

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1977

The House met at 10:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, yesterday as I recall it, it took us until - what? It was twenty-five to six when they began Question Period, two and a half hours after the House met, and today we managed it in four and a half minutes.

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier and it arises out of the statements which have been reported and which, I understand, are in fact accurately reported, to be made by Mr. Sweeney, the President and General Manager of Labrador Linerboard at Stephenville. Mr. Sweeney, as I understand it, Sir, has given his view that the mill is viable. Could the Premier tell us, please, whether that opinion is accepted by the government, and in event how the opinion squares with the decision taken by the government, which is to the effect that the mill is not viable?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sweeney is on the Advisory Board, and that report speaks for itself. I think, Mr. Sweeney, and I think it is fair to say, has become very enthusiastic since his arrival in Stephenville, and I think with very good reason. He has told us, for instance, that he considers the work force at the mill to be as good as he has seen. He, I think, has got carried away with the idea of turning the mill around, if it can possibly be done. I think we agree with him that if there is any - you know, if it can be done, if the economics can be worked out, I am sure there will be third parties interested in buying it. If conversion can be done and that excellent work force could be retained, we have already said that is the case. But our records to date, Sir, do not show that we can afford to carry on as is. If it changes we will be as pleased as anybody in this Province, I will personally, and I know others here who have

Premier Moores:

been involved will be as well.

But in the meantime we are taking this course based on statistics, facts, dollars, I suppose you could say in a very hard businesslike manner, It is not something, as I said, we wanted to do. As I say, Mr. Sweeney's enthusiasm is one that, I think, any mill manager should have, and I think, as far as Linerboard, and it is unfortunate it is not paying, because I think he would be the of individual that would make it a very worthy contributor to this Province.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I cannot debate the Premier's

answer now but I will at the appropriate time because I do not

think he answered the question, but we will go at another one.

Would the Premier be willing to allow Mr. Sweeney to appear before the Bar of the House or before a Committee of the House to answer questions from members with respect to the mill? Mr. Sweeney, after all, is the man who has run it for six months. and the man who was brought in by the government to try to salvage the situation which existed as of last October or November when the Advisory Committee was appointed.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I think the answer has to be no as far as appearing before the Bar of the House is concerned any more than the Advisory Committee themselves, and that would involve all the accountants who were involved as well. But I am quite sure that all the information will be made available to the Opposition and to government members or anybody else for that matter. And I think also that I would be very surprised if Mr. Sweeney would not sit down with any interested party and do the best he could to answer their questions on Stephenville. But I think, Sir, it would be very wrong to bring him before the Bar of the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Will the Premier authorize that?



MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary for the hon. the Premier.

I am wondering what figures they might have available on the cost involved in the shutting down of the mill. For example, we are told that you are still going to have pay something in the vicinity of perhaps \$30 million a year - is that correct?--to service the debt?

MR. ROBERTS: It is of that order, yes. But we do not have the precise figures.

MR. NOLAN: Well if you take that figure, and I presume that is right for the moment, unless the Premier has more accurate information, plus whatever you might have to pay in welfare or whatever else might be involved in social programmes to try to remedy that situation, the void there. What is the net difference then?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, there has been a cost benefit analysis done and that can be made available to the Opposition for a further debate.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the Premier be able to table that?

PREMIER MOORES: Table it for the debate? I do not see no reason why not.

MR. ROBERTS: For the full benefit costs?

PREMIER MOORES: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries, Sir. Would the minister care to react



MR. NEARY: to a news story in the Morning News that the provincial government was becoming involved in the purchase of equipment to process small fish, I believe it was under twelve inches or fourteen inches.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sixteen inches.

MR. NEARY: Sixteen inches and there seems to be some criticism from the federal authorities on this particular project. Would the minister care to straighten us out on it?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, every year pretty well, I suppose since the beginning of the cod fishery hundreds of years ago, there is a lot of small fish caught as a by-catch especially in traps. Indeed the estimated quantity is about 7,000 tons which is 14 million pounds, caught every year. Some of which - well, I suppose the large part of which is dumped and some used for fish meal. We intend to assist two companies in the purchase of machines to fillet small fish. I cannot name the companies yet because the agreement has not been signed.

But, Mr. Speaker, the setting of net sizes and the regulations and rules governing the catching of fish is a federal responsibility. We have made representation to Ottawa with respect to this problem and we feel that until - it is not an easy problem to resolve,-

MR. SMALLWOOD: What would they do with the small fillets, Bulk it together in block?

MR. W. CARTER: They would - it is a saleable product and -

MR. SMALLWOOD: How, in what form?

MR. W. CARTER: In blocks, in blocks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In blocks.

MR. W. CARTER: But, Mr. Speaker, the custom - if I can take a minute to explain - the custom so far, up to date, is that certain fish merchants will go out on a wharf and the boat will come in during the trap season and they will arbitrarily offer the boat owners the union rate for sixty per cent of the catch in the boat, and again arbitrarily say that we will pay you one cent or two cents

MR. W. CARTER: or three cents a pound, I think it is for the small fish - forty per cent of the small fish. And that of course does not go down to well with the fishermen. The fishermen today cannot afford to sell that fish for a cent or two a pound. But certainly our position is that until we find a way to remedy the situation-

PREMIER MOORES: The drying plant should be enlarged.

MR. W. CARTER: Pardon!

PREMIER MOORES: The drying plant should be enlarged.

MR. W. CARTER: The drying, the drying - again it is Ottawa sets the size of the mesh and they are going to have to assist in the changing of the structure of the traps. But we believe that this fish should not be dumped; it is a crime, it does very little for the fishermen, and until such time as the problem can be resolved we believe that the fish should be processed and that the fishermen should obtain full price for it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister indicate to the House if there was prior consultation with the Federal Fisheries Department or anybody in the Government of Canada before the Province went ahead with this project?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, Ottawa, I think is aware of the problem. I am not suggesting - it is not an easy one to correct and I am sure they are working on it. But like I said, we did write Ottawa, the letter is on file in my office.

MR. NEARY: Any reply?

MR. W. CARTER: A year and a half ago. I am not sure of the reply. But certainly I am not blaming Ottawa, I think something has to be done, Ottawa will have to do it but until they can see fit to do it, at least find a way to do it, then we believe the



MR. W. CARTER: fish should be landed, properly processed and the fishermen should get the full value for it. And that is why we are encouraging the filleting of that small fish by assisting these two companies in the provision of two machines to do it.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: An additional supplementary. Hon. member for LaPoile then the hon. gentleman from Fogo.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the catching of the fish and the building of new boats and so forth, would the minister indicate to the House whether or not there will be a federal subsidies involved, if there was prior consultation with the Government of Canada, the Department of Fisheries concerning licenses for these new boats and federal subsidies for these new boats that are going to be built, and will they replace old boats using the old licenses or will they be completely new boats to new fishermen, new applicants?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, there is a federal subsidy now paid on boats up to and including forty-five feet in length. We have made representation to Ottawa to have the subsidy re-instated on boats up to and including sixty-five feet in length.

MR. NEARY: Any response?

MR. W. CARTER: We wired Ottawa on that, I think the Premier discussed it with Ottawa during his trip to that city some time ago and we are hoping there will be a re-instatement of that sixty-five foot subsidy.

MR. NEARY: But there are no guarantees?

MR. W. CARTER: Not yet, but we are -



MR. NEARY: What about the liscences?

MR. W. CARTER: The liscences? These boats will be sold to fishermen who have boats that are of a certain age where they can transfer the liscence. But there will be no shortage of applicants for those boats. We are already compiling a very impressive list of people now that want to buy them.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Fogo.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. Minister of Fisheries. Is this not contrary to the conservation policy of the federal government? - and this might be a double-barrelled question, Mr. Speaker - and who, if the federal government is going to drop, or increase or pay the subsidy, who will pick up that subsidy on the small fish?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, there is no subsidy being paid on small fish. In our new gear supplement programme, which we announced last year, we stated then that we would not be paying that half cent a pound subsidy on small fish. But I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that it is a problem that is there. We recognize the fact that there is a problem. We recognize the difficulty Ottawa must be having in finding a solution to it. But until they do, until they can find an answer to that problem, well then surely we cannot stand by and see 7,000 tons of fish, 14 million pounds of fish, dumped or at least disposed of a year for which the fishermen get practically no return at all.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: But is it not recognized, Mr. Speaker, that that same fish in two years will be much more valuable than it is at the present day if they are catching it under sixteen inches?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, that of course is motherhood. Of course give it two more years and the fish would be that much larger. But if the hon. member can tell me how you can keep that fish alive and allow it to escape once it is caught in a trap, well then maybe he has got the answer. We are working on it. We have gear technologists who are looking at the problem. We have made representation to Ottawa and we are now working on another plan that we think might have some desired results later, but again I go back to what I said earlier that the fish is being caught. It is a fact of life. It has been going on since the fishery started. And we believe - we are

MR. W. CARTER: against seeing that fish dumped. We are against having fishermen being forced into the position of either dumping the fish or receiving a cent a pound for it. And that is what we are trying to find an answer, at least as long as the problem is there we want to make sure that the fishermen get the best possible price for that fish and it can only be done if we provide the necessary wherewithal to the processing companies to find means of filleting that fish where it can be sold on the market and treated like any other type fish.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health, Sir. Would the minister indicate to the House whom the therapeutic abortion committees report to, whom they are responsible to? Are they responsible to the administration of the hospital, the administrators or are they responsible to the minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, provision is made in the Criminal Code of Canada to permit abortions to be performed in Canada. One of the provisions are that the accredited hospitals only would be permitted to carry out abortions, and a requirement of the law is that an abortion committee be established. So it is under the Criminal Code of Canada.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Perhaps the Minister of Justice could tell the House to whom to the therapeutic abortion committees report? To whom are they responsible? Or are they responsible to anybody? Are they a law unto themselves?

MR. HICKMAN: I will have to take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker, because I want to be sure of the answer. But I will get the answer



MR. HICKMAN: for the hon. gentleman on tomorrow.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question for the minister, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Health.

MR. HICKMAN: It is under the general code, yes. Right.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister gets the reports anyway,

MR. NEARY: Would the Minister of Health -

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Health has to approve them.

MR. NEARY: Would the Minister of Health inform the House if

it is compulsory for the reason to be given for the termination of pregnancy on the abortion report?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: No, Mr. Speaker, that is not a requirement of the therapeutic abortion form.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, then the hon. gentleman for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister tell the House what other hospitals in Newfoundland, apart from the General Hospital - I am sorry, I did not mean to put this on my question - but what other hospitals in Newfoundland outside of St. John's are doing abortions?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated a few days ago when my department's estimates were being debated, one hospital, one only in the city of St. John's, performs abortions, that is the General. There are some other hospitals, but I would refer to take the question under advisement. I would not want to give the wrong names, but I will certainly get that information for the hon. member.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier.

Would the Premier advise the House as to when we can expect the Order-in-Council or whatever action is necessary to bring the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro under the control of the Public Utilities Board? When?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: It has already been said, Mr. Speaker, I think, that legislation will be introduced during this session here in the House to bring it under some regulatory agency.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition followed by the hon. gentleman for Terra Nova.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir. A question for the Minister of Education. Could he tell the House, Sir, whether he has received any representations from the President of Memorial University, Mr. Morgan, or any group of persons speaking in behalf of the president with respect to the effects of the government's decision not to proceed this year with the construction of a library despite what the university understood to be a firm commitment from the government that the construction of the new university library would in fact begin this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I have not been in contact with the president. I have read his reaction in the media, but I have not been able to get in contact with him, because I have been trying to contact him on other matters since.



MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Was there any consultation with the university,  
with the president or the authorities there about the effect of this  
decision before the government took their final decision? And  
that does not conflict, by the way, with the requirements of the rules  
of budget secrecy. I understand that the decision has had a calamitous  
effect, or it is feared that it will have a calamitous effect, upon the  
academic programmes of the university. I wonder whether there was  
any consultation with the university beforehand, or was it an  
arbitrary and unilateral decision?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, we had discussions with the  
president prior - well while we were talking about the university's  
budget, and we had discussed the library, and it did have some  
priority, but it is a long-term programme, and in view of the  
financial restraints, we felt that we could not go ahead with it  
this year. On the other hand I might add that we do not think, of course,  
that it will have any immediate affect on the programming at the  
university in the next couple of years. But obviously, you know, we  
do need a library, and every effort will be made in the next three or  
four years to get it.

MR. ROBERTS: They have been doing that for a long time, 'Wallace'.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: A question for the Minister of Education.

In this year's budget there was no reference to the government's  
intention with respect to phase three which would result in  
improvement in the teacher-student ratio. I wonder what the  
government's intentions are in this matter, whether the thing is  
shelved indefinitely or just what the situation with respect to  
the phase three is, which would result in improvement in the student-teacher  
ratio?



MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the third phase has been postponed or deferred again for the coming year. I want to point out that we have been talking about the pupil/teacher ratio -

MR. ROBERTS: In other words it has been cancelled.

