable Sir Richard Squires,

MR. SMALLWOOD: W.R. Warren, Albert E. Hickman, W.S. Monroe, F.C. Alderdice, and the Premier of the present time, five of them elected by the people, five of them who held office for short periods only. Now whether or not the media report its deliberations at anything more than minimum length, whether or not the general public pay anything more than passing interest, the irrefragable fact is that this is Newfoundland's supreme and sovereign lawmaking body, the body to which the government are always responsible, the high court of parliament, the only elected representative of all the people. Membership here is a high honour for any man or woman, for this House, more than any other body in the Province, has the power to make or break Newfoundland.

As I have said, I am now in my twenty-fifth year as a member of this House and for months past I have been wondering why I am here. It is not as though I get much pleasure from being here. I was too long at the helm not to know the nature of the work, the ceaseless cares, the ceaseless crises and the ceaseless complexities of the Premiership. — I was at the helm too long to be happy or efficient now in the daily round of criticism. I am not good at it, Mr. Speaker, I have no taste for it, and so while I sit here as an Opposition backbencher I feel that I am but occupying the seat of someone who would be more useful to my colleagues, to my district, to the House and to the Province. Of course, if the Premier cared to exchange seats with me I might reconsider the matter. I am not sure, however, that my colleagues here would welcome the Premier to their caucus, or that the members across would exult to have me in theirs.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Go on over, 'Frank'.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now in that matter, Mr. Speaker, allow me to give the House fair warning that it had better not jump to the conclusion that when I leave here today it will have seen the last of the Smallwoods. For in the gallery at this very moment there are two other Smallwoods, another Joey Smallwood, my grandson, and his infant son, Joey Smallwood III, my great-grandson.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have reminded the House already that my own life overlapped the lives of some Newfoundlanders who were alive in 1832. If my great-grandson Joey lives to be as old as I am now he will then represent nearly two and a quarter centuries of the Newfoundland political history, and I wish no worse luck

MR. SMALLWOOD: on Ray Guy and Wickford Collins than that they should have the ineffable pleasure, unendurably prolonged, to imagine Newfoundland in the year 2052 as the locale of a joyous political contest between my great-grandson, Joey, and the present Premier's grandson, Frankie, perhaps with Ed's grandson, Eddie, leading the NDP, that is unless Steve's grandson succeeds in capturing that leadership, always bearing in mind however the possibility of John Crosbie's grandson, Johnnie, leading the seventh or eighth political party graced by the well-known, lovable Crosbie charisma.

SOME HON MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, this will by my last day here as a member of the House, and in case there should be any curiosity as to how I intend to occupy my mind and my time may answer is that I will write and edit books and publish them, one book a year, and that they will all be about our Province and our people and our Province's history and they will try to portray the strength and greatness, the romance and poetry, the beauty and courage of Newfoundland and Labrador both. And I will endeavour thereby to inform and stimulate the pride and confidence of Newfoundlanders in their Province and in themselves, and at the same time strive to help our fellow Canadians the better to understand Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders and to understand what Canada gained as well as what she gave when we became part of her.

In 1937 I published Volumes I and II of the Book of Newfoundland, thirty years later, in 1967, Volumes III and IV, in 1975 Volumes V and VI. My ambition is to publish Volumes VII and VIII in 1982, and Volumes IX and X in 1986. All of this, of course, Deo volente, which means God willing. I feel sincerely that I can perhaps serve Newfoundland better with books than I can do with speeches to be made from this desk. From many parts of Canada I continue in increasing numbers to receive invitations to address schools and colleges, Rotary Clubs and Canadian Clubs, churches and Chambers of Commerce, learned

MR. SMALLWOOD: societies and a variety of other bodies. I have in the past accepted only a very small number of these invitations, but in the present state of national affairs in Canada, especially the danger of Quebec separatism, I wonder whether it might be useful to the country of my choice, Canada, if I participate more often in the public discussion across our nation. But this would conflict severely with my duty to this House and to the district that I represent here. So I had to make a choice of all the provinces of Canada, Newfoundland would suffer more grievously from the breakup of Canada and I incline to the view that I can perhaps serve Newfoundland better by joining actively in the effort to preserve the unity of Canada than I can do by continuing to sit here as a backbench member of the Opposition.

I go from the House today with gratitude in my heart for the kindness shown me here, for the graciousness of the people of Twillingate district, and for the long and patient generosity of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, given almost undeviatingly to me down through the years. In my twenty-fifth year as one of its members I leave the House of Assembly as I entered it, a life-long believer in the principles of Liberalism, an enthusiastic Confederate and Canadian, and with unchanging faith in the destiny of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, this day is one of great significance in the history of this hon. House. It is a day, I would suggest, when tribute should be paid for the contribution that the member for Twillingate has made over the past quarter of a century. There has been lots of opportunities in the past to criticize some of the accomplishments, or lack of them, he had in his regime, and history will deal one way or the other with that same twenty-five years in the future. But on an occasion like this I would suggest a tribute should be paid to the individual, the sacrifice and what it has meant to the people of this Province.

This is the day chosen by the most successful politician in Newfoundland's history to be the last in which he will appear as an elected representative of the people of this Province. It is a day on which the House must wish Godspeed to the hon. member for Twillingate, "the little fellow from Gambo", Joseph Roberts Smallwood.

At a time like this it is so easy I suppose for political foes, which all of us on this side of the House have been and I suggest some on the other, at various times, but really what we are talking here about today is to talk about the man, the raconteur extraordinaire, the dynamic personality who went at anything in all directions but certainly was moving at all times. And some of the anecdotes of course if you started to relate them about the hon. member for Twillingate could go on forever because he has had a colourful career and one which we all are so familiar with.

As most hon. members know, the former Premier, as an example, was an unrepentent name-dropper, and this trait has excited and enriched us from time to time. Can you imagine, Sir, the hon. gentleman relaxing in conversation with the incomparable



PREMIER MOORES: Winston Churchill and as he would say, "Not once, not twice but three times." Can you imagine what that says for Mr. Churchill's stamina in itself, Sir. Or dodging his Russian escort in Moscow as he paraded through the streets and then in a search for a retired Nikita Khrushchev who was on that particular occasion as lucky as Castro was more recently.

But on and on it goes and the anecdotes of course go on forever, but Sir, today I would like to be a little more serious. Parliamentary assemblies are houses of transients, members come and members go, the majority of them little noted nor long remembered. In some few the fires of ability, of ambition, or of commitment to the public service burn with a fitful brilliance that briefly illuminates the political firmament. In very rare individuals those fires burn with a steady incandescence of the fixed and

Premier Moores.

constant star whose light remains even when its source is no longer physically present. Joe Smallwood has had an impact on this Province. Sir, I think no one would say that he was anything but one of those rare individuals.

Parliamentary Assemblies are also Houses of partisans. Espousing differing philosophies of government, differing views of economics, differing methodologies of administration, we set ourselves at political enmity one with the other. And yet in so many ways we are united, united in the desire to serve the people we represent and to foster the best interests of this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. It is because of this unity, this unity of purpose and desire, that this House can, on this occasion, on an occasion such as this, lay partisanship to one side; that I, who could never be mistaken as a political friend of the hon. member, can stand here and offer to him my praise for those good things that he has done, as Mr. Trudeau did for John Diefenbaker, as political foes from time immemorial across the parliamentary system and in the free world have done, so it gives me pleasure today to honour and pay some tribute to the hon. member for Twillingate. I do not ask you to believe that at this instant of his departure from the House, Mr. Smallwood will suddenly and magically be translated into a universally beloved figure. The strongest lights indeed cast the darkest shadows, and I expect that there still will be those who retain the capacity to hate with a proper passion. But love or hate as you will - and in the case of the hon. gentleman you can hardly be indifferent - there is none who can deny the enormous significance of his impact upon Newfoundland during the past forty years.

Who is this man whom we speak of today? Who is Joey Smallwood that we should pay tribute to him? I do not propose to offer, Mr. Speaker, this House a biography. He is too well-known.

Premier Moores.

I do not propose to offer my version of the history of our times. I merely propose to state simply and directly why, in my opinion, political friends and foes alike should join to offer to pay him tribute of genuine appreciation.

We are an open and democratic society. Our masters are the people. For just about a quarter of a century the people gave to Joe Smallwood their support, their affection, their trust. To disavow the significance of such tribute would not only be churlish but a foolish assault upon those principles which we profess to be among the chief bastions of the liberties which we enjoy.

But what did the people see in the man that they should thus have honoured him? They say, first of all, one who told them who and what they were; and one who gave them reasons to be proud of their heritage, confident of their capacities, and hopeful for their futures. At a juncture when national despondency was not an imagined malady; when events conspired to demonstrate that the mastery of our destiny was, perhaps, beyond our competence; when the propensity to accept the label of inferiority was a compelling threat; when our political and economic fortunes were at their nadir; it was Joey Smallwood who drew upon his sense of history, his store of historical and pseudo-historical lore, his imagination, and his passionate convictions to sell Newfoundland to Newfoundlanders and even Newfoundlanders to themselves.

In following this course, Joe Smallwood displayed the skills of a consummate journalist. His style, it is true, did not display the shocking, flamboyant brilliance of Robert John Parsons at his best, the analytical acidity of P. T. McGrath, the controlled scurrility of John Valentine Nugent, nor the comedy, of one type or another, of Ray Guy. But in his own inimitable fashion he spoke in simple but compelling language to ordinary people about

PREMIER MOORES: ordinary things. And all he said and wrote, whether an historical anecdote, tall-tale, biographical vignette or current comment, the themes of love of country, pride in its people and their heritage, confidence in its future were always dominant. And Newfoundlanders responded to him, both to the man and to the message. What else did they see? They saw the Father of Confederation, the builder who took a set of rejected plans that had been gathering dust for nearly a century, refurbished them anew, adapted them with skill and art to the materials at his disposal, and completed the edifice that had been defied so much previous effort.

It is perhaps true that John A. MacDonald was right and that the plum would, in any case, have fallen into the Canadian basket. But, Mr. Speaker, in the cool Atlantic fogs plums ripen slowly, and Joe Smallwood is not the man to twiddle his thumbs while natural processes work slowly towards fruition. Once he had seen the vision he was not about to lose sight of it, but with the dynamism and vigour that are his trademarks, set out to overpower all opposition to achieve its reality. In accomplishing this purpose, he displayed those masterful political skills that assured his pre-eminence in public life for years to follow, and which evoked the grudging admiration even of those who were his bitterest opponents. Now these political skills were one other aspect of what the people saw to admire in him, for they were the kind of skills based on an empathy with the aspirations of the common man, on an ability to express those aspirations in common language, on a capacity to touch the people where they lived and what they felt, on the veritable magic of disassociation through which, while the government might seem to be alien and remote, the Premier was open and accessible as one of the people ought to be. Here was not a remote Olympian secluded on the eight floor of the Confederation Building, but a common man with whom the last lone fisherman on the hill of Cape St. George felt he could identify. Did fact accord that with reality? The answer, really, Mr. Speaker, is irrelevant. Whether true or illusion, the master politician created a situation in which the distinction really did not matter. Next they saw the consummate parliamentarian. For over twenty years he dominated this House both as a strategist and as a tactical debater. A student of parliament and

PREMIER MOORES:                         parliamentarians, and steeped in the history and lore of the Newfoundland Assembly, he knew the rules and traditions of the House as few, if any, of his contemporaries did. He also knew how to use those rules to his advantage and to that of his party. With a deftness of touch and masterly control he moved the House as he would have it move and the people followed. Not infrequently he called from his crammed memory anecdotes not only from Newfoundland's political past, but from the mother of parliaments; the names of Morris and Squires, of Bond and Coaker might well be said in the same breath with those of Churchill, Asquith, Disraeli and Gladstone. Whenever examples were required to point a moral, to illuminate a tradition, to explain a rule or to score a decisive debating point, they were readily available on the member's tongue. But Joe Smallwood was more than the consummate parliamentarian, more than the shrewd politician - he was also the Radical Populist Walking in the steps of William Coaker, Joey led an outport movement and drew his strength and succour from that source. It was Joey who remembered Coaker's forgotten people, who marshalled them in the army of Confederation, who polarized the electorate, who bullied and threatened the merchants and bosses who enjoyed privileges denied to the vast majority. In so doing, he claimed the fruits of the seeds that Coaker planted. And if the Populism inherited from Coaker was tempered by the vision of industrial society drawn from Sir Richard Squires, and even if the spirit of Squires ultimately prevailed, it was the Populist appeal that gave him his broad base of power and that will ensure for him an enduring place in the history of our Province.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I believe that one of the strongest reasons why I am able to express this tribute to Joe Smallwood relates to a sense in which he is not a typical Newfoundlander. Newfoundlanders for the most part when they are faced with formidable tasks are prone to begin by calculating all the reasons for not doing it. Not infrequently, when the list of negative arguments

PREMIER MOORES:

is tabulated there is sufficient reason for inaction. Joey operates and operated in precisely the opposite direction. His style is to find all the reasons for doing something and then to proceed, come Hell or high water, to do it - right or wrong. This is definitely not a Newfoundland characteristic but neither, I think, does it derive from Prince Edward Island, Mr. Speaker. It is in fact but one of the paradoxical elements that mix in Joe Smallwood to make him a phenomenon unique in our time, the dominant politician of our age, the Newfoundland parliamentarian par excellence, the only living Father of Confederation, his future, I am sure, will be dedicated to the well-being of the Province and, thank God, in a non-partisan way. And having said that, Sir, I and the people on this side of the House, wish him God speed and good health.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, first of all, Sir, may I pay tribute to the very gracious gesture of the Minister of Justice, the House Leader for the government. I thought his request made at the start of today's proceedings showed magnanimity and generosity. I know he spoke for the Premier and the Cabinet and, I believe, for every member of the House with one exception. I regret that his gesture was not accepted. I think this House has been put in a position where we have been demeaned and I think this Province has been demeaned. I think we are all the losers because the gesture, the request made by the Minister of Justice as the House Leader for the largest group in the House, was not accepted.