MR. HOUSE: - the pupil/teacher ratio, the one to twenty-five, I think, is the one that most people talk about, and now we would need another one hundred teachers throughout the Province for our one to twenty-five ratio. That would give, I think, most boards an average of two teachers for the total number of boards. Perhaps the bigger boards would get the advantage of it more than a small ones, because we have this Clause 13 in effect now which a board losing population will have a one to twenty-five ratio if they go below the one to twenty-six. So it would not drastically affect the educational programme, the one to twenty-five ratio.

MR. LUSH: A new formula though.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: My question, Sir, is for the hon. Premier.

~~Now that the controversial~~

Mr. Neary: Norma and Gladys and the Provincial flag have crept back into limelight again, would the Premier tell the House whether or not he has issued instructions to his Minister of Tourism to cut out this foolish extravagance and waste, this spending on the Norma and Gladys affair to try to justify sending her to Europe last year and wandering around the West Indies? Is the Premier going to reply?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, you know, the question has innuendo which I totally disagree with, and the hon. member knows only too well that he wanted the question asked rather than the question answered.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the Premier tell the House what programme, what is the Norma and Gladys going to do this year apart from being tied up down here in the harbour?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I am sure when the minister's estimates comes up he will be only too glad to give all the details of what is proposed for the good ship Norma and Gladys.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. Then I will recognize the hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NEARY: What about the Provincial flag? Is the Provincial flag going to surface in this session of the House? And what about the Union Jack? A statement has been made that the Union Jack is the private flag of the Queen and it is not permissible to use it in this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Before recognizing the hon. the Premier to answer the question, I must make the same point, but if anything more firmly, than the one made a couple of days ago with respect to another hon. gentleman, and that is a supplementary.



Mr. Speaker:

As I understood, the former question dealt with the Norma and Gladys, and the latter one with -

MR. ROBERTS: Why? Would not that fly a flag?

MR. SPEAKER: - the Provincial flag. So I would suggest that it would not be supplementary but there would be little to be served by ruling it out of order. If there were a situation where seven or eight members, or a number of members were all standing then I would in all likelihood have to rule it out of order because a priority has been given through the supplementary means. That is not the case but I do point it out because I think there would be circumstances under which it would be necessary to, then recognize another member.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: After the ruling, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure of the question asked some while ago. But the fact is that I certainly was under the impression that the Union Jack was the flag of this Province, by statute.

MR. NEARY: Not statute!

PREMIER MOORES: Certainly -

MR. NEARY: The Historic Trust -

MR. ROBERTS: Albert Perlin will write another column tomorrow.

PREMIER MOORES: I have no intention, Mr. Speaker, of getting into a controversial debate on this. But I am sure this House in its wisdom will decide in good time whether the Province should have a distinctive Provincial flag and what flag that should be.

MR. NEARY: Not in time for the Summer Games.

MR. ROBERTS: He has already ruled on that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Industrial Development and also Rural Development --

MR. ROBERTS: And he is associate Minister of Hospital Development.

MR. NOLAN: All right. Well what I am interested in, in view of the unemployment situation in this Province and a large number of



Mr. Nolan:

people who are going to Alberta and so on to find employment, from the Budget I am wondering if the minister can give us some idea of how many jobs that he hopes to create in his two departments with the various programmes he has on his books in this twelve month period?

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have got no crystal ball to begin with so I cannot make that kind of a prediction, but I will give a general rundown on the economy, and on industry and on potential and on the various estimates that have applicability, and perhaps outline some dimension as to what could happen in the Province this present year. I think it would be only fair to say that this Budget, dealing with the emphasis on development, and the emphasis on fisheries, and the emphasis on various other votes that will have a development component that we are not going to have the kind of employment opportunities in this Province this year that will meet the-or even nearly meet the requirement with a growing labour force. And I think it is going to take us years down the road, even with an upturn in the national economy, and even with some of the achievements like was announced yesterday by Mr. Lessard, the Federal Minister of DREE, when he indicated that there needs to be measures taken such as adjustments on a regional basis in taxation policy to allow more incentive for people, the business people in particular, to remain in the local area, that there would be more investment by the private sector in the various regions of Canada that are depressed regions, like the Atlantic region. It is going to take major kinds of aspects of this nature, policies of this nature, to turn the economy around.

Mr. Lundrigan.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, the member is quite aware, as a former minister I believe of Economic Development - or was he an adviser in that field, or did he work in this field with his former administration? - that it is going to take much more than the particular measures that we have in the budget to achieve the kinds of economic growth that will take up the slack in our labour force. And I think that we, as as Province, alone by itself, do not have the mechanism and certainly do not have the financial strength to be able to offset the very critical unemployment problem that we have in the Province.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: Surely the minister must agree that if he is loaning out certain amounts of money each year, it must be predicated on the creation of certain jobs. I understood that that was the reason for the loan in the first place. What I am trying to find out at the moment is - I mean, we now have a new resettlement programme in this Province. Rather than from the islands in Placentia Bay, it is to Halifax, Alberta, Toronto and so on. So if you have \$4 million you are going to loan out this year under various rural development schemes - some of the projects that I know of, by the way, and others that are coming up could be very, very good. I am not disputing that - but I am trying to put a figure on it because students coming out of school, as I am sure the ministers here are aware, are asking questions, Where are we going to find employment? I get it as well as the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I did not really get a specific question. It was more of a commentary, and I will sort of take notice of that and give proper response when the estimates are up. Unfortunately, I would like to have seventy-five hours for the estimates for my own department just to get in the debate. But just to respond, Mr. Speaker, it is

Mr. Lundrigna.

impossible for me - for example, let us take, we are budgeting \$1.7 million for Rural Development Loans Authority .It is impossible for me to indicate exactly what jobs will be created, because it is a programme that facilitates industrial or rural or whatever kind of development. It indicates, for example, that we are willing to lend at least this year \$1.7 million if people qualify for loans in the area of development which has a resource base, and has a manufacturing aspect to it. We have also \$800,000 for community projects. We have the minister with his programmes as well, and other ministers. But, for example under these programmes it depends on what projects come forward , who wants assistance? It is entirely possible that that programme will be totally inadequate, the \$1.7 million, that will have to come back to the government and look for more funds. It is also possible that these funds will not be used at all.

So the government's position that it has taken is that its programmes are to facilitate, to assist the growth in the economy, not to assume the full responsibility for it. And if the member is suggesting that the government should really ignore the public sector and move in with the active kind of job creating programmes as the main method of eliminating the unemployment programme problem in this Province, then it would require an entirely different approach than we are taking as a government. And maybe we need a more socialistic approach, but I do not think the government can afford it; I do not think the people need it.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the minister's answer is most interesting because, of course, it flies in the face of everything which his colleagues have been saying in the budget speech, so we will certainly have a go at him in the debate. But my question, Sir, is this: Since the minister cannot tell us how many jobs were created or will be created this



Mr. Roberts.

year as a result of the programmes which he administers in his own individualistic style, can he tell us how many jobs were created last year as a result of the programmes which he administers ?

MR. SPEAKER <sup>Ludington</sup> Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be most delighted to give the House that information when the estimates are up, and I hope that we can create at least one more job than the Leader of the Opposition now anticipates, because he is going to need one before this year is over.

MR. ROBERTS: I can have the job of being the member for Grand Falls.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the hon. member for LaPoile and then the hon. gentleman for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. NEARY: My supplementary, Sir, is in connection with the job creation that is being referred to, but I think it is more appropriately directed to the Minister of Social Services in connection with the announcement in the budget speech that there is going to be 1,000 new jobs created. Could the minister tell the House if plans have been finalized for these 1,000 new jobs, and if the list has been compiled, where the jobs will be created, what the projects are and so forth? Could the minister give us an updating on this rather urgent matter?

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

MR. BRETT: No, Mr. Speaker, the jobs have not been decided upon. The first round of meetings are being held this week as a matter of fact with the directors. But we do not intend to start these jobs now and interfere with the regular seasonal employment, the Summer months. It is hoped that some of them can get off the ground in Summer, but most of them would be in early Fall.

MR. NEARY: Ah, ha! That is a new twist.

MR. SPEAKER: Time for one final question, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industrial Development. It appears that the workers at Waterford and Treasury Board have come to, it appears to have been agreement on a mediator and on terms of reference and my question, Sir, is if there is that agreement that a mediator is appointed and terms of reference agreed to, will the workers of Waterford Hospital, is there any indication that they will return to work during mediation or do they intend to stay off until the strike has been mediated?

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It does not come under my jurisdiction so I would perhaps -

MR. FLIGHT: I addressed the Minister of Manpower.

MR. ROWE: Industrial Relations.

MR. FLIGHT: Industrial Relations and Manpower.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Oh, I am sorry.

MR. ROBERTS: A real minister, not a temporary one. Come on, 'Joe', you know the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. HICKMAN: I just wanted to -

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Manpower is going to answer the question.

MR. NEARY: Who is responsible for Waterford?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, you know I am not the Minister of Industrial Development, I am the Minister of Industrial Relations. There is a difference.

MR. ROBERTS: If you were the Minister of Industrial Development we would be better off.

MR. ROUSSEAU: But, Mr. Speaker, I can only speak on my information thus far. My information was—and this is why the suggestion was made with binding arbitration in the first instance that work would resume — my understanding now is that no the unit at Waterford are not prepared to go back to work until they receive the report of the mediator.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. HICKMAN: Motion seven.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro (Loan and Guarantee Limitation) Act, 1975," (Bill No. 55).

On motion, Bill No. 55, read a first time.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Finance approached me, I presume he approached the hon. gentlemen in the Official Opposition, to ask to have this bill put through the House today by leave. While I am prepared to grant leave, Sir, personally, but in the meantime I would like to condemn the government for proceeding to borrow \$30 million in their stupidity. They did not take a look at the act.

MR. ROBERTS: We were not going to do it without debating.

MR. NEARY: No, no, not without debate, second reading.

MR. ROBERTS: Could I say a word?

MR. NEARY: Yes. Well I —

MR. ROBERTS: Is the hon. gentleman debating it or is he just —

MR. NEARY: No. No. I am giving my leave. I am giving leave. You know as far as I am concerned the House can have leave to debate.

MR. ROBERTS: Does the hon gentleman take longer to take leave than, say, Groucho Marx?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker —

MR. DOODY: You are not going to give it now.

MR. NEARY: No. No. I am going to refrain.

MR. ROBERTS: Pass that one on.



MR. NEARY: I am going to let that one slide by, Sir. I am going to refrain from that.

MR. ROBERTS: I will pay for it later, I know that.

MR. NEARY: Yes. Yes. I will just let that one slide by, Sir. But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, it is rather unfortunate that this situation has arisen. Now we find ourselves in a bind. The government are boxed in. They are in a corner. They are cornered like a rat. They have this \$30 million waiting to get the signatures put on it. So I guess in the interest of trying to save, trying to rescue the reputation, the credit rating of the Province, that is the only reason I am granting leave. I am not trying to get the government off the hook, but what an impact this would have in the international business world, in the financial world if we did not go ahead today and debate this and get this \$30 million. Although I am going to have a few choice words to say about that too when we are debating the bill.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON MEMBER: What are you up on?

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know what I am up on. I am up on the same point as my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), I try to make it as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Actually there is no motion before the Chair. The bill was read a first time, I said, "When shall the bill be read a second time?"

MR. ROBERTS: Well it is one of these procedures that does not exist but it does exist all the time because I understand, as my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said, that the question is whether there will be leave given to allow this bill to advance through all stages today, because it is a technical problem but I think a rather important one. I understand that an issue has been contracted for and yet the legal opinions are that Hydro do not have authority to make the issue and therefore there is a problem.

Now I am prepared, for those of us on this side, Mr. Speaker, to consent to it with one caveat. I have

Mr. Roberts:

raised the problem with the Minister of Finance, who was kind enough to consult me in advance, a problem about the effect of the bill. I am not sure that it does not go beyond what I understand to be necessary at this time. And the minister, I understand in turn, has undertaken to take this up with the law officers with a view to seeing what, if anything, ought to be done. So I wonder if on that thing, on that ground, we could let it stand because the House will be here this afternoon and tonight. And if we can get this result I am prepared to see it go ahead, and my friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is prepared to see it go ahead. It ought to be debated but that will not take a long, long time. So can we just leave the matter in abeyance? In other words, Your Honour's question of when shall this bill be read a second time, could that just stand in abeyance for an hour or two and perhaps the House would then be in a position to answer Your Honour? That is what I -

MR. SPEAKER: Presumably.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: What I was going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, was that in answer to His Honour's question when shall this bill be read a second time? We will say presently -

MR. ROBERTS: Sooner or later.

MR. HICKMAN: We would say presently by leave, but on the undertaking -

MR. ROBERTS: Leave has not been granted?

MR. HICKMAN: -wait now, I know, but on the undertaking that the bill would not be called for debate until this afternoon.

MR. ROBERTS: Or on the undertaking - Well, see the trouble is,

Mr. Speaker, the words "presently by leave" imply that leave is granted. Why do we not say tomorrow in the normal way and then if there is leave granted it can come up this afternoon by leave. At this stage I am not prepared to see it go ahead until this difficulty has been resolved.