Mr. Speaker, it is right and proper that the House observe this event because today's happenings are a milestone in the history of Newfoundland and Labrador. The departure

MR. ROBERTS: of the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) from the public world, his resignation from the House and his retirement into private life, is a momentous event. It is yet another stage, possibly the penultimate one, in the career of the man who is certainly the greatest Newfoundlander of our time, and may well be the greatest to stride the stage of our 500 years and more of recorded history. It will be strange to say the least not to have the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) as a member of this House. As he has told us, he has served here for twenty-five years. What he did not say, but what must be said, is that for those twenty-five years he stood out as the colossus of our public life.

It is thirty years, Mr. Speaker, almost to the day since the gentleman from Twillingate first raised the banner of the cause which became his life's work. It would not be just nor would it be fair to say that the history of our country these last thirty years can be written in terms of his life alone. But it must be said, Mr. Speaker, that his life and his work was central and essential, and that without the gentleman from Twillingate the last thirty years in Newfoundland and Labrador would not have unfolded as they did.

Confederation is the crowing glory of the hon. gentleman's life. It is an achievement of which any man could be justly proud. It enshrines his name alongside those of the other men who made Canada, Sir John A. MacDonal and George Brown, the original Fathers of Confederation, Sir Wilfred Laurier, William Lyon MacKenzie King, Louis St. Laurent, the men who made Confederation work. Confederation was his cause, Sir, and a noble cause it was. Today, looking back upon the quarter century and more which have passed since we became part of Canada, it is easy to forget that the battle, to use a familiar phrase, was a near won thing, The hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), Sir, made the cause his own. Without the conviction with which he embraced it, the

MR. ROBERTS: eloquence with which he advocated it and the courage with which he defended it, the Confederate cause, Sir, would not have carried the day. There is no Newfoundlander today, Mr. Speaker, no Labradorian today, not one single one of us living between Cape Race and Cape Chidley, whose life is not immensely the better because we are today Canadians. The union has been a happy one and a fruitful one. There are those who say the union was not perfect. To them I say that hindsight makes geniuses of all of us and perfection is a state which cannot be achieved by human beings. Confederation, the joining of the ancient land of Newfoundland and Labrador with Canada, that, Sir, was a great and a crowning event in our history.

The name of the hon. gentleman from Twillingate will forever be inseparably linked with it. My own feelings, Mr. Speaker, as you can imagine, are deep and strong. I stand here today not simply as the Leader of the Opposition or even as the leader of the Liberal Party, but as a man who has worked closely with the hon. gentleman from Twillingate for the last fifteen years or so. It is no secret we have had our differences. Indeed, three years ago the whole Province was entertained for a number of months as we resolved those differences. The general election which followed saw another effort to resolve those differences. It is idle to rewrite history as tempting as it may be. Our differences were real and they were fundamental. But I do want to say now, as I have said before, that there was no bitterness nor malice on either side. The hon. gentleman from Twillingate. I know the Premier would concur, is a worthy opponent. A political struggle with him in many ways exemplifies the very best of what political life in the parliamentary system of democracy is all about.

As I have noted, Sir, the hon. gentleman and I have worked closely together during the final years of his Premiership of this Province. I was his executive assistant and then subsequently his parliamentary assistant and then, following that, a member of his Cabinet and eventually his successor as leader of this party. While we did not always agree, and indeed, sometimes, Sir, disagreed strongly, I treasure



MR. ROBERTS: our relationship. To me, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from Twillingate in a great many ways represents the very best of Newfoundland and Labrador, and the best of the qualities that go to make up leadership.

My acquaintance with public life, Sir, is not nearly as extensive as his, but over the last fifteen years or so I have come to know many of the leading figures in political life in this Province and in Canada. The knowledge and experience that I have gained from those friendships, bolstered by a deep reading in political history and the biographies of political figures, have led me to the very firm conviction, Sir, that the two highest qualities that any man can exemplify are courage and compassion. To me, Sir, these are the qualities which mark a man: the courage to stand by his beliefs even if the whole world howls against them, and the compassion to care for those who are less fortunate and to devote one's energies and abilities to trying to help them.

I mean it to be high praise indeed when I say that the hon. gentleman from Twillingate is a man of deep compassion and a man of staunch and steadfast courage. I am gratefully happy, Sir, that the hon. gentleman leaves public life as he entered it, a member of the Liberal party. Forgetting the differences that may have occurred, they are all behind us now. The important note and the joyful one, Sir, is that the hon. gentleman from Twillingate, as he has told us, has come home to Liberalism. It is right and fitting that he do so. It is where he belongs.

In years to come, Mr. Speaker, all of us in this House will relate with pride that we served in the House of Assembly with the hon. gentleman from Twillingate. It matters not whether we followed him politically or opposed him politically; our boast will be that we knew him and served with him in a common interest, that of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. As an elected politician, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from Twillingate will soon be no more. He tells me that shortly he will send Your Honour a letter in his own

MR. ROBERTS: hand resigning his seat in this House. He will then rise and bow to Your Honour and for the last time leave this chamber as a member of this House of Assembly. In due course, Mr. Speaker, there will be another member for Twillingate, but there will never be another Joey Smallwood. All of us, Sir, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: All of us,

MR. ROBERTS: every Newfoundlander and every Labradorian, Sir, must acknowledge that. And equally we must acknowledge the contribution which he has made to this land, this land he loves so dearly and this land to which he has devoted his life. It is a time to rise above pettiness and partisanship. Joey Smallwood has served his country and his Province well, Sir. Let us remember it and let us honour him for it.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I was in St. Anthony on the far northern tip of the Island of Newfoundland. Early in the morning I watched as perhaps many other hon. members did the service of thanksgiving which was held to mark the silver jubilee of our Sovereign Lady the Queen. Impressive and magnificent are strong adjectives, but they are scarcely adequate to describe those services. I was thrilled to my very marrow. The services, Sir, were held in St. Paul's Cathedral, that glorious structure in the heart of the city of London. As Your Honour will recall, St. Paul's was the creation of Sir Christopher Wren, a great Christian and a great architect. He lies there today, Mr. Speaker, entombed in the crypt underneath his supreme creation. On it, Sir, is engraved one of the noblest epitaphs that I have ever encountered, "Si monumentum requiris circumspice," "If you would seek his monument, look about you." It will be many years yet, Mr. Speaker, before any of us writes an epitaph to honour the hon. gentleman from Twillingate. But today, Sir, as he leaves public life surely there could be no more fitting tribute than to adapt those words which I have just read. I say to those who would seek the result of Joey Smallwood's life work for Newfoundland and Labrador, look about you. Long, Sir, may his big jib draw.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words on the resignation of my colleague, the member for Twillingate, the former Premier of this Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, in paying tribute

MR. NEARY: to the hon. gentleman, Sir, there are so many aspects of the hon. gentleman's life that you could talk about. Looking back over the sixteen years that I have been a member of this hon. House, I suppose I could take the whole afternoon to tell the House about some of the exciting and dramatic experiences that I had as a supporter of the government first, and then as a member of the hon. gentleman's cabinet. We could talk about all the mining developments, the Premier of the day going around the Province with his silver spade. We could talk about the building of Confederation Building, all the fish plants, the hundreds and thousands of schools that the hon. gentleman keeps reminding us that his administration built, all the hospitals that were built under the gentleman's administration and so on and so on, and we could go on and on and on for hours and hours talking about the accomplishments and the failures of the administration that the hon. gentleman headed up in this Province for twenty-three years.

But in my opinion, Sir, the most outstanding attributes in my opinion about the hon. gentleman is, first of all, I would say was his loyalty and his dedication to Newfoundland and to the people of this Province. Mr. Speaker, I had never met in my life a gentleman, and I say this with all sincerity, who was as loyal to his friends as my hon. friend, the member for Twillingate, and sometimes to his detriment. And I have never in my life met a man, Sir, who had such strong feelings for ordinary people as the hon. member for Twillingate, and I would say that was another one of the hon. gentleman's outstanding attributes. And I would place above all this, Sir, the fact that the gentleman was extremely loyal, dedicated to his friends and to Newfoundland and his feeling for the ordinary people of this Province, but I believe it is fitting today, Mr. Speaker, that so many young people should appear in the galleries to watch and hear the hon. member for Twillingate, the former Premier of this Province, make his farewell speech in this hon. House and resign from active politics because, Sir, I believe that one of the most outstanding accomplishments of the hon. gentleman's administration was to give the young people of

MR. NEARY: this Province opportunities to use their talents.

We can talk about

the advances that we made in the field of health and in the field of water and sewerage, highways, smashing the isolation in this Province, but I believe the one thing that we can point to that laid the foundation for the future of this Province is what we have accomplished in the field of education and the opportunities that we have given our young people. Whether or not they use them wisely, Sir, is not the fault of the hon. gentleman from Twillingate. If they use them wisely then all the credit, Sir, must go to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, as one of those who served under the immediate leadership

MR. NEARY: of the only Living Father of Confederation, I feel that today I am sharing in a unique and most important moment in the history of our beloved province of Newfoundland and Labrador. You, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. members of this House heard a few moments ago Joseph R. Smallwood, politician extraordinaire, author, and world figure, write *finis* to a chapter of his life, the political chapter. With you Mr. Speaker, who served as leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition for so many years in benches which are now on Your Honour's right hand, I am certain, Sir, that I share the wish that in writing the conclusion of this particular chapter in his life, the Hon. Joseph R. Smallwood is not terminating the unique identity which he has established across Canada, throughout the United States and in Europe as the figurehead, the totem that best symbolizes to all the whole world, to all the people, that symbolizes Canada's youngest province and Britian's oldest colony.

If this were a banquet, Sir, that we were attending today, Mr. Speaker, instead of the regular House of Assembly intellectual feast, I would feel that it would be incumbent on me to propose a toast to our retiring member, Since this is not so, Sir, may I merely wish him on behalf of the people of LaPoile District, a district that remained faithful to the hon. gentleman for so many provincial elections, much enjoyment and even greater personal self-fulfillment in the days ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I rise here today. One is with very much pleasure to have it recorded that at least I am a part of this tribute that has been paid to the hon. member for Twillingate. Then at the same time with a feeling of sadness to know that one of the most illustrious persons in the history of the political life of Newfoundland should be retiring. I say that, too, in a

MR. DAWE: personal way. I would say that no other member in this House, especially this last ten years, has had a closer personal relationship with the hon. member than myself. I have been in continuous contact with him. I would say not a week passed this last ten years when he has been in the province that I have not had some personal contact with him in some manner shape or form. I can say that this close relationship began primarily at the beginning of the leadership convention in 1969, when at that time, I suppose, it was the greatest political convention in the history of Newfoundland, and probably it will be some time before we will ever see such a convention again.

The Premier told me on many occasions that without my help and support at that time it is doubtful if he had won that leadership convention. And I recall quite distinctly visiting his home on Good Friday of 1969, the convention was being held in November, and the Premier at that time was not too strong in his mind in running for the leadership. It was announced that the present Senator Dr. Rowe was going to be the candidate, and the Premier was going off to Florida. I went up and visited him at his home on that occasion on Good Friday and had a chat with him before he left. I gave him the idea at the time of using this slate run of candidate. I said the convention to him was going to be won or lost at district meetings. It was not an original idea of mine, but it was a thought that I had brought to Newfoundland, I got the idea from watching the reports to Newsweek magazine when the former President Nixon was running for the Republican convention. And if you just recall, they said in the last conventions held that it is undemocratic.

MR. DAWE:

Every state in the United States sends delegates to the various conventions and they are elected and pledged before they go to that convention whom they are going to vote for and whom they are not. I got the idea across to the Premier, "This is the way," I said, "to win the leadership at the convention. It will be won or lost at the district meetings." He took this idea and we pursued that to the end, and the result, as you know, was successful.

Irrespective of that, Mr. Speaker, I have known the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), as I say, in a very personal manner. There is nothing I can add to the gracious addresses given by the Premier and by the Leader of the Opposition and by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) on his accomplishments. But I know him very well personally, and I am sure he is not the person that he has been painted. You would not find a more humble, sincere, unpretentious person within this Province. I have been at his house many times, and you see a carpenter, a truckdriver, anyone who would come and knock on his door looking for help he would bring them into his home. I have seen him sometimes actually in tears over the plight of some unfortunate individual. I am sure at any time that his efforts were never spared, as the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has said, to try to uplift and to, at least, do his utmost to help those who were less fortunate than himself.

He was never vindictive. He never looked on the wrong side of any person. I recall at one particular time - I am afraid to go too far - a man in a very prominent position in Conception Bay and held in very high esteem had a problem. The attitude that he took to help him amazed me, and I have been a friend and have admired him till this day.

Newfoundland has lost, as I say, one of the most colourful politicians we have ever had or ever will have. The only regret that I have is that he did not end his career in the District of Port de Grave. I had arranged for him in the election of 1971 just to do that, and I even had his nomination papers prepared for me to get them signed the next day. But he called me ten o'clock that night and said that he had been advised by some of his friends, or I suppose his



MR. DAWE: friends or his political advisors, that he was not going to run in Port de Grave District, he was going to run in Placentia East. And there again, I think that was a political mistake with the consequences that it was a close election.

Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to let this opportunity pass to stand here and record these few words in humble tribute to the greatest Newfoundland that I think we have ever produced, and who has done more to relieve the sufferings of so many of our people down through the years than all the other premiers of Newfoundland combined.

In closing, I want to add my best wishes to him and say, should he ever try or consider running again in politics I would invite him in any way to run again in the District of Port de Grave. I am sure, if I am alive and can be of any help it will be my pleasure to do so. That is the only commitment I am making to any other party or person. I will do that for him. Only time will tell what the result will be. But I say to the hon. member, he is in good health, things have changed, times change, it is not impossible, and I would say to him that we are thankful for what he has done for Newfoundland and we wish him God speed, and I hope and pray that he and I will retain the close personal relationship

MR. DAWE: that we have had down through these years.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, it is with some nostalgia that I rise to endorse and add a little to the tribute which has been paid to Mr. Smallwood by the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, and the member for LaPoile and my friend from Port de Grave. Sir, I recall my first time meeting Mr. Smallwood. He may not recall this incident, but when I was a little boy, playing with some companions in Wesleyville, we saw this man walking down the road with a pack on his back and he came down and of course, as boys do, we were a bit afraid and we started to run away. However, we eventually stopped and this man came along and he asked us if there was a place that we knew we could suggest that he could get a night's lodging and a meal. And we pointed him to a family by the name of Brenton's at Wesleyville and the owner of the home's first duty was to put a pair of soles on Mr. Smallwood's shoes. He had worn them out completely walking Bonavista Bay, I believe, trying to form a union. But, Sir, that was a long time ago and I never dreamt then that I would stand in this House having worked with him and pay tribute to him at this particular time. I never dreamt then that he would be the man who would break that curse of isolation by connecting up the communities all across Newfoundland by roads and, Sir, no-one appreciated that more than the people of Bonavista North who had to walk as far as Gambo, a distance of fifty miles, to connect with the train. There were no roads then.

So, Mr. Speaker, the people of that area will forever be grateful for breaking that curse of isolation. My next encounter with Mr. Smallwood was in 1955 when I was invited to his office. I believe at that time they were drawing a dividing line in Labrador. They were going to make three districts or two districts instead of one. So I finally got to his office up around midnight— I

CAPT. WINSOR: recall it well-and we discussed the problem and the matters that I went there to see him about, and he asked me my opinion where I thought that the district boundry line should be drawn for the district of Labrador North, and I gave him my opinion. He said it was a very good opinion and then after chatting for a little while longer he said, "Do you know of any good man to run in the district of Labrador North?" So brazenly I said, "Mr. Smallwood, I know of no-one any better than myself." So from that day on, Sir, I entered into politics, and I had the privilege of serving, first as a back-bencher with Mr. Smallwood, then four years in Cabinet, and as I look around today I find myself the longest member sitting here today who had served with Mr. Smallwood.

Sir, I am going to say now, and I have said many times before, he was not a dictator, he was not the dictator that many of his critics referred to him as. I found him thorough and

MR. WINSOR: this is one characteristic which I always admired about him, when leadership was needed - it was needed then and is needed now - Mr. Smallwood took the helm. He left no doubt in my mind where the Ship of State was heading. Very often it was heading in the right direction. So, Sir, I was honoured and I was privileged to serve with a man the calibre of Mr. Smallwood. His equals in our political life will not be seen again. He endeared and endowed himself to the hearts of great, great many Newfoundlanders, especially the young. I travelled with him on several occasions, and everywhere you went the first that was out to greet Mr. Smallwood would be the children of any community. They were pushing and fighting to see who get the closest to him.

Sir, it is regretful today that many of those children, many of those elderly people, could not witness what we have witnessed here today. So, Sir, I join with other members in wishing Mr. Smallwood good health and best wishes, and may he have a long and happy new career. I think he is starting on a new career and his work I am sure will be worthwhile. In history it will be recorded that today we have seen a man depart from our political scene and as I said that will not be again seen in our time.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for St. John's Centre.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words. It is something like coming to bat behind Mickey Mantle when one has heard all the beautiful tributes paid to the hon. gentleman. I cannot say that I had the great honour to serve in the Cabinet of the hon. gentleman. I cannot say that we campaigned together. But I can say we had many heated hours here in the House of Assembly, when I sat over there. I was elected in 1962, the same year as the hon. member for LaPoile, I think. We had seven then and we had made great inroads in the political life of Newfoundland. We had come up to, I think, forty per cent of the

MR. MURPHY: popular vote, and the Tories were well on the way to taking over and correcting all the great wrongs that had happened since 1949. In 1966, another election came. There was only three elected at that time - they called them the three divine persons - the hon. Speaker, Mr. Ottenheimer, who is in the Chair now, - the hon. member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) and myself. The extraordinary thing, the farthest west representation in Newfoundland at that time was the east side of Springdale Street. There was not a Tory member west of that. So, in all fairness, I have got to say that the hon. gentleman was a wonderful politician.

He was very well known, I think, to everybody. As a matter of fact, I was at the age I had never voted until Confederation came. But I had many memories of the old ball park on Carpasian Road which is being revitalized now. The hon. member for Fogo tells of his first meeting with the hon. the member for Twillingate. Well, my first meeting was, we used to run outdoor wrestling at the time down in the ball park. Of course, that wrestling at the time, you know, was all played up with theatrics and everything else. We had a chap, Charlie Greene, who had far more weight on him than he had brains, and, of course, he was being booed, and he stood up and he challenged everybody in hearing of his voice. At that time we used to look up just over the hill on Empire Avenue and the light was burning in the attic of Canada House, I think we called it, which was the residence of the hon. gentleman at that time. So after the challenge was issued we had this guy came up - he weighed about eighty-three pounds soaking wet - with a few beers in him, and he wanted to take on Charlie Greene. So, of course, we told him we could not arrange it that night but perhaps subsequently, a following week, we could do it. Just as he had left - and poor Joe Wadden, who has passed away since, and myself, chatted with him and we got him quieted down - the next thing the door opened in walked - who? - the

MR.MURPHY: hon. gentleman himself! I said, "Good God, Joe," I said - Joe was a great Joey man - I said, "I know he thinks he owns the world but I do not think he is going to beat Charlie Greene." But as it happened the hon. gentleman said, "Look, I have heard all the racket down here, I have been working away in Canada House and I thought I would come down for a few moments of recreation." I do not know if the hon. gentleman recalls that, but that would be in the early 1950's. That was my first meeting with the hon. gentleman, at the time. Subsequently, or at that time little did I know that I would be sitting across the House from the same gentleman as

MR. MURPHY: ultimately the Leader of the Opposition after the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Ottenheimer, had to resign. We have had some wonderful things happen in this House. Many wonderful things have been said about the hon. gentleman. A great Newfoundlander! I do not think anyone can deny that. Ten years ago possibly if the same things were being said it would remind me of the story of the wake where the lady was sat down on the chair with her little daughter, and everybody was coming in, the husband was waking in the coffin, and everybody was saying, My God, there is John now, a lovely fellow, a model husband and all the rest of it, And she said, Mary, for heaven's sake go over and look in the coffin and see if that is your father that is in there.

Politically since that time things have reversed, and when you hear the hon. the Premier get up and speak at great length, and a speech which I believe should go down in the annals of this House as one of the most outstanding tributes paid to any gentleman, and particularly when that gentleman is one of our own native-born Newfoundlanders. I am not as proud a Canadian as I am a Newfoundlander, quite frankly, and I do not say that I was a great anti-Confederate, But many things have happened in this House. There is one thing I will say, whatever the hon. gentlemen's attributes were, that he was a great lover of this House of Assembly and if there is ever a roll kept of presence or absenteeism in this House there is no one, but no one, can say that he served this House of Assembly here more faithfully than the hon. gentleman did.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY: He really loved it, and for that I pay him tribute.

I think, and I do not want to put a discordant note into this, but I think we have lost

MR. MURPHY: something of respect for this House that the hon. gentleman brought to the House at that time.

And, like the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, when I watched the tributes to our Most Gracious Majesty the Queen. Her Most Gracious Majesty, I was thrilled to think that, Thanks be to God, somewhere in the world there is still a bit of respect for that pageantry and for something that we all should love. That is one thing about this House of Assembly.

I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot add anything to what has been said because I think the ultimate tributes have been paid to the hon. gentleman. And when I listened to the hon. the Premier talk about Russia and where he was known and everything else, of course, it brings back the old story of when the hon. gentleman visited the Vatican. He was walking in the garden with the Pope and there were two nuns walking there and one said to the other, Who is the strange gentleman with Mr. Smallwood?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY: So these were some of the things that were said. You know, it was not all fun and games and play. The hon. member for Fogo (Capt. Winsor), I think, is the senior veteran member of the House. We had many hot times here, but I think in the long run I can say this, what we got from the hon. Premier of that day, whether it was mistakes or wrongs or anything else, we did get a deep sense of love and loyalty for this beautiful Province of ours, our own native Newfoundland. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may I would like to join with other hon. members in paying a very sincere tribute to the hon. the member for Twillingate



MR. HICKMAN:                         who is about to depart this House. I guess I am the only hon. member of this House who has had the good fortune to serve in two administrations, and I have always said that the only reason why I was hired on by the present Premier was that he insisted on having an Attorney General who had previous experience and training. But be that as it may, I did serve

MR. HICKMAN: for three years in the Cabinet of the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), and I look upon him with mixed feelings and mixed emotion. In one sense it was a great experience, but I sometimes regret that I heeded the call to go into political life in 1966, which I thought would be a bed of roses to some extent, and I found to my chagrin that that is not the case. I have learned, I think, today and in the last week or so, a lesson in psychology, because in 1968, I think it was, or 1969, I tried to persuade the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) that he should retire from public life and he would have none of it. Then I tried another method and I was even less successful that way. Now, since he came back in to join us again, I have, during the past several weeks when I have heard rumours of his threat to retire, tried to persuade him that he should not retire, that he should stay in this House and serve out his term and continue to make a very strong contribution to this institution. But again he did not heed my call, and decided to retire. If I had to do it all over again, I would have tried reverse psychology back ten years ago.

Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, I think that all of us in this hon. House should be very grateful to a gentleman who has kept alive in Newfoundland this great institution, and that is becoming a monumental task for parliamentarians today, and particularly in the New World and in the free world because of the great anxiety on the part of technocrats and, indeed, on the part of the voter and the public that we not waste out time, as they call it, in debate in legislative assemblies and parliaments, but rather that we spend most if not all of our time in the mundane practice of governing behind closed doors. And I believe that we were fortunate, indeed, that the hon. member for Twillingate was re-elected in the last general election and came back into this Assembly and once again availed of the opportunity to implore us, and at times to beseech us, and at times we were critical because he lectured to us, on the importance of keeping and preserving this great institution. At this time of the year no one in his right mind wants to

MR. HICKMAN: be here, but by and large it is a practice, it is a procedure, it is a form of government that we would fight very hard to maintain. Yet the irony of it is that when we have it we do not take advantage of it, and the hon. member for Twillingate could never stand accused of not having taken full advantage of our parliamentary system of government and our parliamentary process.

He is going on now to what I know will be a very active career in writing and spreading the gospel of this Province. And there, I suggest to him, he is accepting a challenge almost as difficult as the one that he chose in 1945 when he ran for the National Convention, because we find in Canada today a determined effort on the part of many leaders to Balkanize this nation. We also find in the Province of Newfoundland a lack of awareness of our identity as Newfoundlanders. These two have, in my opinion, to be maintained and kept alive. The hon. member for Twillingate has the experience, the energy, the voice, the expertise to make us proud to be Canadians but to guarantee that we are prouder still to be Newfoundlanders, and I wish him well in his next career.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council.

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my hon. colleagues on both sides of the House in paying tribute to the hon. member from Twillingate. I met him on many occasions, but I met him just on a few brief occasions prior

DR. FARRELL: to my entry into this hon. Fouse. He was always very affable, and I am going to keep this on a very personal note because most of the things that I would have wished to have said, and would have liked to have said, have already been said and I would only be repeating a great many of them.