MR. HICKMAN: Either way I just did not want to lose, to be caught this afternoon with everybody agreeing and then not be able to bring it on.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh but if it is - as I understand it, I mean, we could, you know, the mere fact we say now, tomorrow, does not mean we cannot later change our mind. I mean, you know -

MR. HICKMAN: Okay. All right.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, on a motion by the House Leader I cannot see that that cannot be altered. Tomorrow?

MR. HICKMAN: On tomorrow.

MR. ROBERTS: 'Bill' has told you about this problem?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, he is checking on it now.

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Young): Order, please.

Head IX - Rehabilitation and Recreation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Young) The hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, in rising to introduce the estimates for the Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation, I will not take too much of the Committee's time other than to point out a few of the areas with which the department is involved. As hon. members know the department was established in 1973, and one of the main reasons for the establishment of the separate department was the government's firm conviction that greater attention should be paid to the rehabilitative needs and all its facets, and of course, the other arm of the department, the recreation arm, was combined with rehabilitation at that time.

The department, Mr. Chairman, is responsible for the vocation rehabilitation of disabled persons, which is a very important division. It is also responsible for the Alcohol and Drug Addiction Foundation, and I am sure hon. members will be making comments on that as we go along. And our estimates this year reflects



Mr. H. Collins:

government's concern about the problem proposed by the over-use of alcohol. We have just about doubled our vote, our grant to the Alcohol and Drug Foundation people. We have got a vote in the estimates, there is only \$50,000 in it now, but that is because we do not know what the final cost will be, but we are committed to the establishment of a detoxification centre on a pilot project in the city, the establishment of which, please goodness, will take place this year.

Mr. Chairman, the department is also responsible for the Direct Home Service Programme which is really

Mr. Collins.

a new departure from anything which has been done in the past. We have got a good programme going in St. John's, which was a pilot project for a period. We have now extended that service whereby we provide services to the mentally handicapped, and the physically handicapped, mainly mentally handicapped people. We are extending that programme - or we have extended it to Corner Brook, and also to the Conception Bay area. I think it is in Carbonear, the office is in Carbonear, but that office does render services to all of the region of Conception Bay. We are also responsible for the homes for the aged, and we are very proud of our record in this particular field. I am sure hon. members must be too. Our estimates this year, for instance, show an increase of 60 per cent. That is what we have gone from \$10,000 to \$16,000 for the care of the aged in this present financial year. Last year there were new homes opened at Stephenville Crossing, and at St. Anthony as well as an extension to the Salvation Army home here in St. John's. New homes are scheduled to be opened this year in Bonavista and in Springdale, and as well a new 192 bed home in St. John's during the next few months.

Since 1971, Mr. Chairman, the number of people being cared for has increased - that is in the homes for the aged - the number of people being cared for has increased from 1,100 to 3,300 in this present fiscal year. The department also operates Hoyles Home, the Hillview Lodge and Harbour Lodge, those three institutions caring for a total of 550 people that require a fairly high level of nursing care. And I would like at this time to pay tribute to the staff in those homes, because in the Hoyles Home and the Hillview Lodge and Harbour Lodge, hon. members who have visited those institutions I am sure must be impressed with the dedication and the talents of the staffs in those places and the great job which they are doing.

Mr. Collins.

We also operate the homes for mentally handicapped children. Number one, I suppose, that comes to people's minds is the Exon House over here. I am not sure that I like the term, Exon House, and we are giving some consideration to - not necessarily finding another name, but possibly putting a street address on it or something, because Exon House does, in my opinion, to me - I will not say what I was going to say, but the name I think should disappear.

MR. NEARY: I think you should carry on the name.

MR. COLLINS: Yes, we are looking into that. But the name itself, Mr. Chairman, we are looking at it to see what the possibilities might be in putting a street address on it. We have resolved in Exon House to change the direction of care in that particular institution. Whenever any changes are brought about or any attempt to make changes, it always means that the human beings, which we are, a lot of people object at times, But the decision was taken on the best advice we could get from the Canadian Association for the Retarded and also in consultation with child psychologists in Newfoundland. The decision was taken that Exon House, the activity there, should be turned around to try and turn it into a training institution as opposed to a treatment institution. And when we did make that decision there was some rearranging of guests. I do not like to call them patients. There was some rearrangement of guests whereby some of the children who were at the Children's Home on Water Street were moved to Exon House, those who we thought were trainable, and some of the children who were at Exon House, and who in the opinion of the professionals were not capable of absorbing any training, were moved to the



MR. COLLINS: Children's Home, So we have the Children's Home now as a treatment center and Exon House as a training center.

MR. MURPHY: It is an exchange.

MR. COLLINS: It is an exchange but one which will permit us to train some of those people. A lot of those people, Mr. Chairman, mainly children of course, a lot of those children can be trained to some degree, varying degrees naturally. If a child can be trained if only to be able to use the bathroom, at least that is worth-while; if they can be trained to be able to feed themselves, that is worth-while, All of them, I would suspect and suggest, have varying degrees of absorbing training, but in our opinion they should be trained to whatever abilities they have.

That is a pretty trying process, because as I said, Mr. Chairman, we are changing the direction in that home and we are getting a lot of co-operation from the people there. We are going to have to modify our approach on a day to day basis, no doubt, to make sure that what we are trying to do is done in the best possible way. And hon. members will recall that only a couple of weeks ago it was announced by the Premier in this House that we were bringing in a team of people from the Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded from their institute in Toronto to take a look at the Exon House facility, take a look at the programmes which are in place down there, and assess the effectiveness of these programmes and let us have the benefit of their views--and they are very knowledgeable in this field--let us have the benefit of their views as to the standards which we have, make recommendations to us in terms of what they think we should be doing, and they have also told us that in the event we need them to stay on and assist us in putting the proper training programmes into place they will do that. The people from that institute are very

MR. COLLINS: knowledgeable of this type, of this approach to young mentally handicapped people. They have done a considerable amount of work all across Canada in the various provinces and we are looking forward to their input. I might say that the advance the first contact has been made, One gentleman, his name - I cannot think of his name now - but this gentleman came in from the institute last week, He has had meetings with the officials in the department and he has also been over at Exon House and the remainder of the team will be coming in in a matter of days and we are looking forward their advice and their input and their assistance.

We also operate the training schools, Mr. Chairman, at Whitbourne and St. John's, three schools in all which provide rehabilitative programmes for delinquent children. There are a hundred children, I am told, under the care of these schools. And here again I am sure if hon. members have visited them - I did visit all of these institutions prior to Christmas, I have not had an opportunity to see them since, but I was more than impressed with the way things were done, with the dedication of the staff, and the tremendous work which those people are doing.

Mr. Chairman, the other arm of the department deals with recreation and sports services. I might say for the information of hon. members that during the past fiscal year grants were made to four hundred community recreational projects with a total cost of \$2.5 million. In this year that amount has been increased to \$3.5 million, \$2.6 million of which of course has been committed as our portion in the ongoing programme for this year. The Summer Games, as we all know, was one of the major events to have taken place in Newfoundland, was co-hosted by Corner Brook and Stephenville, which was sponsored by the department. Those games, Mr. Chairman, involved one thousand athletes in final competitions, it involved about about four thousand in terms of regional playoffs. And hon. members are now aware of course that in 1978 my department will

MR. H. COLLINS: sponsor the Newfoundland Winter Games in Central Newfoundland which is to be co-hosted by the towns of Grand Falls and Gander. And I am told that that would involve a similar number of athletes and approximately sixteen different sports.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said on past occasions, we are very proud of our record in the past few years in terms of the advances which we have made in recreation in Newfoundland. We now have approximately thirty stadiums in the Province and twenty indoor swimming pools and there are literally hundreds of other types of facilities such as soccer pitches and softball diamonds and playgrounds, outdoor rinks, and so on which have been built largely with the assistance of the Department of Recreation.

Probably the major event in sports ever to ever to take place in Newfoundland will occur this Summer when with the Canada Summer Games we will see somewhere in the order of 3,000 athletes coming to St. John's from all over Canada and those athletes will be participating again in approximately - somewhere between fifteen and twenty different sports. With the facilities which are being provided by the City of St. John's, with considerable assistance from the Provincial Government, everybody I am sure in Newfoundland are looking forward to a happy Summer.

MR. LUSH: How much has the Province put into the Summer Games or will put into the Summer Games?

MR. H. COLLINS: I do not know if I have it or not. I will certainly get the information. But we are looking forward to the Canada Summer Games. The city, through their committee which they have established, they have been doing a tremendous job there and we are hoping that some of our Newfoundland athletes who have been preparing for a period of time now will be able to give a good account of themselves.



MR. H. COLLINS: I might mention, Mr. Chairman, also that not too long ago, about three or four weeks ago the first recreation conference ever to take place in Labrador was held at Happy Valley. The conference was attended by approximately 100 delegates from all over the Coast of Labrador. I could not get in there myself, I spent about three hours at Torbay Airport, and I do not want to be nasty about St. John's weather or anything else, but I am sure it is obvious to everybody why I could not make it. But some of the officials, the advance guard had gone in, and I must say that those people did a tremendous job.

The 100 delegates were flown in from various parts of the Coast. They were tickled to death, very enthused. I am sure the hon. member for Naskaupi will tell us and they have come up with a lot of recommendations which the department are putting together now in the final stages. Another, not a conference on that level, but further meetings will be held in Labrador to some extent with the individual bodies. We will probably get them together in groups if we can, but on the basis of the conference, the recommendations and suggestions which those people had, they have all been put together and our people will be going back again to outline to the people in Labrador the various programmes, how best they can take advantage of them, etc.

We are very encouraged by that because, as we all know, particularly on the Coast of Labrador, very little has been done, minimal facilities are available for the people to be able to participate in anything in recreation, and I believe that it is most important that we follow through with that.

I might say also, Mr. Chairman, that we have a conference planned - Newfoundland and Labrador Conference, this is a conference on fitness which will be taking place some time this

MR. H. COLLINS: Fall, hopefully in October, it might be November, but certainly in the Fall. We put together a group two or three months ago I suppose now, from the Department of Education, the Department of Health, the Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation and people from the University, and some federal people are involved also, to give us some advice as to the best direction to take for the conference. And it was suggested that before the conference took place we should be in a position to have determine the state of the physical fitness of

Mr. Collins.

Newfoundlanders. And Memorial University - I am sure it is Memorial - have undertaken a survey to be able to indicate to us the state of the fitness of Newfoundlanders. And I expect that when we see that report we are all going to be terribly shocked, because I suppose if there is any group of people anywhere in the Western World who need to do more in terms of physical fitness, it must be Newfoundlanders. That derives possibly for a lot of reasons. We have never had the facilities, so a lot of people will say, I am not sure that that is all that important. But maybe because of our climate and other things we have not really kept in shape. And I am very interested in that aspect because I believe when we talk about health, when we talk about recreation or whatever, I think it all comes back to fitness. And we have got to find ways and means, once we can identify what the problems are, which this team will do, once we have done that we have got to find ways and means whereby we can better utilize the facilities which we now have, because the provision of those facilities is very expensive. And as we go down the road there is going to be more and more competition for the provincial dollars, so that what they have in place now has got to be utilized to a greater extent. For instance, we cannot afford to have expensive gymnasiums in a lot of schools across Newfoundland being used only sometimes maybe for one or two hours a day. We have got to find some ways to change that.

I know that a number of school boards across the Province are beginning to co-operate to a greater extent with us and with various sports groups. There is still a lot of work to be done there, but I am sure we can do that, and the same applies, I think, Mr. Chairman, in terms of hockey stadiums or whatever. Granted those facilities must be used, and athletes who have something to give in terms of being experts, of being - not professionals - real top athletes, naturally, we have to give them the opportunity to show their best. But I believe



Mr. Collins.

also that there is a responsibility on all of our parts that the facilities are made available to anyone who wants to go , just general skating or whatever it might be. I am sure that we can arrange - we can arrive at some way to bring about a better arrangement than we have now, and that will be the purpose of the conference. As I said, number one, when we go into the conference we will know, please goodness, what the problems are; where they are; and then try to find ways and means to cope with them.

The department, Mr. Chairman, is also responsible for youth services such as the 4 - H Clubs. And we make grants to Girl Guides and Boy Scouts, boys clubs, cadets, church sponsored groups, etc. And, of course, there is also a considerable number of grants made to private agencies such as the VON, the Canadian Paraplegic Association, the Association for the Aging , Big Brothers, etc. All in all, Mr. Chairman, a great number of areas, with youth, and with different organizations involved in youth, all of the professional sports bodies. And, as I said, we are very proud of our record in recreation, and sometimes a lot of people feel that money spent in recreation is not all that important, possibly not well-spent, but I am convinced - and I think the federal government are coming around to our point of view, too, by virtue of the fact that they have established a department of fitness in sports - and that is that we have to find ways and means of not only making it possible for our young athletes to participate in organized sports, but also we must become more fit if we are ever going to get any control over our escalating health costs and all of the other implications.