On a personal note, I remember meeting him at a time when he was in a great battle, which I will not mention, and even attended a meeting with him at that time, much to some people's dismay, but I enjoyed it immensely and had a long discussion with him at that time. And then not too long afterwards I went through a period of great travail and great personal danger, and I am glad to say - and I would like to say publicly at this time because I have never even had the opportunity to state this publicly before so I would like to say it publicly today - that he put all the forces at his command that were available to him to help me at that time, and I wish now to publicly thank him for that and to also add to what has already been said that he has a very successful future.

Now my colleague who sits in front of me, an old combatant of the hon. member for Twillingate, has mentioned to me that he is going to make all provincial parks available free to senior citizens. So, Sir, I would like to announce that to you, that you can go into any provincial park you like in future without any payment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. FARRELL: I stole the thunder from the hon. minister whom, as we all know, had many bouts with the hon. member for Twillingate and as I said I was just going to say a few words that I would like to get across, and with that I wish you the best of luck, Sir, and all success in the future.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Before calling the next routine business I would like to welcome to the gallery a former and long-time member of the

MR. SPEAKER: House of Assembly and former Minister of the Crown, a gentleman whom I have not seen in the legislature for quite a number of years, Mr. Charles Ballam.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I would also like to welcome a former Newfoundlander - I suppose if one is a former Newfoundlander, one is always a Newfoundlander - Mr. Harry Winsor, who now lives in Rome, Italy and is head of the Indian Ocean programme with the FAO of the United Nations and a number of hon. members certainly will know the gentleman. He served as a member of the Newfoundland Fishery Development Authority from 1954 to 1964, and is in the Province on a visit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is a little difficult to get back to this now but I suppose the nation's business must go on. I have a petition to present on behalf of 146 residents of Westport, Mr. Speaker. Now this is the second

MR. RIDEOUT: time this year that I have had occasion to present a petition on behalf of those residents on the same problem. The House will recall that some months ago, or a couple of months ago, I presented a petition on behalf of the residents of Westport asking that there be an enquiry into the tremendous increases in electricity rates in that community. Since I presented that petition, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland Hydro officials have carried out some investigations in the community and have made some corrections but, apparently, the problem is not yet overcome, and the prayer of this petition is that Newfoundland Hydro have some experts come in and not only check the meters but to replace the meters in the Community of Westport because, Mr. Speaker, there has to be something wrong. I do not know what it is, I cannot get any confirmation from Newfoundland Hydro officials what it is, but there must be something wrong. There are 146 people, Mr. Speaker, who have signed this petition and they have sent along again four or five examples of the increase in electricity that they have experienced in that community from this month over the month previous. The House will recall, I am sure, that I spent five or ten minutes some months ago quoting unrealistic figures, to say the least, Mr. Speaker, of what had occurred in electricity rates in that community.

Now, as I said, some corrective action was taken, the bills were corrected, but the thing is showing up again. Let me give a couple of examples, Mr. Speaker. One person had a bill of \$32.37 in March month; their April bill is \$212.87. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is something wrong. There has to be. Another person had a bill of \$29.01 in March; their April bill was \$161.73. Another gentleman, \$37.92; his April bill, \$101.28. And on and on the story goes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, can we blame those people for being upset? They have contacted Newfoundland Hydro. Newfoundland Hydro has written them all form letters and said that their accounts for the period that I mentioned some months ago would be re-done so as not to show up those tremendous increases up in the \$5000 and \$6000 brackets, the House will remember some of them were. But here it is occurring again, and I cannot blame those people, Mr. Speaker, for asking

MR. RIDEOUT: that the meters be replaced. There is nothing else to do. They have replaced the meter reader, if that is the way to say it, and that has not helped the situation. They have a new meter reader, or a reader of meters.

MR. MURPHY: Did they get the meters tested by the Federal Department of -

MR. RIDEOUT: I do not know if the meters were tested, but Newfoundland Hydro officials were down there shortly after I presented the last petition.

I have been in touch with Newfoundland Hydro officials myself, and like I said, Mr. Speaker, they have been down there and checked into the situation, but here we have the whole thing re-occurring again. It happened from January to February. Now it is happening again from March to April.

And, Mr. Speaker, the last closing note of the petition is that those people are withholding payment of their bills until the April bills are again straightened out. Now I think that is a reasonable petition. I would have to agree with them one hundred per cent on that, and I do not know if this is happening anywhere else in the Province, Mr. Speaker, but certainly the people of Westport have gone through this twice in the last three or four months, and I think it is incumbent on the Newfoundland Hydro to go down there and correct the situation once and for all. If it means installing new meters, well let us do that, but let us not have those people suffering the traumatic effect of finding a couple of hundred or two hundred and fifty or a three hundred dollar light bill appearing in the mail. We know there has been an electricity rate increase, Mr. Speaker, but certainly nothing to correspond with the tremendous increases that we have seen in Newfoundland Hydro - or in the hydro rates in Westport.

So, I ask that the petition be tabled for the second time, referred to the Department to which it relates, and hope that the Minister will guarantee me that something will be done in Westport.

MR. MURPHY: 'Tom' is that only in Westport?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines of Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I want to, number one, thank the hon. member for bringing this to my attention through the form of a petition. I do not know if I was in the House the last time when the hon. member presented the first petition. I regret very much his having to present a second petition on the same problem. I am as mad about it since I have heard about it ten seconds ago, or three minutes ago, as the people of Westport are, and I will guarantee - it is one minute before everything closes down here, I think we are on summer hours - but I will guarantee it is the first initiative that I take after I shave tomorrow morning is to get on to Newfoundland Hydro and to have somebody down there as quickly as is humanly possible to correct it, and to indicate to them that I do not want to see this happen anymore. It is extremely frustrating to the people of Westport or the people of any place to have this kind of thing happen, and I am just as angry, or angrier than the hon. member, and I will see to it, as the Minister responsible for Newfoundland Hydro, that something is done immediately.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend knows, the gentleman from Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout) who presented the petition, that I promised some of the hon. gentleman's constituents that I would support the petition if and when it was brought before the House. I have had a number of telephone conversations with some of the hon. gentleman's constituents and I have had a few letters from the people down there who are complaining about the excessive bills they are receiving from Newfoundland Hydro. Obviously,



Mr. Neary. ,

Mr. Speaker, the meters in the Westport area have gone haywire and they should be checked out, and I am glad to hear now, Sir, that the Minister of Mines and Energy is going to take immediate action to try to have this matter rectified. I am sure that the hon. gentleman's constituents will be most grateful to the hon. gentleman even though the hon. gentleman had to bring two petitions before the House . I think now the hon. gentleman is going to get action, going to get results and will be able to report to his constituents this evening that between the two of us that we finally got the hon. Minister of Mines to move.

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

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I rose in support of the last petition, and I will do so again. I welcome the minister's statement that he will look into it. I should ask the minister if possibly he can look into the situations elsewhere. The last time when a petition was brought to the House I also indicated what has occurred elsewhere in a number of other areas, and certainly we face the same problems on the Labrador Coast. And at that time I indicated that what we done there was rather than complain, because we have been fed-up complaining, that we devised our own techniques of turning the meters upside down or on the side, because they registered more slowly then and, of course, give a smaller reading. But I indicate to the minister - and I hope - it surely should be noticeable that when a meter goes astray, goes wrong, that the figures indicated on the bills, for instance, are way off. It is not \$1 or \$2 or \$3 more per month. You will find all of a sudden that the meter reading will be two or three or four or five times what it was the previous month. And when you get the month of April being higher than the month of March or February, for instance, there obviously must be something wrong.

Mr. Strachan.

I also understand from our knowledge of meters, because we are getting very good at it, that the inside part is sealed in the meter and that in many cases they are very difficult to check as such. And I should indicate that, I think, the simplest solution in all cases like this is to replace the meter almost immediately and take the meter off. But to go and check it in the place of residence and so on generally means that it is improperly checked or it can be for various reasons, surges in current and so on it can read wrongly or correctly as the case might be. So I think that in these cases where it indicates from the bill that there is something wrong with the meters they should be immediately replaced and the meter taken to a proper place to be checked out before they are done. And I hope that he will look elsewhere in other areas where there are these anomalies and people know about them.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Meat Inspection Act." And on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Health, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland Optometric Association And Governing The Practice Of Optometry In The Province, and a bill, "An Act Respecting Opticians."

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Education.  
Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Health, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to present bills, " An Act To Amend The Department Of Health Act." "An Act To Amend The Registration (Vital Statistics) Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave of the House to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Increase Of Pensions Act." Also I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask permission of the hon. House to introduce a bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Made Between The Government And The Government Of Canada Respecting Reciprocal Taxation Of These Governments And Their Agencies." And further, Sir, on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, who has gone to perform his functions at the Public Accounts Committee, I would ask leave of the House to introduce on tomorrow, a bill, "An Act To Establish A Municipal Grant System."

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend, Revise And Consolidate The Law Respecting Social Assistance."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Motor Carrier Act." A bill, "An Act To Amend The Automobile Insurance Act." And on behalf of my colleague, the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: I have the answer to another question here, this is No. 216, Mr. Speaker, the member for LaPoile, this is relative to the settlement with the contractors and owner-operators in Goose Bay, and the amount of wood and so on. There are several others which I have got here, but they do not seem to be quite complete. I will have them ready for tomorrow. Thank you.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. I wonder if he in his capacity as President of Treasury Board could the minister tell us whether or not there has been any discussions between Treasury Board and the NAPE Unit at Waterford since the events of yesterday in what is transpiring there at the moment?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members are aware the negotiating team on management side as well as on the union side met yesterday. Subsequent to that the union held a meeting and at that time the membership decided to reject the mediator's report. There has been no discussions subsequent to that between the union and management. Quite honestly, I have been searching, and my colleagues have been searching, for something or some way in which we can discuss, and how to discuss it, and where to take it. Quite honestly I am speaking on behalf of government, at this particular point I am at a loss. The terms of reference for the mediation were quite clear and were complied with. The mediator came in with what appeared, on the surface of it at least and certainly even on deeper consideration even more so, to be an honest attempt to find an equitable solution. As I have said publicly and can say now that there are many items in there which the mediator had suggested which government would never have agreed to across a bargaining table, particularly the automatic step increase which can be quite expensive, particularly if

Mr. Doody:

it is applied to other institutions and hopefully it will not be, and call back pay, overtime, and various other areas. But, as I said yesterday in the House, we are willing in the interest of getting the strike settled make these concessions.

The union unfortunately once again has not made any concessions, to the best of my knowledge they have agreed to none of the mediator's suggestions, and they rejected the whole thing out of hand. The meeting could not have taken more than an hour and a half yesterday because the reports were back here into the House; the meeting was scheduled to start at 2:30 and by about 4:00 o'clock we had reports that it had been rejected.

So quite honestly I can only tell the hon. member and the House that I honestly do not know where we go from here. I do not know what recourse is open to us. Those of us who have read the report can see that Mr. Hart has looked at the thing in depth, and it can also be seen, I think on study why - I guess is not why, but I guess the answer is to a question raised by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) yesterday following my short statement as to why such a compromise had not been achieved before - I think it is demonstrated in this report why such a compromise have not been achieved before. Mr. Hart demonstrates the fact very forcefully that it is impossible to achieve a collective agreement when one side goes in with a precondition on which all other parts of the subsequent agreement are to be predicated. He warns us about getting ourselves into such a box, and warns about the difficulties of getting into what he refers to as a Hobson's choice position.

I do not know what I can add to that, Sir, I sincerely hope that some position can be opened up whereby we can get back at the thing and get it organized. I heard Mr. Locking say that they had made their position clear, and the next step was up to government. I do not know how many more steps government can really take. We have accepted the report in its totality; the union has rejected it in its totality. I would humbly suggest that the next move is

Mr. Doody:

really up to the unit to let us know where they stand, and what they are prepared to -

MR. NEARY: A secret ballot would not be a bad idea either, you know.

MR. DOODY: You know, this is one of the options. I understand that the membership were offered the option of a secret ballot. But they were offered the option of a secret ballot and a stand up vote which -

MR. MURPHY: Did not the Opposition get that bill here the other day?

MR. DOODY: No, it is kind of a different principle.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is no difference.

MR. DOODY: The principle of the secret ballot as outlined or suggested by the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau),

MR. DOODY: the Minister of Manpower and Labour, is one in which the particular geographic area, or industrial section of the Province is in danger, then the government has the right to ask the union to conduct a secret ballot. In this particular case we are not even going that far. We are not even suggesting that the -

MR. NEARY: You would think they would take the initiative themselves and hold a secret ballot.

MR. DOODY: That would be my suggestion, but when management makes suggestions such as that and makes them publicly then of course one is accused of interfering in union business.

MR. NEARY: That is true.

MR. DOODY: And when you try to help on that side you get your fingers chopped for telling the union how to conduct its business, and if you try it the other way then you are being indifferent and you are not trying to do anything to resolve the dispute so -

MR. NEARY: It would be very wise to do it.

MR. DOODY: I think the union would be and I think the union membership are really the ones who have got to take the initiative here and protect their own rights because, as I said in this House and I am sure it must be quite obvious to everybody, that it is the union membership are the ones who are really bearing the brunt of this thing and I really feel - I know it might sound like crocodile tears, but I mean it sincerely - I feel very, very badly on behalf of all these people who have been on the street all this time. And what have they got to show for it? How can they possibly hope to recoup from it? It is a frustration and in answer to the hon. member's question, I do not know where government goes from here. I honestly do not. I wish I did.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I can say to the minister that we on this side certainly appreciate the dilemma that the government finds itself in. Now I realize from reports that the union has rejected the mediator's report in total but could the minister tell us whether

MR. RIDEOUT: or not there will be any efforts made in an attempt to get both sides together to see whether or not there have been some agreement on some points and possibly continue discussions in other areas? Is there any effort being made by Treasury Board to get the two sides together once again, at least to see whether or not there is any common ground following the mediator's report?

MR. DOODY: As I indicated a moment ago, Sir, government - I should not say government although it really is government - the management section and the union have sat down and gone over the thing in detail prior to the union meeting and were in agreement on all the principles that were set forth so that neither side could say that our understanding was thus and so and the other person's understanding was so and so and come to some false or misleading impression of what the report contained. And we are also cognizant of the fact of course that anything - I find this extremely difficult. But anyway we have also got to be cognizant of the fact that all these things are subject to the Anti-inflation Board and this is another complication but of course the Anti-inflation Board and its agreement with the Province of Newfoundland and with the other provinces was an agreement that was in effect prior to the strike and prior to the subsequent negotiations and prior to the mediator's report, and so this was also discussed and a matter of concern to everybody. But it is a real item and it is one that I think even adds more urgency to the union membership realizing what the facts of life are, however unfortunate they might be, and try to find a way of getting the situation back in gear. As to the question has government approached the union since yesterday to ask them if there is something, the answer is no. No, we have not. We have been hoping that given a day to mull it over and think it over that the union people might come up with some ideas or some suggestions, because without trying to sound pompous or humptious or



MR. DOODY:        what have you, it is literally true that every  
move that has been made in this thing from the beginning has been  
made from this side. The union, quite honestly, has not budged an  
inch from their original position and the original position  
was the constabulary pension thing, except for that one point  
along the way in which they said that as of

MR. DOODY: 1971 we put in a temporary plan and then we will review it later. Well, I guess everybody including the union executive and the membership knows that once you apply or give to any group a concession as large as that it would be very, very difficult indeed to remove it the following year in another set of negotiations. I think it would be naive for anyone to pretend otherwise. And apart from that bit of icing on the cake there has not been a move from that side. And I think in the interest of collective bargaining eventually, unless we make a mockery of the whole system of collective bargaining, the union has got to give somewhere along the line. And the government cannot be on the run completely or we are not going to govern. You know, somebody has got to manage and someone has got to be in the union, and the whole collective bargaining system presupposes give and take on both sides, but I think Mr. Hart outlines that far more eloquently in his statement than I could ever hope to do.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile followed by the hon. member for Eagle River and the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. the Premier is in hearing distance of my voice, but if he is not - if the hon. the Premier is not coming back to the House perhaps the Minister of Finance could answer the question that I would like to put to the Premier, and that is in connection with the hon. Premier's business on the mainland over the last few days, I presume in connection with the Linerboard mill in Stephenville - discussions with companies and firms, I presume, on the mainland to try and find another operator for the Linerboard mill. And no doubt the minister as chairman of the board has discussed this with the hon. the Premier. Can the hon. minister tell us anything about the discussions that the Premier held over the last few days on the mainland in Toronto and Montreal in connection with the Linerboard mill, or for that matter in connection with the rumours that the St. Lawrence mine is also going to close down? Were there any discussions in connection with trying to avert the closing of the St. Lawrence mine or the Linerboard mill at Stephenville?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY:

On the second part first, on the St. Lawrence mine, my understanding is that the Premier did not have discussions when he was on the mainland in that regard although I do believe there are discussions scheduled later on this week between the Minister of Justice and the Premier and the management or owners of the mine. With regard to the Linerboard mill situation, I have as the hon. member suggested, quite naturally discussed it with the Premier since his return. He did have discussions with the Principals of Consolidated Bathurst. There was certainly no constructive or no definitive or final arrangement or agreement arrived at. Indeed I do not think there was even a tentative or even a suggested agreement arrived at. I think they explored the possibility of the company becoming actively involved out there. I do not know how receptive the company was to the idea. I gather from discussing it with the Premier that they were something less than wildly enthusiastic, but I do not think that they have closed the door on it completely. And the Premier had indicated to them and has indicated to us that we should pursue that as vigorously and as actively as we can. I can assure the House that, you know, so we will do, but I would not want to mislead the House and I am sure the Premier would not want me to do so by suggesting that any great optimism was engendered during that meeting with Consolidated Bathurst.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Would the hon. minister tell the House if at this point in time - I think we are now into our second month since it was announced that the Linerboard mill is going to close down, so that only gives the administration say about another four months - does the minister see any reason at this point in time to have an extension of the closedown of the Linerboard mill or is the administration still on target, still going to close the Linerboard mill at a specific, you know, on a specific date even though the negotiations may continue and may go on for a longer period of time?

MR. DOODY:

Well at this point in time there has been no

MR. DOODY: change in the market conditions or in any other conditions to warrant any change in the announcement that had been made at the time the hon. member suggested, a month or so ago unfortunately. And with that in mind we are keeping on that proposed target date. In the meantime, of course we have been pursuing not only talks with Consolidated Bathurst but with other companies and will continue to do so, and we are pursuing all possible avenues of either management agreement with a company, a sale, a disposal of some sort or management agreement of some sort. To date we have not been able to achieve that, but we have not given up hopes. We have not given up the desire or the intent of trying to do that, but we have nothing of a positive nature to indicate that the target date that

MR. DOODY: has been set should be changed or will be changed. I sincerely hope that something comes up to make us change that.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister then tell the House if the Premier, during his visit to the mainland, just held discussions with one company or was there more companies than Consolidated Bathurst involved? Did the Premier meet with the parent company, the Power Corporation of Canada, and Consolidated Bathurst? And what other companies did the hon. gentleman meet with during his three day visit?

MR. DOODY: I can only say for certain that the Premier met with the principals of Consolidated Bathurst. I do not know whether there were representatives of the Power Corporation at that meeting or not. I do not think there were or I probably would have heard it. I cannot say. I think that is something you should ask the Premier.

MR. NEARY: It was only just the one company?

MR. DOODY: To the best of my knowledge the Premier went there specifically to discuss it with Consolidated.

MR. NEARY: There are no other bids on the linerboard mill?

MR. DOODY: There have been some people in the Province talking to us during the past several weeks. They have gone back to assess the situation and have asked us not to reveal their name or identity until they get an opportunity to look into it further. We will be in touch with them and they will be back in the Province again. But as to the Premier's trip,

MR. DOODY: for further information on the Premier's trip, I think the questions would be best directed to him because I do not want to make a misleading statement or to mislead the House or indeed, to misquote the Premier.

MR. NEARY: Well, will the Premier be making a formal statement in the House on this, Sir?

MR. DOODY: I really have no idea. I think that that is something that you should address to the Premier.

MR. NEARY: He is not here.

MR. DOODY: I know.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I have recognized another hon. gentleman. This will not preclude the hon. the member for LaPoile from getting back in later on, but I have recognized the hon. gentleman from Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: In the absence of the Minister of Transportation and the Premier, and because I have previously asked the Minister of Finance the question, I will direct it to him. Yesterday in the House I asked the Minister of Transportation a question concerning the replacement for the Carson. The Ambrose Shea, which I heard over the weekend was going to replace the Carson - and the minister indicated the Ambrose Shea would not be replacing the Carson, that that vessel would not be coming off the run to go on the Labrador run - a few hours after he had replied absolutely that he stated there was no replacement except the Marine Transport and a couple of other charter vessels which are replacing it, that the Ambrose Shea would not be coming off the Argentinia run to go elsewhere in the Province, that up to that time there was no replacement at all. What I am stating is that a few hours later

MR. STRACHAN: than that - and I had heard the day before that the Ambrose Shea would be coming off - the statement then was made that the Ambrose Shea would then be doing the Labrador run.

What I am asking the minister this time; since the people in Goose Bay are in desperate straits and are looking for assistance and advice and so on, could the minister indicate to us whether this administration is making a real attempt, and I mean this time a real attempt, to pressure the CN or Ottawa as well, to come to a speedy decision as to the compensation or liability for the accident, or some form of compensation if we have to wait for a judgement case, in case of enquiry, which can take up to many years in Marine Law? Can we indicate anything to them? Or else three quarters of the businessmen will be out of business, there is no question about it whatsoever. The cash flow has stopped and they are in trouble.

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

MR. DOODY: Certainly, Sir, I can speak on behalf of the administration in saying that we will do everything we possibly can to put all the pressure that can be put on CN, and indeed, are so doing now. What the ultimate result of that will be, I suppose, as the hon. gentleman has mentioned, could depend on (a) the attitude of CN and whether it recognizes the liability. If it does not then we are going to get into the Marine Law area which is indeed a very vague and wonderful and ponderous process for arriving at a decision. But certainly I am not in a position to speak for either CN or the Government of Canada in that regard, but I am in a position to speak for the administration and I can assure hon. members that

MR. DOODY: everything that this government can possibly do to speed up the process and to get a decision out of the people responsible, that is being done and will be pursued very vigourously.

As to the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications saying that the Ambrose Shea would not be going on that run, if the hon. member says that he did so say, then I certainly will not argue with him. All I can say is that I did not hear him say that, but if he did, then obviously he was incorrect and did not have the information.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: A question for the Minister of Fisheries. Is the Minister of Fisheries in a position to tell me now whether the lobster fishermen on the Port au-Port Peninsula were wiped out in a storm two weeks ago



Mr. J. Hodder:

when, I believe, there was a storm a couple of weeks previous to that, if they will be receiving compensation for the loss of their equipment?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated to the House that there is no ongoing programme of assistance to assist the fishermen who lose fishing gear, lobster pots. I told the House some days ago that officials of the department would be investigating the loss, and if there is any kind of assistance that we can render certainly we will only be too happy to do so. But I am told as well that up to the present time even the fishermen themselves, because of certain conditions in the area, are unable to give a full assessment of their loss. But certainly once we find out what the situation is then we will be talking to Ottawa, and if indeed assistance is possible we will certainly render it.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. HODDER: I was just wondering if the minister was aware that a group, I think it was the Federal people are doing a survey of the losses on the gear in that area. The investigation has stopped about half way through, I do not know the reason for this, but I am told that for some dispute or other that they are no longer surveying the damage.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the fact that the Federal people were undertaking a study down there or at least trying to assess the damage, losses. But I am told that the ice is still in close to the shores; this has made it I suppose pretty well impossible for the fishermen or indeed anyone to give a true assessment of what happened. But certainly I will look into that matter, and if in fact they have discontinued their investigation for no apparent reason then certainly I will make representation to them with a view

Mr. W. Carter:

to having the investigation carried on.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans, followed by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. FLIGHT: My question is for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. I wonder is the minister in a position to tell us exactly now when the spruce budworm - when the experimental spray programme will start; the date, if he is in the position to tell us?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the exact date, but it will be sometime within the next two week period according to the development of the budworm - it has been determined now from the field tests that have been done that it will be sometime in the next two week period. But the exact date is never known, except for a couple of days beforehand. We know the appropriate time in the year of the development but until the last field test is made then there is no exact date set.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the minister indicate to the House if it is already indicated that the programme will start within the next two weeks or during the next week. Is all of the apparatus and manpower, equipment, airplanes and what have you in place ready to do the spray programme now?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge everything is in place, ready to go.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile followed by the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing but bad news these days about the closing down of mines in Newfoundland. We hear Buchans is going to close down in less than two years, sixteen months from now, and now there are very strong reports that the St. Lawrence mine is

Mr. Neary:

going to close down. Would the Minister of Mines and Energy tell the House if these rumours, these reports in the press and radio and on the media are correct? And if so, what steps is the minister and the government taking to try and avert the closing down of the St. Lawrence mine?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, there are indications and firm indications concerning the Buchans situation as all hon. members know. There is also a fairly firm indications that a new mine might be opening up in the Makkovik-Kitts area in the next couple of years. There are some very promising mineral occurrences in Central Newfoundland that should realize themselves into mines over the next couple of years. So as well as a number of phase outs there are also a number of hopeful signs on the mineral scene in the next couple of years.