Are the twenty minutes up? ~~/~~

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FLIGHT: Some of the last lines the minister used there, that there are people who believe that the money spent in recreation and rehabilitation is not well spent, I could not disagree with that more. I think that the money spent in recreation and rehabilitation is well spent, and I think the problem is there is not enough being spent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to start with Exon House. And it is time, Mr. Chairman, that the administration would come clean on Exon House. Now it is one thing for the Premier or the Cabinet to suggest that they are bringing in some consultants, and to take a look at the system and the way Exon House is operated, to make recommendations and these changes will be made - that is one thing and that is admirable - but what has left a bad taste in people's mouths in this Province, Mr. Chairman, is that there was child abuse in that hospital, and all the consultants in Newfoundland are not going to wipe that away. People are going to demand, and rightly so, that if there was child abuse it is not as a result of the system under which the hospital runs, it is not a result of the facilities available or nothing, it can only be traced to the attitude of the people who work in that hospital. And, Mr. Chairman, this type of thing does not hurt until it gets close to home.

We had a tragic accident at the Waterford Hospital. The patient escaped and presumably drowned. Now, Mr. Chairman, as I sit in my seat here and listen to the Minister of Finance giving the statement as he knew it and as he been advised, although being concerned in that sense the way every member of the House was concerned, I did not feel personally attached type of thing or personally affected, just in the same sense that everybody else felt about a terrible tragedy. But I arrived back in Buchans, Mr. Chairman, and found out that that

MR. FLIGHT: young man was from Buchans and suddenly the whole thing changed. The problem is, Mr. Chairman, that the people who are most effected are the people who are hurt. And there are people all over this Island who have got relatives, children in that hospital, and they are wondering today as to whether or not it was their child who was abused. And, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the government that it will not be enough, a report from a consulting firm saying that Exon House is well run, that we recommend this change and that change, will not be accepted. And I doubt very much if the Opposition or the media or anybody else in Newfoundland will rest until the government comes clean as to whether or not there was child abuse, what brought on the abuse, and what action has been taken against the people, whether it is through administration, all the way down the line, Mr. Chairman.

If anyone in that institution is in any way responsible for child abuse should be fired. Clean them out every one of them. And that is not an unreasonable request, Mr. Chairman.

I am afraid, and there are other people in this Province afraid, that we are seeing the old red herring trick with regard to Exon House, with regard to the child abuse. The main recommendation and the main concern of the nurses when they first broached government was child abuse. It was not with regard to the facilities or regard to the shifts or regards to the working conditions, it was that they had seen, witnessed child abuse. That was the concern. And the Premier comes in to take everybody off the hook, stands up and makes a great statement that we are going to bring in consultants, we are going to look at the whole operation, now that we know what the problem is we intend to correct it.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the problem is child abuse,



MR. FLIGHT: maltreatment of, in most cases, retarded children. How low can you get! And this administration stands by and says that we are going to fix all the problems in Exon House by bringing in a team of consultants who can tell us what is wrong and how to correct it.

Mr. Chairman, justice will not be done until it is, beyond any shadow of a doubt, indicated as to whether or not there was child abuse, who was responsible, and until action is taken against the people responsible. And that applies to anybody in any office of any calibre of any station in Exon House. And when the minister stands up to speak again I want to hear him address himself to this situation in Exon House. I want to hear whether or not there is an investigation going on as to who was responsible for the child abuse and what action has been taken.

DR. J. COLLINS: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. FLIGHT: Yes.

DR. J. COLLINS: For the clarification of the House, would the hon. member like to define what he means by child abuse? That term can have wide ranging meaning. Would you like to define what you mean by child abuse in this instance?

MR. FLIGHT: The hon. member has put his finger on the problem. Maybe child abuse should be identified but my interpretation of the kind of child abuse that went on in that hospital was battered children. Children being struck, hit, battered, bruised. As a matter of fact, there was some very vivid descriptions in some of the local papers shortly after of incidents taking place in the hospital and how - I am not going to go into the details. That is up to the administration to determine and they have not done it yet.

Mr. Flight.

It is up to the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation to determine to what extent there was child abuse, exactly what the child abuse was, by whom was it perpetrated, and what action is going to be taken to the people by his administration to, number one, to make sure it never happens again, and number two, to see that the people responsible are punished. Because, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion if child abuse is proven that is criminal. And people who are prepared to work in an institution like Exon House, certainly nobody in that House should be permitted to continue to work there if they have the type of personality that would lend itself to the battering or maltreatment of children .

I am quoting from some of the local media, Mr. Chairman, and I would hope the minister when he stands up would address himself to it. My problem, Sir, is that I do not think that the original charge, the child abuse charge, has got the kind of coverage , has got the kind of attention that it should have had. I believe that when the nurses came and made recommendations - the original charges to Recreation - it was based on that, maltreatment and abuse of patients in that hospital. And I believe the administration's approach was simply a case - they realized the error; they realized what was happening, and they realized that what they had allowed to happen for something like eight months. Imagine an administration having in their possession recommendations from the Nurses Association that there was child abuse going on in a hospital that they were responsible for, and something like eight months being allowed to elapse and not even an investigation! How callous can you get?

And, Mr. Chairman, if I appear to be over-dramatizing here - I realize. I agree with the minister. I used the word batter. That is an ugly word to use. Maybe it was a bad choice of words, but I am simply trying to put into perspective the feelings of the people in this Province.

Mr. Flight.

They are not basically concerned. We have to assume that Exon House has been run up until now - it has been run by this government - we have to assume that the facilities and that the programmes and that the calibre of people working there knew what they were doing. My Lord, we do not need people to come in from the Mainland or from any other institutions and tell us how to improve that facility. We have to assume that it was being run the way one would expect a home for retarded children to be run. The fact is, and the inescapable fact is that this thing came about by the known, proven, abuse, maltreatment of children, and that is the issue that has gotten the least attention. That is the issue, Mr. Chairman, that I want, and the members on this side of the House want, and the general public of Newfoundland want, particularly people who have children in that hospital or relatives, and they are scattered all over this Island - and if the minister, when he stands up to speak, does not address himself to that specific issue - never mind the issue about what we are going to do to improve the calibre and the way of life and the services of Exon House - I want the minister to address himself exclusively to the charge of child abuse and maltreatment. And if necessary I want tabled in this House who it was who was abused, what children were abused and who abused them and how it could happen in a system like this? And why it would take seven months after it was first brought to the attention of the administration, why it would take seven months to have any action taken or to have it considered? That is probably enough on Exon House, Mr. Chairman, but that is not all that is going to be heard on Exon House. I look forward to the minister when he addresses himself to child abuse.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I notice in one of the subheads that the minister has allocated \$10,000 for alcohol counselling, I think. Mr. Chairman, it is time for this House to recognize what alcohol is doing to the young people of this Province. One of the most honourable,



Mr. Flight.

noteworthy crusades being carried on in this country in my mind today is that crusade being carried on by the Hon. Jim McGrath against liquor, drugs - advertising as it affects children.

Now, Mr. Chairman,

Mr. Flight; there is no question in this world that young people are affected and impressed by T.V. advertising. I smoke. I should not, but I do. Right now I have an eight year old son and every time I take my cigarettes out of my pocket this past four years he has attempted to try and stop me. I tell you he has helped me cut down on smoking. And the only reason is because it is got to him day after day, after day, after day, after day, the anti-smoking ads on T.V. Now, Mr. Chairman, if that affects the children that way then I assure you that when they see, an eight, nine, ten eleven year old child sees on T.V. a bottle of Molson's or India between periods in a hockey game, and the advertisement says "We are not saying our beer will make you better looking. We are not saying it will make you virile, we are not saying it will make you get more women, but we are saying, you know, we have the best beer in the world." And the implication is, "If you want to be with it, if you want to be a man then you better drink beer." And it is working, Mr. Chairman. We lowered the drinking age in this Province to nineteen recently, in the last two or three years. And I am told by clergymen, by organizational workers, the various organizations that sponsors youth dances, and this type of thing that alcohol is the biggest problem being experienced by them today.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is one thing if the minister, or if this Province, and I do not know if the control is completely within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government, but let us do something else, let us turn it around, Mr. Chairman; instead of advertising showing them how beautiful it is to drink beer, let us slap the cameras, let us put the cameras on some man who comes home loaded drunk at twelve o'clock tonight and beats up the family and throws the T.V. through the window. Let us pick out the homes in Newfoundland and show them that side of drinking. Let us take them and show them the destitute, the Harbour Lights down on Water Street, show them the results of the drinking. We are taking the people of Newfoundland, we are making \$15 million, \$16 million, \$17 million a year by pushing liquor in every way we can on them, and we are allowing

Mr. Flight:

a measly \$10 million a year for the rehabilitation, for counseling on alcohol, \$100,000 there for drug and alcohol addiction, but alcohol costing \$10,000 is the subhead.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal government had the nerve, it was rough politically, but finally they were convinced to put on the cigarette packs that smoking is injurious to your health. Well then I ask the minister why we cannot, probably Consumer Affairs would be the proper minister, why we cannot have stamped right on the label on the bottle of beer or hard liquor that, This is injurious to your health. The biggest health hazard in Canada today, Mr. Chairman, is the consumption of alcohol. We are running the risk with the way we are pushing alcohol today in Newfoundland of having half our young people alcoholics before they reach the age of twenty-five.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we will talk about the shape, the condition, the shape our young people are in. Mr. Chairman, it is time - There have been petitions presented in this House with regards to the closing of taverns and clubs on Sundays. Well, Mr. Chairman, it is time also maybe for the Minister of Rehabilitation to avoid - He will be rehabilitating - Some Minister of Rehabilitation will be rehabilitating ten years from now people who are fifteen and sixteen who are drinking liquor in this Province because it is so easily attainable, because we as their leaders are telling them it is the proper thing to do, we are allowing the people who are making the money. You know I understand we have some money in those breweries down there. It is the local beer that I see advertised. I am not talking about - The minister can stand up and say, Oh we cannot control national advertising. India Beer is not being advertised nationally. Blue Star is not being advertised nationally. Dominion is not being advertised nationally. Screech may be advertised nationally, but it is brewed here so I think it is time for us to meet our responsibilities and try to cut back on the consumption of liquor in this Province, and the first place to



MR. FLIGHT: cut back is to clamp down on the kind of advertising that we are permitting in this Province.

Mr. Chairman, some time ago there was a very tragic accident

MR. FLIGHT: in Newfoundland, we saw a fire at an Old Age Home. It was a tragedy beyond description. There was at that time, after the tragedy, there was an indication by government that an inspection would be carried out and certain standards imposed on all homes in Newfoundland, both private and government run, with regard to safety standards to ensure that this type of accident, this type of tragedy would never occur again.

Now, since the initial statements by government following right on the heels of the tragedy I have not heard myself - maybe somebody else have and the minister can indicate what steps he have taken - but I have not heard a word as to whether there is an ongoing programme, whether the facilities of these homes have been upgraded, whether the fire protection necessary has been installed. I know the Newfoundland Hotel had to install some sprinklers or some warning systems. But how about the senior citizens homes sprinkled across this Province. Are you indeed following through with the programme announced by your administration?

Can Newfoundland feel safe now that all the senior citizens homes in Newfoundland have either been upgraded to a point where there is no fire hazard or that the work is ongoing or has anything been done? If the minister would address himself - yes the hon. member for Burin indicated that it is too bad that we have to lose lives to get action and that is becoming all the more, that is becoming more and more significant, Mr. Chairman, over the past few years in this province. More and more we have incidents, I just referred to Waterford. That tragic accident a few days ago in Waterford probably had more to do with the bringing about of the solution we are seeing now than anything else. But it took a death. It took a lot of deaths to get the type of action we are supposed to have been getting but we do not know if we are getting or not in the case of the senior citizens' homes. So again I would like the minister to address himself to what exactly is happening with

MR. FLIGHT: regards to, particularly with the safety aspect, with the safety precautions being taken in the senior citizens homes of the province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the minister mentioned Summer Games, in the recreation aspect. Summer Games. A few days ago, Mr. Chairman, a week or two ago we went through a debate here and the debate was based on Labrador: Why the feeling in Labrador is what we have today in this province? Why the feeling of anti-Newfoundland, that we are not concerned about them. Why? Mr. Chairman, when one realizes that the Summer Games had been awarded to the Labrador City -Wabush area and this administration just took them away from them, and put it in Grand Falls and Gander -

MR. H. COLLINS: I will give the facts when I speak.

MR. FLIGHT: The minister will give the facts when he - the minister will give the facts. I remember CBC open line - the CBC Here and Now show where the people, the people that I listened to were the people involved, the people involved with the programme who had done all the groundwork, who had asked that the games be provided in Labrador City. Apparently everybody concerned was - all indications were the games would be held in Wabush-Labrador City. Suddenly the people concerned in Labrador, the people, the organizers were told that the games would be in Grand Falls. Now the minister can deny that if he wants. But in denying it he is going to have to dispute the word, not my word, the word of the people in Labrador City and Wabush, who told all Newfoundland that they had the Summer Games and that they wanted the Summer Games and had the facilities and had done the organization work. So when he denies that -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. FLIGHT: So the minister can - I would appreciate it if the next time he speaks he would answer some of the points that I have raised here Mr. Chairman. /



MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. Chairman for recognizing me.

Mr. Chairman, really the most important, I suppose, aspect of this department is the philosophy behind the department. That is the most important thing, Sir. It is the kind of department that you have to continually keep a watchful eye on. You have to keep up to date on things. You cannot afford to slacken off on that particular department at all. And I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the weakness of this department is in the minister himself, that the minister is incompetent of running this department. This department, Sir, is under the Minister of Health at the present time due to restructuring. When restructuring was done shortly after the Moores administration formed the government of this Province, they carried out a restructuring programme changing various and sundry government departments that was supposed to be the salvation of Newfoundland. We have not heard a sound, not a peep about restructuring since. It increased the number of - I beg your pardon?

MR. LUSH: Was there ever a full-fledged minister?

MR. NEARY: Yes there was.

MR. LUSH: Not in this session.

MR. NEARY: No, not in this session. There was a full-fledged minister at one time. But now we have an acting minister. We have a minister who covers two departments. And even in the portfolio to which that hon. gentleman is responsible, the Department of Health, the hon. gentleman has shied away from his responsibilities. So what would you expect the hon. gentleman to do with a portfolio that really is probably - he probably looks upon it as a bit of a nuisance to him? And in the second place, Mr. Chairman, Recreation and Rehabilitation should not be in any way associated with the Department of Health. It should not. It should not come under the Minister of Health. There is a tendency to run the institutions more like hospitals than rehabilitative institutions.

Mr. Chairman, I happen to be the minister responsible for part of that department for three and a half years. I was the one who introduced

MR. NEARY:

the name, rehabilitation, into the vocabulary of the ministry in this Province.

MR. MORGAN: That is about all you did do.

MR. NEARY: I changed the name of the Department of Welfare, which was demeaning, I changed it from the Department of Welfare to the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation. And then the administration, when they restructured themselves out of business to insulate themselves from the ordinary people of this Province, they split the department. And that, in my opinion, was a mistake. They should not have split it. And, Mr. Chairman, I paid very strict attention to what the hon. gentleman was saying about Exon House in the early part of his remarks, in the hon. gentleman's introductory remarks. And I got news for the hon. gentleman, Sir. The hon. gentleman had the face, the face of a robber's horse to stand up and say the minister is changing the direction of Exon House. Exon House was bought and purchased from the Anglican Orphanage Corporation of this Province to be used as a training institution. Does the hon. minister realize that? Do not try to come in this House and give us a snow job about changing the direction of the department. I was the one who signed the document. I negotiated with the Anglican Orphanage Corporation for the purchase of that building and spent over a million dollars renovating the building and getting it ready for mentally and physically handicapped children in this Province for a training institution, not to be run as a hospital. And when I left the ministry on January 18, 1972 that was a training institution.

Mr. Chairman, people have been sent - Doctor Stanley, who is one of the most outstanding men in his field of rehabilitation in Canada - a hospital has been named after the gentleman over in St. John, New Brunswick - came to this Province on a voluntary basis and gave us guidance and gave us the benefit of his experience and advice before we opened Exon House. Doctor Pottle,

MR. NEARY: Dr. Renouf she was at the time, now Dr. Brown. We had a special committee set up to advise us on how to run Exon House as a training institution. And the hon. minister will find in the files reports and reams of documents telling us the kind of a training programme that we should run in that institution. The minister will not find out anything new from the people who are being brought in now as a result of the controversy at Exon House. The minister will not find out anything that he did not know before because it is all in the files of the department. The trouble is, Sir, and it is not because I left, if I had stayed maybe it would have happened but I doubt it very much because I was keeping a very close, a very watchful eye on Exon House because it happened to be my baby. Before that time, before Exon House was open, a lot of these kids were in homes and a lot of them were up in the Children's Home on Water Street West. They were out in homes sometimes locked up in bedrooms, tied to bedsteads and everything else and they were brought in to be given some training.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, if there is one thing that I am proud of in my lifetime, and I would thank God I was given the opportunity by the hon. former Premier of this Province to use whatever ability I had in this regard, if it is one thing that I am proud of, Sir, it is the work that I did for the young people of this Province and for the senior citizens of this Province, because the programme that they are now carrying out in building senior citizens homes is the programme that I started when I was Minister of Social Services. The adoption programme that they are following is one that I started. I think I could probably claim almost single-handed - cash payment to people on welfare instead of the voucher system, payment by cheques. The reforms were absolutely fantastic, Sir, and dramatic in three and a half years. And if there is one thing that I am proud of, Sir, and I thank the hon. gentleman for giving me the opportunity to use whatever talents I had in this regard, is the work that I



MR. NEARY: did for the young people of this Province, right from newborn babies right up to children who were sixteen years of age in the training homes who we had to let go when they became sixteen years of age under the law. And so I do know wherein I speak, Sir. I think I do know a little about this subject and I think it is wrong, Mr. Chairman, and I do not care whose toes I walk on, but I think it is wrong to turn the controversy at Exon House into a political issue. It is morally wrong, Sir. I do not think the situation, as far as child abuse is concerned, I do not think the situation is quite as bad as it has been painted. There has been a gross exaggeration for whatever reason, Sir, I do not know, what the motives are I cannot say, but I will say this, Mr. Chairman, that I would be very, very surprised and as a matter of fact I would be shocked to learn that children have been beaten and Exon House because I do not believe it. I do not think it is true. As a matter of fact I am sure it is not true.

I think probably there is more truth to a little bit of a power struggle that may be going on within that institution, directly resulting from the lack of direction from the minister of that department, the minister responsible for that department. That is the reason for it, Sir. The low morale at Exon House is the cause of the trouble, the low morale that is being brought about by a minister who has been completely ignoring the recommendations and the cries and the breakdown in communications between the minister's department and Exon House by placing incompetent in charge of the institution who do not know how to deal with people, who do not know how to cope with the situation, who do not know how to get her back on the rails. She got off the rails after 1972 and the minister and the staff do not know how to get her back on the rails. They allowed the institution to start being run like a hospital. The thing to do is to keep the children drugged, to keep them on tranquillizers, to keep them quiet so they would not be bothersome.

MR. NEARY:

And the morale deteriorated. Do hon. members not remember two years ago, three years ago in this hon. House I talked about the morale at Exon House.

MR. J. CARTER: There is no need for shouting.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am not shouting, Mr. Chairman. I happen to be pretty mad about this situation. The hon. gentleman from St. John's North may not be interested but I can assure the hon. gentleman that I am. And I think it is a shame, Sir, it is a shame the way the government and the minister has ignored institutions like Exon House and did not take a greater interest. That is the result of restructuring and taking that particular branch of the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation, of splitting it up and taking it away from that department.

So it all gets back, Mr. Chairman, to a matter of philosophy. And the hon. minister now finds himself right in the middle of a controversy that the hon. minister has not said too much about, like all other things, like the fisheries scandal, like the Waterford Hospital strike. The minister shielded away from it, ignored it, let his colleagues take the rap. When is the Minister of Health going to stand up and the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation and take the responsibility and take the rap for the good or the bad of his departments. So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that steps will be taken to rectify this situation at Exon House at an early a date as possible, because as long as the morale is bad over there and you have this internal bickering and power struggle, whatever it is that is going on, Sir, then the ones that will suffer will be the children. They may not suffer by being beaten, but they will suffer in other ways, psychologically. And they will not get that tender loving care that these kids need. That is the important thing, Sir. The whole idea of Exon House, Sir, was to run it as a training institution. And we moved as many children as we could from the home on Water Street West that could be trained and brought children in from around the Province that could

MR. NEARY:

be trained. As a matter of fact, Sir, the first children who went out to school, who went out to a regular school, went out from Exon House under my administration. And then the minister tells us he is going to change the direction of Exon House. Change the direction of it, my eyeball!

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of other matters to which I want to refer. I want to refer to the minister's comments in connection with the Summer Games. And I am not going to go back and rehash this scandal involved in the land transaction of the Summer Games that the Minister of Justice would not allow an inquiry to go ahead on in this Province. That is a mark, Sir. That is a dark cloud that will hang over the location of the Aquarena forever and ever. I am talking about the scandal involving the purchase of the land. Mr. Chairman, what I want to find out from the minister is what is going to happen to all this property when the Summer Games are over? There is a gigantic struggle going on at the moment between the recreation people, the City Council, Memorial University, of who is going to assume the responsibility for all these posh facilities. multi-million extravaganza that is being built. Who is going to assume the responsibility for them? Is the Province going to take the responsibility for the Aquarena which is going to cost the people either of this Province or of this City a minimum of \$300,000 a year to operate? Will the government assume that deficit, assume that responsibility despite all the malarky that we are hearing from the P.R. con men, "Oh, it is going to be a great thing, a beautiful thing for Newfoundland these fine facilities we are going to have after it is over!" I am told Memorial University would not touch it with a barge pole because it is going to cost too much. The City Council are now backing away from it. Who is going to end up with these facilities and who is going to pay for the deficit in the Aquarena and all the other facilities that we have around, scattered around that will be a hangover from the Summer Games? We saw the other night on television or in the newspapers, I think it was the Weekend the hangover from Expo '67.



Mr. Neary.

I do not know if hon. gentleman read the comments of the various dignitaries and people in authority in the Province of Quebec and in Montreal in connection with the Expo 67 facilities that were going to be built and, Oh what a great thing this was going to be for mankind and for Canada! And today all you have got is a shambles, the buildings are falling down. And I say it is a good thing my hon. friend, the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), rescued a couple of these buildings and brought them to Newfoundland, the Czechoslovakian Pavilion and the Yugoslavian Pavilion. I know where the crockeryware ended up, down in Robin Hood Bay. That is some of the crockery ware I was talking about when I put that question on the Order Paper. Otherwise these buildings would have been run down if they had not been brought to Newfoundland. They would have been run down. And my hon. friend was condemned, and criticized and beaten and browbeaten from one end of this Province to the other. And today you look at Weekend and what do you see? You see buildings with the roofs fallen out of them, the doors hanging off, the windows hanging out over at Expo 67. And here we are with this Aquarena over here. What is going to happen to that? Who is going to take it over and run it? It is an orphan. It is going to be an orphan. I can see it coming. The Minister of Rehabilitation does not want to touch it. The University does not want it, and the City Council does not want it, because it is going to be too expensive to operate, a minimum of \$300,000 a year. So I will be interested to hear what the minister proposes to do about this problem.

And then what about the Ferryland stadium? Mr. Chairman, we were told when Mr. Charlie Power was a member of this House that the government had committed itself to a stadium for Ferryland, and as far as I can learn, Sir, to the best of my knowledge, nothing has been done yet to fulfill that promise to the people of Ferryland and give them

Mr. Neary.

their long overdue promised stadium. Will it be bait, Sir, in the upcoming Ferryland election? Will it be held out, dangled as a carrot in front of the voters in Ferryland again? It is only after being an issue now in three elections on the Southern Shore - three! They used it in three elections, and I bet you a dollar that Charlie Power, and his crowd will be back again dangling the carrot and saying, Oh, the big issue on the Southern Shore in Ferryland district is a stadium so that our young people can enjoy recreation facilities. Well, Sir, it was promised three years ago. Why is it not there? Why? The Minister of Finance knows why it is not there. I do not know if the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation knows why it is not there. But maybe the bulldozers will move in now as soon as the by-election is called, if it is ever called. It may be a good thing to have a by-election, another by-election. Maybe the third time will be lucky. Maybe the third time round, Sir, they will get their stadium. They have not gotten it yet, and I want to hear what the minister has to say about that promise, and that commitment.

Another matter, Mr. Chairman, that I want to hear the hon. gentleman comment on is a matter that has bothered me for some time, and that is forcing people who go into senior citizens' homes with a few dollars in the bank, forcing them, Sir, to get rid of their bank accounts, forcing them to pay up to, I think, \$1,200 a month, to as high as \$1,250 a month at Hoyles Home, to \$1,000, \$800, \$500, \$900 a month in other places. Some of the senior citizens, Sir, who worked hard, saved their money, and who had a bank account - and there are only about a dozen of them I would say in the whole Province - these people are forced to spend their own money before they are allowed to be accepted into Hoyles Home or in any other senior citizens' home in this Province. Now, Mr. Chairman, I can claim, I suppose, part of the blame for this, because -

MR. COLLINS: That statement that they are forced to spend their money before they can get in -

MR. NEARY: Commit their money. They are forced to commit.

MR. COLLINS: Well, they pay their way.

MR. NEARY: They pay their way, Sir.

MR. LUSH: What did you say -

MR. NEARY: \$900, \$1,000, \$1,200 a month for some people.

MR. COLLINS: The fact that they have money is not a deterrent to getting in.

MR. NEARY: The fact that they have money is not a deterrent to them getting in, but they are being discriminated against.