Secondly, as far as the St. Lawrence situation is concerned, we do not know that the St. Lawrence mines are going to close down. We understand and have been informed by the company that they are doing some studies as it relates to the future of the mine, and that they will be informing us of the progress of these studies. And I understand that in the next few days it is possible that some more information from the company might be forthcoming to government.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's answer was rather frivolous there in the beginning. Sir, it is a very serious matter. Would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House if any discussions have taken place prior to the reports that came out today in

Mr. Neary.

today's press if any discussions have taken place with the minister and with the administration in connection with closing the mine at St. Lawrence? Is there any threat that it is going to close down? Or are these just rumours, you know? The minister should give the House, the people, the information.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have given the House on a number of occasions information relating to the St. Lawrence situation, and it is untrue for the hon. member to indicate otherwise. The situation is that they are reassessing the future of the mine in St. Lawrence, that the possibility exists that it will close down, that the possibility exists that it will stay open, that the studies are going ahead to determine which of those possibilities might be probabilities and might be realities, and that they will be coming to us with the results of those studies very soon.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister indicate then just what the problems are? Is there anyway that the government can help? Is the company looking for subsidies of any kind? What is it that the company requires of government, of the people of this Province to keep that mind operating, if anything? They must be asking the government for assistance of some kind. What form of assistance are they asking the government for?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the studies that are going on are studies within the company and until we have a full report from the company as it relates to those studies,

Mr. Peckford.

I am not in a position to indicate whether in fact the company is asking for any assistance from government.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister indicate to the House then that in the event that a decision is taken to close that mine over the next few days when the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Mines and Energy meet with the company, will the government immediately appoint a task force as they did in the case of Buchans to move in to see if alternative employment can be found for the people in that community, what the possibilities are of getting new industry in the St. Lawrence area?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: The hon. Minister of Justice, the member for the area, has been on this matter for quite a number of months with me as well as the hon. Premier. We are, as always if an eventuality is an unfortunate one that there is a close down, we will do everything in our power as a government to assist the people as we do in like situations in other parts of the Province.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is a supplementary in the sense that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) mentioned Buchans and it is relative to what he has been talking about here for the last couple of minutes. Would the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy indicate to the House as to whether or not they have received any additional information from American Smelting and Refining Company or Price (Nfld.) with regards to the mining potential, updated reports on ore bodies or new findings? And rather than ask

Mr. Flight.

supplementaries, while he is indicating this would he indicate to the House also whether or not the Cabinet have made any decisions as to their course of action in Buchans as a result of the various meetings that have been held this past month or so?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: The first part of the question:

There are ongoing discussions and contacts between ASARCO and Price and the Department of Mines and Energy, and I am sure that they will continue daily and weekly and monthly as the year progresses. And as that information becomes available and is assessed by government we will be indicating what that information is to the people of the Province through the House, if it is open, if not, through the media in the first instance. Secondly, the matter of Buchans, an action that government will be taking is under study by Cabinet and when I am in a position to give more detailed information, I will so do.

MR. SPEAKER: A final question by the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: BRINEX have indicated that they are looking for miners or they were trying to build up a work force for the Kitts-Michelin uranium deposit should they go ahead, and all indications are they will, and they are looking for people from the Island part portion, Will the people from Buchans be given preference in this? Will the government be making representation to them to make sure that the miners from that area will be relocated into Happy Valley - Goose Bay, for instance, to work the mines there? And is this an ongoing discussion with BRINEX

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines  
and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: The question presumes that the  
Buchans operation is going to close down, which is a presumption.  
It is not altogether valid at this point in time. But as  
usual where qualified people exist in a given occupation  
and there is a demand somewhere else, government, of course,  
will divert and try to assist people from one area to  
another when they are looking for jobs and have not got  
employment in their own areas.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Members' Day  
we proceed to Motion 14.

If the hon. member speaks now  
he closes the debate.

MR. MURPHY: I am sorry I am so short, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Environment.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, this is a very interesting topic. Perhaps it is about fifty years too late as far as I am concerned. But I would like to say just a few short words on it and in doing so I am just wondering at this present time, and I do not know if the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) would have statistics that I would like to know. I can go back some fifty years ago when I started work with a firm on Water Street, a pension I think was something that was unknown at the time. We dealt with what was happening at that particular moment in time. No one worried too much; whether they worried or not it did not do much good because I do not know if there were any pension plans in existence at the time. I can go back to my own particular case where I started work in 1929. I did work with three commercial firms and I had not a cent of pension accrued until 1956 when I went to work with a life insurance company, and then in 1962 when we came into the House of Assembly where we did have a pension plan.

MR. NEARY: What is that button the hon. gentleman is wearing?

MR. MURPHY: I am an alert consumer.

MR. NEARY: What is the other one?

MR. MURPHY: And on this one here, "Consumer" - I cannot read it. That is a federal one, "Consumer aware," not beware. They opened the thing down at City Hall today. This was my official uniform for the opening.

MR. NEARY: You have more buttons in your coat than money in your pockets.

MR. MURPHY: I have more buttons than that too.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the matter of pensions, of course, as we go back over the years and we recall many people that today and in recent years have gone out at the age of sixty-five with not perhaps a five cent piece as a pension



MR. MURPHY: due them from any firms, basically retired at the will of the firm they work with and they might give me \$10 a month and they might give another fellow \$15 a month, and another fellow \$20 a month, whatever the case may be; in other words it was at the pleasure of the employer that you did work with.

Now as far as this motion is concerned I think it is a very worthwhile matter to discuss. What this House of Assembly's authority is to impose pension plans on private firms and looking again at the fact that in recent years - and I say recent and I mean quite recently, in the past ten or fifteen years, where most of the people working are organized into some type of labour union and I think basically that most of these unions have as their fringe benefits pension plans. I do not know how many people today that are not covered under a pension plan. And I am just speaking again from the little knowledge I do have, I believe any enterprise today, and I am talking about contractors this type of thing, where there is a four per cent deduction or a contribution from the employer towards vacation pay - I believe that applies in the case of contractors, this type of thing, where you do not have what we used to call in the old days, a steady job but you had jobs working at different types of work - but whether there is or it is possible to put some kind of a compulsion there on that type of person to have a pension plan, I do not know. I do not know what the similar legislation is in effect in any other provinces. But to those again I

MR. MURPHY: say that looking back over the years and thinking of people coming out today, in many cases with the benefits today many people will be far better off at the age of sixty-five than they were at the age of forty or forty-five. Because we do have the old age pension, we do have the Canada Pension Plan and we do have in many instances private pension plans. But what happens to the person who does not have a private pension plan? He will get his old age pension and he will get his Canada Pension. If that is sufficient or not I do not know, but as a life insurance agent I have sold many pension plans to various firms within the city, and tragically, I have found to my surprise and disappointment that many employees use these pension plans as thrift clubs. In other words, they were in three or four years and then they requested that they withdraw what they had put in to purchase a car or something else. I have been in firms who were very anxious to put a pension plan in their business, and in most cases it worked with a 5 per cent from the employer and 5 per cent from the employee, but I have found in a great many cases that the employees were not too anxious to put their 5 per cent in. In many cases they lived for the day and not for the twenty-five, thirty or forty years hence. Now at my age, where I have a year to go before I become a senior citizen, this matter of pensions is of great moment to me and great importance, but for someone who is twenty or twenty-one or twenty-two years old to look forward for forty-four years to retirement is a sort of unrealistic matter. But I am all for some type of pension plan and I believe that a man who serves a firm for a great number of years is entitled to a pension. And I can only think of my own father who worked some fifty years with a firm. He retired through disability, if you like, at a pension of \$5 a week. He lived for two years on the pension of \$5 a week. His pension, his five dollar bill used to come up every Friday, which was pay day, dropped off at the house. He died on a Thursday. On Friday his \$5 did not come, but two

MR. MURPHY: mass cards at \$1 each. But I think, you know, anybody who has been in the work force here or perhaps anywhere - I cannot localize it here - but anybody who did work with a Water Street firm like I did - as I say I started in 1929; I will be some fifty years working next year - as I say, I did not have one cent of accrued pension due me until the year 1956 when I went to work with Mutual Life and 1962 where this pension here perhaps will be the basis of my retirement with the Old Age Pension Plan and the Canada Pension Plan.

We look back fifteen, twenty, twenty-five, thirty years and we are living in two different worlds. Because any of us who have reached the age of sixty can look back and think thirty-five, forty years ago when we saw someone fifty years old we would want to know what the heck they were doing out at a dance or something like this - they should be home making their soul. I think that was the old way, you know, which we took for granted. But today as we look around we have become used to so many comforts of life, at the age of sixty-five - and I use sixty-five because it is a basic retirement date - your regular monthly, weekly or bi-monthly salary ceases, but that is about all. That is about the only change. You get a pension which might be a fraction one way or the other of your salary. But most people today have a motor car, they are still driving a car. Most people have a home and in many cases they are still paying off mortgages at that age. We have many comforts that we did enjoy at the age when we were working with a lot more money to pay for it. So very little things change; only the actual amount of the cheque, whether you get from the Canada Pension Plan, the old age pension as against the fairly comfortable cheque you are getting when you are working.

So, the need for pension plans is quite important, Sir, I would say. I am all in favour of pensions, but again, I am just wondering how

MR. MURPHY: in today's age we would introduce compulsory pensions. We have them in, I think, every area of the civil service - whether it be federal or provincial there is a pension. There is a lot of talk of course about whether they are funded or one thing or other, and this just makes me laugh when I hear the fact that the pension plan is not funded by a government department. You know, it is just a red herring so big that it really smells, because once you work with government and you are guaranteed a pension at the age of sixty-five, whether they put your \$2 in a box there under the counter or not every time you put your 5 per cent in does not make the least bit of difference in the world, because when you reach sixty-five you are guaranteed your pension is there. With private firms it is altogether different where they have to get a third party to set up a plan for them. The employee and employer put in their money, they will go to a life insurance company or a trust company and say, 'Look, we want to guarantee our employees a pension at the age of so and so.' So an agreement is drawn to say, Yes,

Mr. Murphy:

you put in X dollars, you put in X dollars and when that gentleman who is now twenty-five reaches the age of sixty-five here is what this pension plan will pay. It is guaranteed. There are different types of pension plans, Some have a five year certainty; in other words, you live for five years you will get the full pension; if you die within the five years someone gets it for five years. Some are ten years certain. In other words, your pension at the age of sixty-five if you die after three years, seven years is paid to your beneficiary or it could be without any certain or forever, which would be slightly less, In other words, you live to the age of one hundred you would still get your pension. These are private pension plans.

So what you are doing actually is, as they say, making today's dollars work to cut today's dollars for tomorrow. So what you are doing when your high earning period is on you take money out of your salary to put towards the pension plan so that when the time is reached where your earnings are decreased and your pension, you will have saved in the fruitful days to provide for the days that are less fruitful. As I say on this again that I think today that pretty well every union in a part of their agreement have pension plans, and I think it is compulsory that they do. The fringe benefits are a big thing today, like hospital and medical benefits, and I think pension plans should be a very important part of that particular plan when you go to work with people.

Of course, as we go back again, some years ago when you started work with a firm you pretty well worked their all of your life. Things have changed again where you have different employers today, but that does not make any difference because if you can build up your pension at, say, Ayre and Sons for eight years that pension is there for you; you go to Bowrings or another firm that pension is still there for you. And in most cases they are portable. In other words, they are arranging now that you will carry your benefits

Mr. Murphy:

from A firm to B to C to D, so that the monies that you have put into a pension plan provides that pension at retirement age. You have other options; if you want to withdraw from the pension plan you will get your refunds back, and in most cases it is at 5 per cent interest. And another favourable benefit, of course, is income tax deductible. In other words, in your high earning period you can deduct, I think it is something like \$2,500 today, I am not quite sure, on the Income Tax Act, but up to \$2,500 as an income tax deductible item.

So it helps particularly when I look at my hon. friends, the young lawyers there who are self-employed in many cases it gives them a chance to provide their own pension plan -

MR. NEARY: There is not a lawyer here now.

MR. MURPHY: I am looking at the hon. gentleman at the table.

MR. NEARY: No, the hon. gentleman is not a lawyer.

MR. HICKMAN: The shortest man at the table.

MR. MURPHY: At the table - are you not lawyers, gentleman? If so you are under false pretenses.

MR. FLIGHT: I thought you thought I was a lawyer for a minute.

MR. NEARY: There is no way you can juggle it.

MR. MURPHY: And, of course, the hon. and distinguished gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) the mover of this great motion, who has got to be the outstanding one, he represents many great firms, I understand.

MR. NEARY: Including Stares Electrical.

MR. MURPHY: But, Mr. Speaker, to get back to this, a pension plan today is no longer a fringe benefit, as we used to call it one time. I believe it is a necessity. It has got to be compulsory in some way or another. How we do it? How do we impose on any private individual and say, Look you must provide a pension plan. And when I say on a private individual, we go right around the circle and we are imposing that on the consumer. Because any firm that is in business,

Mr. Murphy:

and let us not forget the fact, that spends extra money on any expense - whether it is painting their store, putting new fixtures in or providing benefits to their employee - in the long run who is going to pay it? The guy or lady that goes in over the counter and spends their dollar. Because they are making a certain profit on their business, and once they take another 4 per cent out they add that back on their overall costs, of course. They put it back, and a cent a pound on many items would give them the money to pay the pension.