MR. NEARY: They have to give up their bank accounts. They have to keep paying their way until they are paupers. They are forced to become paupers with this foolish system. And I was always told that it was something that the Government of Canada insisted on, there was an agreement of some kind that I could never figure out. Maybe I listened to the officials of the department too much on this particular matter and I should have went ahead myself when I was minister and wiped it out, cut it out. It does not make any sense at all, Sir. We put these senior citizens' homes there for our senior citizens without fear or favour, without discriminating - and my hon. friend I believe knows what I am talking about, my hon. friend the member for Fogo (Captain Winsor) and there are other members probably in the House too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon. member's twenty minutes has elapsed.

MR. NEARY: I will have to come back again, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words about this most important department. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) started off by saying that philosophy was most important in this area and the need to look at new developments and what the philosophy of what the department is. And I could not agree with him more. And the present structure seems to indicate that the government does not place too high a priority on this particular department.

Now the point I want to make is this, that I do believe that if there is among all the departments here one special division that needs a minister of its own it would be this one. But I am not sure that we do with the proper structuring. I think for example that there is certainly some aspects of rehabilitation that should probably come under Health but there are very few. And certainly recreation, that should not come under this particular

MR. LUSH: portfolio. The Minister of Health, I do not think, can pull these two together.

I do believe that there are many aspects of this department that could very profitably come under Education, very profitably. But I am inclined to believe that if there is one division that can do with a minister it is this one because the needs are important and I do not agree with splitting the thing up and having one man to look after the whole division. It is too important, too too important. But again I think there are aspects here that fall within the purview of educators and could better be done under that particular department.

I never heard all of what the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said. I do not know whether he suggested what should happen in this respect or not.

MR. NEARY: Put it back where it was in the first place.

MR. LUSH: Yes. Now since I have been a member of this House there has never been a full-fledged minister of this department, again indicating -

MR. NEARY: There has been a full time minister.

MR. LUSH: Not since I have been here.

MR. NEARY: No. No. Before you came.

MR. LUSH: Right. I am saying since I have been a member there has not been a full-fledged minister of this department. I think there was an acting minister, I believe the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) was acting last year.

So this indicates certainly a lack of interest, or a lack of priorities by the government with respect to this particular division. And I believe that the needs are great in this area, in the area of rehabilitation, in the area of recreation, and a most important area and I just want to say a few words about rehabilitation for a moment, and to reiterate

MR. LUSH: some of the remarks already made by the hon. member for Buchans (Mr. Flight) and the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

First of all though I want to say I think there is a tremendous need in this Province to come up with some facilities, some training programmes for the disabled and for the handicapped in this Province, and I am sure that the minister must realize this and I am sure that the demands on his department for this sort of thing, for more space, for more institutions for the disabled and for the handicapped is tremendous and the need is great. And of course the difficulty with coming up with programmes and institutions of this kind is that they are so expensive. They are tremendously expensive, and no doubt that puts a restriction on the government but I do believe



MR. LUSH: that there is more that can be done. I am not aware or I am not knowledgeable of all the institutions in this province that look after disabled and the handicapped. Exon House is the only one that I am aware of outside of the training schools for boys, which is a different place.

MR. NEARY: Children's Home on Water Street West. That is not a training school.

MR. LUSH: Right. The Vera Perlin School. What do they call that? You know, that is for -

MR. NEARY: Mentally retarded.

MR. LUSH: Right. Anyway the point I was going to make, what is outside of St. John's?

MR. NEARY: Harbour Lodge.

MR. LUSH: Harbour Lodge, where is that one?

MR. NEARY: Carbonear.

MR. LUSH: That is the only -

MR. NEARY: Adults. Physically and mentally handicapped adults. I opened that one too.

MR. LUSH: So there is a great need to expand those services, if you will, and to get a couple of more institutions may be in Central Newfoundland and one on the West Coast. But I realize the cost of those institutions, certainly because of the nature of the disability and the handicap that the programmes are more expensive to administer, and the buildings I expect are more expensive to build because there has to be certain architectural designs for these people. There is no question we are talking about a lot of money. But Sir, that does not at all take away from the need. The need is there. I think we have to be aware of that need and do everything possible to try and meet those needs for the handicapped and for the disabled. They too have a right to take advantage to be able to take advantage of the training programmes of certain educational opportunities in this

MR. LUSH: province the same as non-handicapped people. I believe in the past that there has been an attitude that these people should be just cast aside. I think we have to change that philosophy. These people are human beings the same as all of us, and they have rights and privileges and a government, any government, must do all they can to insure that these people have the rights and privileges to be able to train themselves and prepare themselves to make the best out of life. Presently we do not have the facilities or the institutions to be able to do this. But every effort must be made to insure that these people can train themselves to the best of their ability. Of course we have also people who are non-trainable. This is a different kind of institution altogether. I am not sure that we have an institution at all that can properly look after these people. I do believe that Exon House from time to time tries to do its best, takes some of these people in, but -

MR. NEAPY: Some of the non-trainable.

MR. LUSH: But it must put an awful strain on the staff to have people with varying degrees of handicaps and disabilities, some people non-trainable and then some trainable. Now there is a philosophy gaining support that we should probably not isolate people who are disabled and people who are handicapped but integrate them in with non-handicapped people. I think that has some merit. But certainly the people in our society who are non-trainable, I think this is a different institution and something that the government must be looking at and another point I think we must be very careful about the kind of people who work in those institutions, the institutions for the disabled and the handicapped.

Now I have not been close to that in the last two or three years, but I do know that back certainly two or three years ago that it was felt, I believe, that anybody off the street could come into those places and work with those people, work with the handicapped and work with the disabled. I know of what I speak, that there was no effort

MP.LUSH: to look at people who are specially trained. Certainly these people need people who are specially trained, and they are just not any ordinary teacher. I, myself, a teacher of 15 years, would not consider myself capable of working with handicapped people, people with special disabilities. I would not consider myself trained. It is a different type of training, different type of understanding. I do believe the government must make every effort to ensure that people working with these types of children, the handicapped, the disabled, that these people are especially trained and I have noticed in the

MR. LUSH:

last year or so, I have observed people who worked there and I know that there are people there, dedicated people, people who go there with an understanding and an appreciation for these people and do a good job. But I do believe the government must be concerned about certainly the type of people that go there, that they are trained to be able to work with these kinds of people. I will not say anything about the senior citizens' homes, Mr. Chairman, although I have some strong feelings about it. But I believe the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) certainly raised all the points that I would want to raise about that as did the member from Buchans (Mr. Flight).

I want to devote the rest of my time to recreation. Again, a great need, a crying need for recreational facilities in this Province; again in this whole department one could criticize the government for not doing enough. But again I think we have got to look at the reality of the situation. And what I am more concerned about is not the total expenditures of the department, but how these expenditures are allocated, how they are indeed spent. And I would hope that they are spent in a way that the taxpayers of this Province will get the most returns, spent in a way that will give all of Newfoundland the most advantage for its money. And I am not sure that that is happening. Now I believe the minister mentioned that there were 400 communities or 400 projects that the government sponsored last year to the tune of \$2.5 million. Now, again, \$2.5 million is not very much in view of the need. But we have got to be realistic about it. Now in my own district, I am not aware of any money that was spent on recreational facilities. I am not saying there was not any.

MR. H. COLLINS: \$2.5 million was last year's commitment.

MR. LUSH: Right, right.

MR. H. COLLINS: 400 projects.

MR. LUSH: 400 projects, right.



MR. COLLINS: The hon. member should understand, if he will permit me, that some of those projects are over a period of three years or five years. So the total commitment would be much more. That was a one year payment to the committee.

MR. LUSH: Right, right, I understand. But, Mr. Chairman, this again, as I have said, is only a drop in the bucket to the need. But I am trying to be realistic about the situation. And all I want to do is reinforce the feeling or reinforce the need, if you will, in this Province for recreational facilities. The thing is, you see, that I am quite pleased that this is a department, number one, that recreation particularly, is recognized as being important because in Newfoundland we have not come up to this feeling that recreation was rather important. We have been a working people, and recreation is something new. But, Sir, do we need recreation facilities in this Province now? We need them in the worst kind of way! So many young people in every community with nothing to do, nowhere to go! There is no wonder that they are venturing into alcohol and drugs, this sort of it. The wonder of it, Sir, is that there are not more, with the lack of recreational facilities in this Province. And I believe that we have got to look at this seriously. The minister made a good point when he talked about using the facilities of schools. You know, this is a sad indictment on our educational system because in many of our communities the school is the only place with a gymnasium, the only place. And that gymnasium is used only, for the most part, from nine o'clock in the mornings till about five o'clock in the afternoons. That is the total use of it. Then it goes from six o'clock, seven o'clock in the night, no use at all, not on a community basis. A few teachers might go back and use it, but on a community basis it is not used. Mr. Chairman, this could fill a most important void. The schools could be used for young people to allow them to go in to take part in recreational facilities at no great cost to the community. And this is sad, indeed sad. I know in my own district that young people from the ages of about seventeen

MR. LUSH:

to twenty-five, say, it is most difficult for them to get a school gymnasium. Under certain circumstances they can, but they have got to go through a lot of red tape. And yet we can understand school boards' positions, you know, of

MR. LUSH: having the proper supervisory people there, but I am sure that can be done if only the school boards would loosen up, if they would take a different attitude. But I am sure that there are responsible people in the community who would go in and supervise -

MR. H. COLLINS: That is underway.

MR. LUSH: Right. I am sure that there is a loosening up, but not to the extent that all hon. members, I am sure, would like to see. But it would break your heart almost to see those beautiful gymnasiums throughout the Province lying idle for a large part of the day.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And that would apply virtually to the whole of the school.

MR. LUSH: Pardon?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does that not apply not only to the gymnasium but all the space and facilities of the school?

MR. LUSH: Sure, that is right. Sure. That is right or it could be used -

MR. MURPHY: Could I make just a short statement because I am very much interested myself? With reference to after hours, I know it is a great worry on the part of school boards, the damage and all that. What is the situation outside of St. John's - I am familiar inside - of alumni and ex-pupils' associations getting together perhaps to take some responsibility? Is there a move towards that end? You know, for example, down in the member's area, have you ex-pupils like we had the Patrician's Association? For example, St. Patrick's Hall or - I am wondering just how prevalent that is in the outside parts of the Province and if we could not encourage that? Perhaps someone graduates, if he would come back and sort of take over? You know, it is just a general question. I am just wondering.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, I can only speak for the area that I am familiar with, and I do not find that sort of organization coming

MR. LUSH: to fruition or even close to it. You do not find that. But certainly there should be something. Something like this can be done.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do they even have an alumni association?

MR. LUSH: That is right. They do not because - well, I do not know why, but there are enough teachers there and other -

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is field there for someone to do it, is there not?

MR. LUSH: That is right. Sure.

MR. MURPHY: The teacher's field is a job, that is what we found, in the day. At night time, it is voluntarily and that is another matter.

MR. LUSH: Anyway it is certainly something, and as the hon. member from Twillingate mentioned and one that I support and agree with wholeheartedly, that not just the school gymnasium but all of the school, the entire school can be used for young people and for adults after hours and can be certainly used to much more advantage than what is presently the situation. And another point worth mentioning is the school grounds itself. Now the minister mentioned about developing soccer pitches and baseball diamonds and this sort of thing. In many communities the only piece of land that is suitable at all, sensible for, it is the school grounds. Now there is the other aspect of course that some of our schools are built in the worst places in the world as far as with playground availability and this sort of thing. But in many areas, and here in St. John's, we have schools built on large plots of land. From May or certainly when school closes from June up until September they are never used.

Again I think there should be some move here to make sure that we develop those areas, during the periods when the school is closed particularly that the land is just not lying dormant, that we can develop them into soccer pitches and into baseball diamonds. We can do this and at no great cost. But again of course this is just a new movement because in Newfoundland, particularly in rural



MR. LUSH: Newfoundland, that we have not considered this to be a very high priority, but it is becoming one. It is and we must develop recreational facilities if we are to help young people to direct their lives in the proper way. We must do this. We must do it.

And the minister mentioned physical fitness and of course we know the situation with physical fitness all across Canada. I think it was something like three or four years ago in a test administered to young people that it was found out that they were far below their physical condition, what they should be for their age level, and I expect Newfoundlanders are probably nothing different from the Canadian average. And if recreational facilities would be a requirement to improve our physical fitness then I would suggest that we are below the Canadian average in this respect.

But, Mr. Chairman, the need is great. And one other suggestion I want to make, because again I realize this is - we are getting into expensive things and we have to be realistic about it. I think the same analogy can be made in recreation as somebody made with reference to our water and sewer systems, getting these Cadillac systems. I believe because of the nature of our communities that we have to moderate, modify some of the things we want. We have to bring them together. For example, that is one thing. All of the communities in Newfoundland we have been a bit parochial. We want everything

Mr. Lush.

next door. We want a rink here; we want a rink there, we want a stadium here; we want a swimming pool here. I think there has got to be a move on the part of government to convince people that you cannot have these things on a community basis. They have got to be on a regional basis. If you are going to have a stadium in my district, for example, probably as much as I can expect or the people can expect right now is one stadium for the whole district, if the district were laid out properly, but it is not unfortunately.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. LUSH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Exploits.

DR. TWOMEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for a few minutes more on the philosophy of Rehabilitation and Recreation than pick out any specific facets. As we all know it is becoming an increasing complex problem, the care of our aged. I just wonder if it is the change in values of society, because when a person reaches a certain age now so many of us are inclined to categorize them and put them in a certain little pigeonhole in our lives. I think that this is entirely wrong, but the cult is spreading. I happened to be in England a few years ago and was taken to see a new row of expensive houses, beautiful gardens and all that, and someone pointed out, there is the mother-in-law's home, this one, that one. And I inquired what they meant. Any purchased home which had either two or three bedrooms, the purpose was to keep the mother-in-law or the grandparent out of these homes. I think that this is entirely wrong, because those who are growing old often can offer us so much in life as parents and as grandparents. They give the child and the boy and the girl a sense of belonging, because they can give the history of the family, the history going back for generations, often which we of the younger generation cannot do. I feel they should be revered rather than put in museums. And this is

Dr. Twomey.

increasing all the time. Since 1971 we have increased from 1,100 to 3,500 people in institutional care in Newfoundland. I think this is a disgrace. As we look back in history, just to name but a few of the remarkable people who have given something to our lives and to the lives of the world, in politics, Chancellor Adenauer, in art, Picasso, in music Toscanini. We have these people, and they are all around us. I have seen them in Newfoundland, the grandparents, the senior citizens, who have been able to teach the art of boat building, of fishing, of the very basis of humanity where they indoctrinate us as, middleaged and our children.

We must realize, too, that the cost is escalating all the time. For ambulatory patients it costs about \$450 to \$600 per month. For bed care, \$900 and perhaps higher in a few occasions.

MR. NEARY: The Hoyles Home charges -

DR. TWOMEY Yes, that is right.

Now, I wonder what alternatives we can hope for or think about in the care of these people. I would like to feel that they are a part of the families still, a part of the nation, not a part of the institution. Perhaps there are some things we could look into and consider. One is home nursing. Frequently these people do not require continued institutional care; maybe a help with their medications, a help with injections and a few other little minor things like that. The social worker visit - the boy scouts and the girl guides

DR. TWOMEY: have a principle of doing one good service every day. Maybe they could visit the old people who are isolated from their families and help them with maybe writing a letter, running an errand to the local store, or just chatting for a little while to bring them into the reality of life. Then a short-term visit to the senior citizens' home when the younger people want to go away on a holiday, just have them in there as a kind of hotel for a month rather than say, "We cannot go on a holiday, here lies a liability; we will get rid of this individual and put him into a home, in perpetuity until they reach their demise."

Some other things; when you have seen older people in institutions they become mummified after a period of time. And I do not think that this is right. Because this should not happen. It is conditioned by the environment rather than anything else. So maybe cottage units, low rental cottage units, that might help these people.

There are remarkable facts about the old people, sixty-five and over in North America, if they are asked. Fifty-one per cent of them will say, I am in perfect health. Only fifteen per cent of people sixty-five and over will say, I am in poor health.

Rehabilitation; I think the minister is to be commended in establishing two work training centres for the adult mentally retarded. This again is a forward advance in our approach to retardation and other problems. Because these people, again like the aged, are frequently isolated from our community. They can be taught to do something meaningful, and they can be taught to be accepted, to feel they are a part of our society.

Likewise, there is a continuing programme in St. John's to help the mentally retarded children. This is helping the parents to recognize they are problems and also to see that there is a ray of hope for these kids.



DR. TWOMEY: On recreation, the other speakers have covered it adequately. I agree with the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) when he said we are having Cadillac recreational services. I agree with him that it should possibly come locally, go into the schools, into the ball parks. Practically all the major schools in Newfoundland have a gymnasium. How many are teaching gymnastics, which is possibly one of the greatest? How many of them have running clinics? How many of them have sports every year? I think these are the things that we should be doing rather than going and building mausoleums which are too expensive and too infrequently used.

I will not speak further. I will give the members of the Opposition their rightful chance of addressing us. Thank you.

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

MR. CANNING: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great attention and interest and I am very much impressed with the previous speaker, and before I go in my few points I am going to take up regarding the department now before the Chair -

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! Order, please! Would the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) please keep his voice down?

MR. CANNING: I will just say this now; the member who has just spoken that when I heard he was standing for the district of Exploits was the first I heard of him, but I asked who he was and what not and what I have heard was that he is a wonderful doctor, a wonderful man in the civic life of his area, and he was beloved by all, and I am sure that any time he has risen to his feet to speak in this House the logic he has given is such, that

MR. CANNING: I now understand why that hon. gentleman is here. Mr. Chairman, my first remarks and my first comments will be on homes for the aged citizens, and I am sure the House is not - this is not urged on by the fact that my hair has prematurely turned white, the minister's hair has prematurely turned white and even the member for LaPoile - it is not that I am going to try and get nicer homes for us to retire in.

Mr. Speaker, I have my personal opinions of homes for the aged, and I am going to give the home at Grand Bank as an example, but first I will say that one of the saddest things that I have had to endure or experience in my time representing my people is to see an old man who has reached the age of late sixties or early seventies or perhaps gone in his eighties being taken from his home in Placentia Bay and placed in either the Hoyles Home or even St. Patrick's Mercy Home. More so perhaps being placed in - Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask once and for all, because I have my mind made up I am going to do one thing or the other. I am either going to come in here and listen to anybody I can listen to, or I am not going to start talking to sometimes an empty House because there is nobody interested, what I am saying is not going to go anywhere. Perhaps it is not worth a damn what I am saying, perhaps I am all haywire, but if I am not I would like to be listened to, and when a minister to the Crown comes up to the Chairman and talks out loud, Mr. Chairman, well it just irks me, it just irks me, it is just terrible. Now I do not know, perhaps I am nervous, perhaps I am jumpy, perhaps there is something wrong with me that I cannot talk when somebody is talking, but I just cannot do it.

Mr. Chairman, when I look over at the Premier's chair over there and see it empty every day after day, after day - the man who runs this Province - and when I think of how well it was filled for twenty-three years. The man never appears, he does not give his opinion on

MR. CANNING anything, he does not defend his ministers and he is not here. And then look over at seventeen or eighteen ministers, with one or two of them in there - four or five now, I believe. I am speaking to an empty House, what am I here for?

Mr. Chairman, I am not here for that, that is not why I stayed here before for so long, and that is not why I am here now. So I am just asking for one thing now, if they do not come in, if I have to speak to an empty House I will have to speak to it, but I will at least ask for whispering, if they would whisper. But when people start to talk out loud, they pass back and forth before you whispering a couple of feet away from you - not whispering, talking, I just cannot do it. Perhaps that is a weakness that I have. - Perhaps I should resign. Perhaps there are people that can do it, I do not know.

Now I am thrown off, I know what I am going to say and I think it is going to be logical, I think it is going to make sense and I think it is going to be advice to the House, and I think what I am going to say is a policy that this government should follow and whoever follows after them should follow.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am speaking about talking senior citizens, old people, out of one part of this Province and wacking them into St. John's.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CANNING: All right, Mr. Chairman, before I go any further, we have some nice homes in St. John's, We got St. Patrick's Mercy Home down there of which I know a lot, I have had the experience of visiting people there, and seeing the tender affection they are getting, particularly by the Sisters of Mercy. And of course the other modern home some distance from it, built by the liberal government. It is a great home, the first one that we had where we could go in and see that we were putting our old aged people in a modern environment, modern facilities, And I surely have admiration for those that are

MR. CANNING: under churches in town. But now I want to tell you about one that is in my district, an ideal one, was what I think was a proper move when it was made, to build a senior citizens home in Grand Bank and I am going to tell you why.



Mr. Canning: Mr. Chairman, again, even if I am not listened to and people are going to talk, and I have to talk to an empty House, a half empty House at twenty after twelve in the day, I think we have all lost interest. And I am not throwing it across at the other side of the House; I do not think this side of the House is proving too well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CANNING: At least at the present moment the Premier of the Province should be listening, and I am sure anybody who has the ambition to become Premier should be listening, because I am here trying to do my best. I have always done it, intend doing it. It is my best, how much it is I will be judged. Mr. Chairman, I have been judged for twenty-five years, in a few days from now, by the people who sent me in here. So I suppose I got a right to be here and I surely got a right to speak in the House and not waste my twenty minutes asking to be heard.

Mr. Chairman, I will get back to my point. As I said, it was one of the saddest things that I have experienced, I have had to do, at least, I will give one instance where I took a man about eighty years old, a man who had fished the Grand Banks, first I suppose fished the Cape St. Mary's, down on the Grand Banks all of his life, worked hard, brought up a family but arrived at the stage where he was being looked after by his good daughter, who fell ill, and he had to be moved to a home. Mr. Chairman, I brought him in in my own car, I brought him out to the Goulds, I drove up a driveway a few hundred feet, away from the sea, and dropped him off and brought him in and gave him to the person in charge of the home. Mr. Chairman, I surely had a feeling that evening as I drove away from that, I started to think and looked back on the life he had led, the home he had left, what he had contributed to this Province, and now he was going in there far away from his friends and his relatives, among strangers, and among people who perhaps had nothing in common with - I do not know, perhaps there was not a fisherman there - but, Mr. Chairman, I will advise the government now, and advise anybody else who in the future who has

Mr. Canning:

to consider the aged of this Province, which is a large sector of our population, people who have built this Province, who kept it going, and when they can no longer work they have to retire.

Mr. Chairman, at Grand Bank we have a Senior Citizens' Home. There we have the people, the men, I will particularly speak of the men, and the women, of course, of the Burin Peninsula. They are situated in the middle of Grand Bank, Perhaps I could have gotten a better site in my district, but I was not around then, I got some beautiful ones looking out at the ocean, but anyway they still look out at Fortune Bay and that is good enough for me. They have so many men - the hon. member for the district would know more about it; I am not near it; I do not have the opportunity to visit it that often - but I can tell you the picture there, number one is, they are at Grand Bank where I suppose the most civic minded people in the Province are, and I am not trying to make politics, I got no notion of going over to try to get them to put me in power, I will present a petition for them when the minister is not around, and do things like that, but I got no intention of going over and seeking votes, but I will tell you this, that they are the most friendly people, they are charitable people, they are civic minded people, they are just a wonderful people there. How many have we got there? How many inmates have we got there?

AN HON. MEMBER: About 200 I would say.

MR. CANNING: Two hundred.

AN HON. MEMBER: About that.

MR. CANNING: There are a couple of hundred inmates there, Mr. Chairman, and most of them, practically all of them, I suspect, are from the Burin Peninsula and areas of Fortune Bay.

Mr. Chairman, it is an ideal situation, they are there, they are people who -

MR. H. COLLINS: The total there at Grand Bank is eighty-two.

MR. CANNING: Oh eighty-two. I was far out that time. All

Mr. Canning:

right there are eighty-two people there, men and women in their declining years who have everything -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:                   Twenty-two?

MR. CANNING:       Well whatever number is there I will just give the principle thing.   Mr. Chairman, there are several church groups and other associations in Grand Bank who

MR. CANNING: visit that home daily, and then of course more important still that most of the people, most of those seventy-two or eighty-two people who are there, their relatives are not too far away. They have paved highway and they will have a shorter cut when the Loop is finished. They converge on Grand Bank on Sundays in the night, time and time again I phoned asking for people and they said, Well they are at Grand Bank visiting their uncle or their aunt or what now.

Mr. Chairman, if anybody - I will give that example, they are there among their own people. They are looked after well by the people of Grand Bank, and I certainly pay tribute to them. I have been told by my constituents that when they go over usually the bed of their relative is surrounded by people from Grand Bank and Fortune.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CANNING: What was it Trudeau said the other day in the House? The speaker is requesting quietness.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. CANNING: Trudeau used the word and if they do not stop talking I will use one bigger.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: That is why I have to talk as loud as I do .

MR. CANNING: Yes, that is what it would drive you to, would it not? If they do not want to listen to me, if what I am saying now is not sensible somebody tell. The member for Grand Bank (Mr. Hickman) is not going to tell me.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are doing a good job there.

MR. CANNING: Because I am speaking for the people of Grand Bank and the people of the outports of this Province. The people who keep this Province going, that is the people I am talking about. They came off draggers and out of schooners and out of small boats and out of longliners, when they go in there when they get too old. Those



MR. CANNING: are the people I am talking about. I am not talking about the people who live off contracts. I am not talking about parasites. I am talking about the producers, in their old age, when they are finished, when they cannot help with any more, that is the crowd I am talking about. If you want to listen to me listen to me, and if not get out in the hallway and have a chat.