"Whereas the hardship wrought to persons so coming to the end of their productive years and being retired without the right to pensions ought not to be tolerated by society." Now that is a very strong expression, and I would say a very commendable one. But again, how practical is it? And what machinery can we use for me or anybody else in this House to go across to anybody, any firm doing business - and do we limit it? What about the firm employing one or two persons? I know in certain areas - and I am not sure; some years ago I checked - I think anybody with ten employees or more - and I do not know what the hon. member has checked on the background - that a firm with ten employees or more must provide a pension plan for retirement.

So it is a very, very interesting subject, I am sure, for other members of the House and particularly those representing industrial areas. I think the member for Baie-Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) would find the mines would have their own pension plan. Has Buchans got one, 'Graham'? You know, so basically these had been built in as a part, but, you know, how many people, I wonder, -

MR. FLIGHT: Only a small minority.

MR. MURPHY: What?

MR. FLIGHT: A very small minority of the population works in those industrialized areas.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, but I am just saying, I wonder how many are not - what is the word in labour? - organized, outside that do not have - and I think basically these are the ones that we have got to look after in many cases, because the labour unions as such, you know, do assure on behalf of members, you know - and I can go back, when I joined the Clerks Union on Water Street. I was second vice-president in 1937, and we had one of the largest unions in the country then, because we had every store on Water Street with a tremendous number of employees who were members at that time.

MR. FLIGHT: I thought you were a capitalist.

MR. MURPHY: What?

MR. FLIGHT: I thought you were a capitalist.

MR. MURPHY: Me?

MR. FLIGHT: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: My darling fellow, I have more experience in labour than all the crowd here only I do not shoot off my mouth about it. I am not that type. I am a very retiring, humble type, like the Premier and the former Premier, a humble gentleman, you know. But, you know, as I say, my background, I remember attending a Federation of Labour meeting. The first one I attended was at the Newfoundland Hotel in 1937, and a gentleman who we honoured last year at Corner Brook, Mr. Harry Oxford who worked with Bowaters for years, he was given an honorary degree by the university out there. He was the president at the time. And I think back on some of these people in these days in the labour union, and I look at some of the labour leaders today and we can see and thank God that we had fellows like Bill Gillis and Ron Fahey And Nish Jackman and all these people who I would say worked without a five cent piece.

MR. NEARY: Do you know that his brother is retiring after fifty years of service? Father Jackman on Sunday coming is retiring.



MR. MURPHY: Oh, yes. I am on the committee.

MR. NEARY: Are you?

MR. MURPHY: He is my Parish Priest for three months of the year.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. MURPHY: That is, on the nineteenth, by the way, not this Sunday.

MR. NEARY: The nineteenth?

MR. MURPHY: Mass is on the nineteenth. The actual celebration is the twenty-sixth. Any other information?

MR. NEARY: He is a lower Bell Islander, boy.

MR. MURPHY: He is a good Bell Islander. And I guess the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will be there. I do not know if he will be allowed in or not after deserting the people on Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Is there any chance of getting in on the celebrations?

MR. MURPHY: Oh, yes.

MR. NEARY: I imagine they would be pretty good.

MR. MURPHY: Come up to the pool, and we will have a swim first and then go down after.

MR. NEARY: No, no. I am afraid that I might get the blue bottle fly.

MR. MURPHY: You do not drink champagne.

But, Mr. Speaker, again, you know, how will this thing work? As I say, the idea is wonderful. It is a tremendous idea. I think, as far as I say, as far as I am concerned - I would not wait for next year to retire, I would be gone about four years ago if I had to have a pension plan from the time I started work, as I say, in 1928, 1929. And it is something, I think, that is a part of society today. And without some form of pension - I do not know how long the old age pension is going to last. I would say that within the next three or four years

Mr. Murphy.

the federal government will be taking a long, hard look at continuing what we know now as the old age pension. Because I believe when they brought in the Canada Pension Plan, which is contributory, I would say that eventually they hope that that will replace what we call the universal old age pension plan. Because when we look at that plan, perhaps it got to be the most stupid thing in the world for people at sixty-five - and they could still be earning \$10,000, \$15,000, \$25,000, \$30,000 a year and still get the old age pension where there are other people with not a cent to their name still only getting the same amount of money, because it is a universal pension plan. So I will say that within the not too distant future the old age pension plan as we know it will be gone and we will be basically on the Canada Pension Plan and that gives some people a chance. But for people, such as housewives who marry and do not continue in the working force, it is a bit difficult on them. But when I was Minister of Welfare - and this comes under Mark LaLonde, pensions - we were looking at that, that she should be as much entitled, because she is doing a job for the community, for the family as well as someone else that is out working in the commercial area.

MR. RIDEOUT: You will always have to have old age security.

MR. MURPHY: In a measure. But I think it might be changed somewhat.

MR. RIDEOUT: Oh, yes.

MR. MURPHY: I think this universality might be gone, you know.

So, Mr. Speaker, again, as I say, I do not want to spend too long on the matter, but -

MR. NEARY: He started and he does not know how to stop.

MR. MURPHY: What?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman got started, and he does not know how to stop.

MR. MURPHY: No, I think I have said just what - because I am not in possession of any of the machinery that would put me into motion. I was not here for the hon. gentleman's speech unfortunately when he introduced the bill to hear what his thoughts were on it, and I did not hear anybody else. I do not know how many hon. members have spoken to the bill. But I am sure that it is something that is of great, vital concern. But the actual mechanics of imposing a compulsory pension plan on employers, whatever the case might be, and on the employee - and a lot of them will not want to contribute money for it because today we have an attitude in a lot of places, you know, let Joe do it and, you know, I will get my old age pension from someone else so they figure that the taxpayers as a whole will do it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favour of this plan, and I am quite frankly, quite curious as to anyone who has any ideas on it and how the thing might work.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may have but a brief two or three words on this very commendable resolution of the hon. member for St. John's East. It is a fact that pensions are becoming much more topical, and the right to pensions, than heretofore. All we have to do is read the progress and learn of the progress, hear the progress that is being made from time to time in the field of collective bargaining and whereas up to three or four years ago when once the wage package was settled everyone went home, if you could get an extra statutory holiday or a few hours overtime all to the good, today it is becoming increasingly apparent that pensions certainly enjoy equal status insofar as the people of this Province are concerned as wages. And that is as it should be. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons for it is that we are moving more and more toward early retirement. It will not be long now before we will have, in my opinion, compulsory retirement at age 60.

Many types of employment provide for retirement at a much earlier age even now. Traditionally members of the police forces, members of the fire department and employees of the penitentiary go to pension after twenty-five years service unless they have had promotions during that time, which means that men and women are leaving the labour force and leaving their occupation at a very early age, quite often at a time when their families are still dependent and when they still have not finished paying for their homes and when they are in a position where they are still big spenders and need money to live the kind of life that active people enjoy. All of which places a much greater emphasis on pension, and the desire and the demand of people that they be adequately secured.

Taken in its proper perspective and to its proper conclusion, the employer should in my opinion encourage and establish the kind of portable pension that most people need.

MR. NEARY: If I had the heart I would call a quorum but I have not got the heart.

MR. HICKMAN: And I know that the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), he cannot get up. If he is as tired as I am and as hot I am he would not be able to get on his feet to call a quorum, let alone walk out.

MR. NEARY: I am beat. I am really beat. I have not got the heart to do it today.

MR. HICKMAN: But, Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make is this, that pensions depend to a large extent on the earning capacity of the employee during his productive years. And obviously if you have an attractive pension scheme it augers well for productivity during the working years of an employee, and again the beneficiary, if you want to look at it selfishly, is the employer, as well as providing the benefits for the employee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose whenever anyone goes into public life he always has two or three pet little projects that he would like to see implemented. I had three when I went in,

MR. HICKMAN: and I was told that all three were impossible. One was to bring deep-sea fishermen under the jurisdiction of the Workmen's Compensation Board; another was to provide appeals from decisions of the Workmen's Compensation Board, because I have been aware of some shocking inequities that have been inflicted upon people; and the third was a piece of legislation similar to what is envisaged in this resolution. I succeeded in two of my pet projects but could never find a formula whereby the third one, the one we are debating today, could be fully implemented. Because, Mr. Speaker, whilst I have no hesitancy in supporting a petition which urges the government to take immediate steps to bring in legislation, and whilst we would most assuredly as a government heed the urgings of this hon. House in that respect, no one should feel that great difficulty will not be encountered in drafting legislation to provide the kind of plan that will be as embracing as it should be and as embracing as the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) would like to see it. For instance, Mr. Speaker, I would assume that any legislation dealing with this kind of pension would have to build into it a form of financial guarantee on the part of the Province, because we are not dealing here with the large corporations.

Most large corporations in Newfoundland, as a result of union negotiations or as a result of their ability to pay or for any number of reasons, have pretty good pensions either through insurance companies or they are self insurers. Governments have their pensions so that the public servant and the employee in larger corporations really need not be concerned about this kind of legislation. What we are dealing with, obviously, is the small employer to a large extent: the shopkeeper in Frenchman's Cove who has two employees, the man who runs the carpentry shop in LaScie who has three employees, whose -

MR. PECKFORD: Nick's Nose Cove. Do not leave out Nick's Nose Cove, Green Bay.

MR. HICKMAN: - which means that the strength of that pension may to a large extent be dependent upon the fiscal strength of the

MR. HICKMAN: small employers, plus the fact that many of the small businesses do not necessarily go bankrupt, but after a few years they move on or go into some other field of endeavour. And that has been the history pretty much throughout this Province. Now what happens when that occurs? True, if there has been any payment paid into a fund the employee gets it back, but that is small compensation to him. This then raises the next question - and I would hope that the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) who has made a very in-depth study of this and can answer some of these questions because it will be of great help to those who have to research and see if there is existing legislation dealing with this kind of problem - and the second question is, Is it possible to pass legislation that would provide for the portability of pensions between, again, these very small employers, or employers with a small number of employees who will have varying pensions, because their ability, their financial ability, will vary from one to the other? These are just two problems that I am sure are not incapable of solution, but two problems that have been studied in the past and the solutions have not been found.

You know, I can speak with some personal experience on this although I do not think I have before, my family was a victim of this very thing that is envisaged in this bill. My late father worked from 1919 to 1965 in a very small company in Grand Bank as a paid employee, and when they decided - the owners; it was a merchant company - they decided that there was a lot of money in surplus, that they were going to wind up the company and distribute it amongst themselves, which was their legal right to do. But they had no pension scheme, so my father, at sixty-five years of age, was called in and given a cheque for \$5,000 which he thought was the most magnificent thing ever happened to him. The only thing he did not realize at the time or did not fully appreciate was that would be the total money that he would have at his disposal for the rest of his years, and fortunately for him they were many. And no one felt - and this is what I am talking about;

June 8, 1977

Tape 4013

EC - 3

MR. HICKMAN: in the early 1960's or certainly the late 1950's - that there was nothing thought wrong with that. Indeed, it was considered



MR. HICKMAN: an act of supreme generosity that that kind of gratuitous payment could be made to an employee who had spent about forty years with one company and I say it modestly but his efforts made it a very prosperous one for the owners. So that no one needs to convince me, Mr. Speaker, of the wisdom and necessity for the kind of legislation that this resolution envisages, but I do say to this House that we would be very unwise indeed if we thought that by simply passing this resolution that there will appear on tomorrow a piece of legislation which will be capable of embracing all of the philosophy that is contained in this bill. But that does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that we do not have an obligation to try because I am sure that the reasoning that was advanced some years ago when I first asked people to inquire into it in 1967 may not prevail today. Because I was told the same thing with respect to Workman's Compensation for deep-sea fishermen, that it could not work, there was no way that it would be actuarially sound and that it would wipe out the disaster fund. But a formula was found, none of the dreadful things ever happened and today people believe that it has been around forever. And I am sure that with that same approach, and if we approach it from a positive point of view and if our actuarial experts approach it with the understanding that they have to find the formula and not with the idea that they should see how many reasons why they cannot do it, then I believe, Mr. Speaker, we will find that before too many sessions of this House has passed, and hopefully at the next session of this legislature, there will be presented to hon. members by government a bill that will meet the requirements of this resolution and if we do then all of us will be very grateful indeed for the leadership shown by the hon. member for St. John's East in bringing this resolution so properly before the legislature of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon member for Port-de-Grave.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to rise and support in

MR. DAWE: principle this bill as brought in by the hon. member for St. John's East. And the question that I was going to ask is the question just raised by the hon. Minister of Justice, what would happen if any small businesses we have throughout the Province should decide to go out of business, or for some reason through financial means or some other means decide to close down? Would that be the end of their pension?

I can cite in my own district several instances, as was mentioned by the hon. Minister of Justice, but I am sure that if ways and means could be found, even if it has to be supported some way by the provincial government, it is a bill that would receive wide appeal and support throughout the Province. And I do trust that the Minister of Justice, as he suggested, probably in the next session or the session after some ways and means can be found to bring this legislation into law. But I do wish to compliment the hon. member for St. John's East. I know many instances in my own district in which the problem has arisen and I am sure as I said that this bill will be received with wide appeal throughout the Province. I do trust probably in the next session or sometime in the not too distant future that the problems as raised by the Minister of Justice could in some way be resolved and I say that this bill could be enacted into law.

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

The hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, relating to some of the questions that rose today and rose last week, I would first of all like to draw again to the attention of the House that this type of legislation that is being envisaged is not legislation that would be passed for the first time in Canada. I appreciate the Minister of Justice's concern in 1967 because they are the same concerns as a lot of other people, but since that time there has been legislation passed, and it has been passed in other provinces of Canada. I have here material that his legislation draftsmen can avail of, the Pensions Benefit Act of Ontario. There is a similar Act in Quebec a Pensions Benefit Act of Saskatchewan and Alberta. And these are Acts that are passed that have required and encouraged private businesses to maintain pension plans for their employees.

The answer to the question, what if small businesses go out of business? Will that be the end of the pension? The answer to that is an unequivocal, no. Because this is one of the reasons for the enactment of the legislation itself. Because what has happened is that people have been pensioned with, in some cases, a pittance, but even in the case of the pittance the company goes out of existence and cannot afford to pay the pension to the retired person and that itself is a real tragedy because then they are passed the retirement stage. And the answer to it, he does not lose, a person does not lose his benefits; the monies are paid or taken, the employer pays a certain amount, and the employee pays a certain amount. Neither the employer or the employee is to hold that money; that money goes into the hands of a third party, a trust company or an insurance company or what have you, and then that money is invested, and in accordance with the usual manner of paying pensions, in the same way as those who have voluntarily provided pension plans, it is paid out to these people at a certain retirement age.

Mr. Marshall:

Now obviously there would have to be a certain period of time, there has to be, and in these Acts you have a ten year period, and at age forty-five then the pensions are what you would call locked in. So you avoid the situation that was described today by the hon. Minister of Provincial and Consumer Affairs, and he is quite familiar with pensions because of his activity in his private life, that what happens is after a certain period of time at law that these contributions are locked in, so in other words they cannot be withdrawn. So that the pension must be there when they get to a certain age.

Now I do not pretend that legislation of this nature is not without difficulty, and I have done a fair amount of reading on it myself, and as I say I have material that is readily available to the Department of Justice in connection with it.

MR. HICKMAN: Ontario and what other province?

MR. MARSHALL: Ontario, Quebec, Saskatchewan, and Alberta are the provinces. I mean, I got copies of the Acts right here. Now, you know, you are not going to enact any bill that is not going to be without, you know, certain difficulties. And one of the things that was done in Ontario was to make the pensions completely portable. Now I understand from conversations that I have had with concerns on the mainland, the president of one of the larger - well, I suppose the largest trust company in Canada - that in Ontario they had a certain amount of difficulty in applying the portability aspect, that is if somebody leaves Company A and goes to Company B to take his benefits with him and what have you.

AN HON. MEMBER: That sounds like the Auditor General's report, A, B, and C.

MR. MARSHALL: Well Company A, B, and C, and so on.

So there is a certain amount of difficulty involved in enacting, but they did have it enacted, and it can be applied. Certainly the requirement of maintaining compulsory pensions themselves, apart from the portability, is quite easy to enact. As I say it has been enacted

Mr. Marshall:

in other jurisdictions.

Now I have mentioned this matter before, and this resolution is really a plea that it be taken seriously because I do not think that any member of this House, every member of this House realizes what a grave problem it is where people work in a concern for numbers of years and come to the end of their time and are thrown out in effect without a pension. Very often what occurs as well is that you find that persons are retired before, which is even worse almost, they get laid off at age forty-five or fifty because the employers sees that within a few years time they are going to come

MR. MARSHALL: to pensionable age and they cannot bear the responsibility of it so they let the person go after about twenty-five or thirty years of service and that has happened and it is still happening here. So it is absolutely and completely essential.

Now the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) and others wondered about the practicality. The member for LaPoile wondered whether it was possible to administer and said that we had the Canada Pension Plan. But I say that this particular legislation is practical. It is in existence. There has to be certain specific regulations passed and certain specific instances that will have to be met from time to time and all of these acts have envisaged a pension commission, as it were, and a superintendent of pensions that polices these particular pension plans and sees that not only are they maintained in existence but also sees that the investments that the respective funds invest in are sound and give good protection to the people concerned.

It has been suggested in the debate that perhaps this would be a provincial fund and I would like to emphasize that under no account should it be a provincial fund. The plan is, as I say, to give it to insurance companies, trust companies, third parties. Because we have already seen very sadly what has happened with the present provincial pension fund. The monies have gone in and theoretically they have been invested but they have been invested in water and sewerage systems throughout the Island and what have you and the people themselves in the Provincial Government, aside from the fact that the Province of Newfoundland is behind it, which certainly should be protection enough, but intrinsically they have much less protection than a person who is out in a national firm who is protected by a plan such as this. So we have already, as the Minister of Finance has indicated, we have already experienced a great deal of problems with the provincial plan

MR. MARSHALL: in that the monies were not funded many years ago in the past and we are going to have horrendous difficulties in the years to come. And this plan does not envisage in any way the involvement of government from the point of view of expenditure. In every case of this nature there will have to be a certain amount of supervision to see that the act is enforced in the same way as with respect to any other act. But there are no monies to be paid in by the government. The monies are to be paid in by the employer and the employee.

The Minister of Finance when he was speaking mused whether, you know, we should send more auditors around the Province. He wondered how necessary it was for government to bring it in or whether we were legislating society out of existence or if this was a function of government to look after every facet of life. I will agree with him that there is too much legislation in this Province. I do not believe, for instance - now, of course, some of this is hindsight - government is getting involved in Crown corporations such as Labrador Linerboard mills. I do not believe in it myself. I think some of us agree now with the government getting involved in Labrador Linerboard mills. I do not agree in government getting involved in even marketing boards that they are involved in, the egg marketing boards and what have you, or many other of the legislation that is being passed. But this is a different thing altogether.

MR. NEARY: What about -

MR. MARSHALL: This is a necessary reform. I beg your pardon?

MR. NEARY: What about we carry this and get it over with.

MR. MARSHALL: No, I want to finish off a few things.

MR. NEARY: If the hon. member would agree, we will all vote for it.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, we will all vote for it but in a few moments.

MR. NEARY: We are all shellshocked. Out of desperation we will vote for it.

MR. MARSHALL: If the hon. member votes with me I suppose it is out of desperation.

MR. NEARY: I would not say that. The hon. gentleman is not quite as nasty as his colleague, the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), not quite. The hon. gentleman should stay away from him though, he may get polluted.

MR. MARSHALL: Anyway, Mr. Chairman, by way of explanation of some of these points, I feel that this is a very necessary reform. It is not looking for a handout for people at all, but really it is a plan that is going to require people to provide for themselves, compulsory provision for themselves. When you get to comparing the Canada Pension Plan and the Old Age Pension, that is all very well to say as the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said, we already have the Canada Pension Plan and the Old Age Pension, that is not sufficient. There is no reason why an employee of one company should have a private pension and an employee of another company not have a private pension, or you know a pension as a result of his work.



MR. MARSHALL: as a result of his work they -  
you know, the same thing. The member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) pointed out it is going to be passed on to the consumer. Well so it may be, but the fact of the matter is, one company is now in business - company X, we will say, is now in business and company Y is in the same business. One maintains a pension plan and now the other does not. And this -

MR. NEARY: Check the highway employees. Are they qualified for pension?

MR. MARSHALL: The what?

MR. NEARY: The highway employees, the casual workers.

MR. MARSHALL: The temporary employees. It is going to be very difficult to have it apply to temporary employees, but it certainly -

MR. NEARY: Yes, but they are permanent. They are permanent temporary employees.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, but all employees are in the employ of an employer for a period - this is the way these other acts go - that are in an employ for a period of six months then start making their contributions towards their pensions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have answered all of the points. I just want to recommend and bring to the attention of the Minister of Justice that this particular legislation does exist. It exists in other provinces. It most certainly should exist here. This is, I think, the second or third time I have brought it up in the House, and the purpose of the resolution is really a plea that it be followed up by legislation. I would hope the government would examine it and bring in legislation the next time, but in any event, as I had indicated the other day, if legislation does not come in via the government we will see what we can do to bring in a private bill. But it would be much more appropriate and in the better interests I think of all concerned if it were looked at very closely by the persons concerned for the provision of pensions in the Province within the Civil Service to get their views and to see if we cannot come up with a real good plan, because I do not think anywhere in

MR. MARSHALL: Canada really has there been such a necessity for -

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question? In what other provinces do they have this kind of legislation?

MR. MARSHALL: Well, I -

MR. NEARY: Does the hon. gentleman have copies of -

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, I have copies of it here. As I said, you know, Ontario, Quebec - even Quebec follows the Ontario legislation, but it is one of the few pieces of legislation where Quebec's legislation follows that of the other provinces.

AN HON. MEMBER: Alberta and Saskatchewan.

MR. MARSHALL: Alberta and Saskatchewan. So, you know, here they are -

MR. MURPHY: Just a question if the hon. member does not mind.

I do not know but perhaps he did answer it prior to - Is there a minimum number of employees that a firm employs that should be covered? Perhaps he did explain it.

MR. MARSHALL: There has been in some of the acts. In Ontario I think they started off at fifteen and then they dropped it down. And I think that the numbers of employees covered by an employer should be, you know, as wide ranging as possible, the lowest number possible, and if this is a province-wide plan there should be enough people involved to make it worthwhile for the trust companies and the insurance companies to provide plans where they would not provide them now for the smaller businesses because they have the larger fund that they would pool. But as I say, in this Province I do not know. I thank the hon. members of the House for their support, but I do not know of any province in Canada really or any place in Canada where legislation like this is so necessary. The Minister of Justice has given a personal instance and other members have as well. And we can all call to mind instances of this nature.

MR. MARSHALL: So, in closing I would thank members for their support and say I certainly look forward and hope to seeing appropriate legislation brought before the house in the very near future.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?  
The question before the House is as set out in Motion 14. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Those in favour please say, 'Aye' - those contrary, 'Nay'.

In my opinion the 'Ayes' have it.

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I notice there that the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) did not vote against this resolution. Is there something wrong with the hon. gentleman?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Should we not send for a psychiatrist?

MR. J. CARTER: It is entirely unanimous, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if I may, in the absence of the House Leader, it being six minutes to six o'clock, I wonder if all hon. members are willing to call it six o'clock -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. PECKFORD: - and then the next motion, well, can we call it next Private Members Day - if it is the wish of all hon. members I would so move that we call it six o'clock.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I certainly concur with what the acting House Leader has said. I just want to raise one point.

When we had the fiasco of resolutions two Wednesdays ago I believe it was, the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) spoke and then I spoke for about ten minutes or so on my resolution, so I assume that means that I adjourn debate and will be called on next to speak on my resolution next Wednesday if we are still here?

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Yes, that would be the procedure.

June 8, 1977

Tape 4017

EC - 4

MR. RIDEOUT: Well I am certainly all for calling it  
six o'clock.

MR. CALLAN: We are hoping we will not be here.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Before considering the motion to adjourn  
before the House a point of order was raised. I do not feel I have to  
rule on that particular point of order as I do not believe it was meant  
with any seriousness.

MR. MURPHY: I understand both gentlemen are going out  
to dinner.

MR. SPEAKER: The clock is now at 6:00.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned  
until tomorrow, Thursday, June 9, 1977 at 10:00 A.M.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

JUNE 9, 1977

Answer to Question Raised in the House - From  
The Honourable C. William Doody

Question Number 216

Mr. Neary (La Poile) - To ask the Honourable, the Minister of Finance, to lay upon the Table of the House, the following information:-

- (1) How many contractors who were cutting wood for Labrador Linerboard in Goose Bay received compensation as a settlement for not completing their contracts?
- (2) Specify amounts paid to each contractor for terminating his contract.
- (3) What is to be done with the approximately 30,000 cords of wood still in the woods at Goose Bay?

Answer

- (1) and (2) See attached.
- (3) No decision as yet, has been made.

*James 8/17*

CONTRACTORS:

1) Watkins Enterprises	\$ 42,309.00
2) Lake Melville Logging	25,636.00
3) F. Pickett	4,173.00
4) B & N Enterprises	39,642.50
5) M. Burton	<u>10,059.00</u>

Total Contractors Payments \$121,819.50

Total Number of Contractors 5

OWNER OPERATORS

1) T. Chaisson	\$ 5,000.00
2) M. Chambers	5,000.00
3) S. Patey (2 Mach.)	10,000.00
4) H. Clarke	4,000.00
5) V. Brown	5,500.00
6) L. Barry	5,500.00
7) G. Norman	5,000.00
8) R. Stückless	5,000.00
9) T. Tobin & D. Byrnes	5,500.00
10) E. Everett & C. Adams	5,000.00
11) C. Ryland	5,000.00
12) E. Hillier	5,000.00
13) J. Norman	5,000.00
14) M. Burton	4,500.00
15) C. White	5,500.00
16) R. Saunders	5,500.00
17) A. & A. Cull	5,500.00
18) C. Chaisson	<u>5,000.00</u>

Total Owner Operators Payments \$ 96,500.00

Total Number of Owner Operators 18

All settlements based on anticipated production.