Mr. Chairman, my argument is that in the future in considering homes for the aged, I think that we should consider this, that we will not take the people out of their own environment where they were used to, will not take them away from their friends, but as far as possible, and I say as far as possible - it is all right in Grand Bank, you have a hospital next door; but I would not suggest you put it somewhere down in Placentia Bay or over on the other side of Fortune Bay somewhere where you just cannot get medical attention because they need it, but, Mr. Chairman, I have visited old aged homes, and I have gone in to St. Patrick's Mercy Home in the night and I will meet some old skipper from Placentia Bay or from wherever he comes from and have a chat with him and, Mr. Chairman, it is no good of me talking about the cost of living to him, there is no good of me talking about the taxi I came in or the car I came in, but if I speak to him about the fishery, and I usually do, you should see the difference in him. You go in and he is sitting there smoking a pipe, gazing in oblivion with nobody to visit him because his friends just cannot get there. You go in, and if you crack a joke with him and say, How would you like to be off Cape St. Marys or out in the middle of Fortune Bay tonight, he starts to perk up. And if you ask him for his story, when he went fishing and what he did, in the next half hour, Mr. Chairman you brought him back two or three years. He just perks up. He is talking about something that he knows about, the life that he has led, and I would advise

MR. CANNING: anybody who can afford to visit those people to visit them and talk in their own language and talk about the environment they left.

I think it is sad to see people taken out of their own environment and put into the city here, or put out in Topsail, wherever we have those homes, and separated from their friends for the rest of their days.

MR. HICKMAN: It is a pity these stories are not being recorded.

MR. CANNING: No, not recorded, Mr. Speaker, but worse than that they are not reported. What are you going to see in the papers today I wonder? What is The Daily News going to put in The Post next week about the Burin Peninsula besides 007, about the Burin Peninsula.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right.

MR. CANNING: A few birthdays and a few births.

MR. HICKMAN: Hear! Hear!

MR. CANNING: And I do not want them to give me publicity, not at this stage.

MR. HICKMAN: If the hon. gentleman will permit a question?

MR. CANNING: Sure.

MR. HICKMAN: What I was saying, I am not talking about the reporting of what happened in the House. What I was drawing to the hon. gentleman's attention, and I am sure he agrees with me, it is a pity that all of these retired deep-sea fishermen, and there are not many left who went to the Grand Banks and the Missan and Banquereau under sail, that their stories and not being recorded and preserved, because no one has done a history to my knowledge of the bank fishery.

MR. CANNING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have gotten a lot of history talking to the people of my district who come in here and retire. I get a lot of history when I drop into their homes and I am sure what the member has just said certainly has merit.

Mr. Chairman,

Mr. Canning.

I only have a few minutes left of my twenty minutes. I have a few more notes on recreation and a few other things that perhaps I should emphasize. But anyway I have been led into this. I have been delayed, and most of my five minutes was taken up asking for the attention of the House. But I would hope that every member in the House will give this some thought, the thought of removing these people from their environment, from their friends, not only, Mr. Chairman, for their sake, but for the sake of those who are at home. In some cases you might take a man seventy-five years old out of Marystown or out of Monkstown or out of somewhere else, and he has relatives reaching that age at home who perhaps are ill, who perhaps do not travel over the road, who can never see him again. I think it is a sad occasion to have to remove them far away from their own environment, far away from their friends and just let them linger and pray - I suppose most of them pray that their time will come quickly.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I have contributed to this debate, and I hope that my few remarks will be given some thought by those who govern this Province or who guide the destiny of this Province. And at least if that one thing impresses those who got to do it, to think about it again and see that we will try and as far as possible, as far as our means, to have those homes for the aged at least in the general area where those people have lived, brought up people, contributed to this Province, done so much for the Province, that they can at least enjoy their twilight years still in the company and in an environment where they worked hard, and that they may always be able to look out through the window and see at least the harbour that they sailed in and out of.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a few remarks to the debate, and before doing so, I would like to congratulate the four previous speakers, some for constructive criticism and others for destructive criticism. And it is always easy to ballyrag or to knock down. It is even easier to knock down a house than it is to build one up. I think my thoughts are well-known.

I would also, Mr. Chairman, like to disagree with the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) when he makes such terrible remarks about the hon. Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation. I know him, Mr. Chairman, to be a very honest and hard-working individual.

MR. NOLAN : Who is that, the hon. member for LaPoile?

MR. WOODROW: The hon. Minister of Health.

In fact he has not only one, but he also has the Department of Health as well as Rehabilitation and Recreation, and I feel that he is doing a good job. Now everybody, at least almost everybody who has spoken up to now has spoken about the senior citizens, and I would like to say that in the city of Corner Brook the present administration has given its full support to the Interfaith Home, and they have also give their support to the old Western Memorial Hospital. I believe we have at the present time, Mr. Chairman, sixty beds, sixty beds open there at the same time for geriatrics - and what is the word we call it? - extended care patients.



Mr. L. Woodrow:

Mr. Chairman, I would also agree with my friend for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Canning) when I think he says that there should be smaller units constructed in the places where people live, because this would keep them into their own environment, and I think they would enjoy themselves better. I recall my father before he died, when he could not go fishing, he would go out in fact in the morning and sometimes in the afternoon and look down at the sea, In fact, that alone did him a whole lot of good. So if perhaps say smaller units, say of ten or twenty units could be constructed this perhaps would not only help the senior citizens to enjoy the evening of their life better, but it would also cut down on the cost as well.

MR. H. COLLINS: The Inter-faith people in Corner Brook are about to do that now.

MR. WOODROW: Yes, I was going to add, Mr. Chairman, that there are about fifty-four rooms, units, to be built on to the Inter-faith Home in Corner Brook, perhaps they have already been started, if not, they will be started in the very near future.

And speaking of homes for children, Exon House, unfortunately it has been given some bad publicity of late, but I suppose no matter how perfect the staff at Exon House are, in fact no matter how perfect any of us are, we are not by any means all powerful, and we are all subject to human error.

Now I also feel that the administration has tried to be fair to all the districts in the Province. For example, you have a home in North West River.

MR. NEARY: What kind of a home in North West River?

MR. WOODROW: That is a home for the aged, is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: There is no home for the aged in North West River.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. WOODROW: It certainly is mentioned here -

MR. H. COLLINS: That is for school children.

- MR. NEARY: That is a boarding home for school kids that go to school from up the coast, is it not?
- MR. STRACHAN: A hospital, an IGA hospital.
- MR. NEARY: The IGA hospital they operated, ....
- MR. WOODROW: But it certainly been given a grant by the administration.
- MR. NEARY: There are no senior citizens homes in Labrador.
- MR. WOODROW: I am talking now about - I am on children's homes, -
- MR. NEARY: Or children's homes.
- MR. WOODROW: - and the one in Goose Bay - the one we are talking about is one for children.
- MR. NEARY: No.
- MR. H. COLLINS: He is talking about the treatment of children, he is partly right.
- MR. WOODROW: Okay. Fine. All right.
- MR. H. COLLINS: You are partly right.
- MR. WOODROW: Partly right.
- MR. NEARY: Is he talking about the dormitory in North West River? The dormority that is another one of my projects.
- SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!
- MR. WOODROW: We also have in Whitbourne a school for boys, St. John's School for Boys, and there is also a School for Girls in Pleasantville; it is all helping the youth in some way.
- Counselling, remedial and training programmes for the physically and mentally disabled persons. Now, Mr. Chairman, perhaps a little bit more could be done in the field of alcoholism; in fact, I believe this problem has reached very high proportions at the present time. In fact, I notice in the petition presented in the House, several petitions were presented in this field.
- MR. NEARY: From the LOL, the Lloyal Orange Lodge.
- MR. WOODROW: Right you are.

I am sure that the administration will give this matter some consideration. It is not an easy problem to solve.

Mr. NEARY: Can you make it retroactive?

MR. WOODROW: In fact perhaps we can get up and criticize but getting up and criticizing it is not the same as doing something about it. In fact, the easiest ,

MR. WOODROW: thing in the world to do is to criticize .

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the field of recreation, I am thinking of the extension, and especially speaking now of the Western part of the Province and especially in the Corner Brook, Bay of Islands area. A new addition was built on to the stadium over there last year and we also have a very fine arena in Cox's Cove. We have not as yet got artificial ice on it but I am sure that this will come in good time.

I certainly have shared the thoughts of some of the previous speakers when they say that our school auditoriums should be used frequently. In fact it is almost a sin, probably a tragedy, to think that there are so many of our young people around today with nowhere to go and a lot of those school auditoriums could be used. Now I realize that there are complications in having this done but I feel that in time maybe these complications will be overcome. And also I feel, Mr. Chairman, that we should try to encourage our people to walk more, to swim more, because this is after all, this is an inexpensive means of recreation. Perhaps even if they had to walk, if they had to walk to school more than they do, maybe if we did not have so many school buses around. Not speaking really against the school buses but perhaps if children - I do not mean to say the smaller ones, but certainly children from grade eight onward, if they had to do a little more walking it would not hurt them, In fact, walking does not hurt anybody.

Mr. Chairman, maybe if we encouraged also such things as outdoor ice skating rinks; these are matters which can be thrown in - at least somebody would probably give them some thought and something maybe could come of them. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the sad part of it all is that everything is so costly today. In fact today, Mr. Chairman, it is not the building of the building we have to deal with, but it is the operational costs and there are



Mr. Woodrow.

only so many dollars to go around and you have to try to make the -

MR. NOLAN: As long as they go around.

MR. WOODROW: As long as they go around is right. Well, I believe, Mr. Chairman, I believe that this administration is trying to be fair. When you think for example of the capital grants and the current grants to recreation all over the Province, I really and truly feel that they are trying to do their utmost. No one in fact I suppose can be perfect, because as long as we try to do our best I think really that is all that matters. So, Mr. Chairman, I will conclude now. I just wanted to add those few remarks. And I hope that we can continue as we have been doing in the past our help for the senior citizens of our Province, and help in fact for the youth as well. When we speak of youth

Mr. Woodrow.

we are speaking especially in the field of recreation. Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. John's Centre.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, just a few short remarks on this very important department. I have not heard all of the debate. Unfortunately I was not here when it started. But having spent a couple of years in the portfolio of Social Services and dealing with older people, particularly, we can only say how happy we are at the tremendous facilities that are available for older people. We listened to the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning), and I think everybody must agree that where possible these older people should be kept as near to their own relatives as they can. And in my experience, and I agree with him again, where we have a case, one of the big matters talked about today are day care centres, where people are very anxious to bestow the children some time before nine o'clock in the morning and pick them up at five in the afternoon. And I am afraid in many cases, Mr. Chairman, that is what is happening to our older people too, that they have reached the stage in their lives where in the opinion of many they become a burden on them, and get them out of the home as soon as you can, and let someone else look after them.

Now, in many cases, and I say this quite frankly, that that is absolutely necessary, because in my own case, not my family, but my wife's family, her father was ninety-one when he died, and his mother was eighty-nine. They have lived in their home up to the time where both of them had fallen and broken hips and it was very difficult to look after them in the home by anybody, and they needed special care in a hospital, and then they had to go to a home to be looked after. And we can thank God that we have these homes and the surroundings in them. And anybody who can go back forty or fifty years here in the city of St. John's, and look at what they called the Poor House, or the Asylum on Sudbury Street up there, and visit that place to see just what conditions the older people lived in. And I was a member of a

Mr. Murphy.

group that visited there once a month, to visit the ex-pupils of the school that we were attached to, and it would break your heart. And if there is any monument that would stand - and I do not care in saying this - to the government, the Liberal Government, that there is one transformation took place, among others possibly, was the Hoyles Home. I think that was Heaven, and the people were taken out of purgatory where they suffered for awhile until they died, and brought to this beautiful Hoyles Home. And anybody who visited there, as I used to once a month - what a difference! And I know the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) must feel very proud of that achievement, and I am talking about the Hoyles Home, Sir, because no doubt about it. People were put up there in the Poor House - or as I say they called it the Poor Asylum right there on Subbury Street. The only bit of change they got was the smell of the hops from Bennett Brewing Company who was right next to them. I suppose that kept them a little bit revived there. But to go up there and see it - and in Heaven's name how I often after visiting there went home and could not eat my - we used to visit Sunday mornings - and I went home and could not eat my Sunday dinner - after coming out of that and saying, Please God, do not let anybody light a match there today, because if you did you could talk about your Hull Home and all the rest of it, but that would have been a great tragedy.

So I think we have come a long way, and then we looked at these Interfaith Homes, Corner Brook, beautiful, the homes we have here in St. John's, St. Luke's and the others. And now we have the new one - I think I saw pictures yesterday; I do not know if it is officially opened - I think it is the Baptist one, marvelous, outstanding. And I think we all have the sentiments of the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning). But I do not think we can put one in every city or town in the Province. But perhaps we could have regional, as the hon. member has said, where there is one in Grand Bank, and the people in Marystown, Burin and whatnot

MR. MURPHY.

could visit there, And perhaps in future planning for hospitals where you are spending millions of dollars for all the rest of the different areas, why not make some part of that same construction where they could share common services perhaps, such as heat and this type of thing, to heat one section, and I believe that is being done, Mr. Chairman, in Corner Brook and these places where some of these are being turned into certain parts for old age homes. I think it .



MR. MURPHY: is wonderful, Sir, and we can thank God, I suppose, for the money so far to be able to do it and we can thank both governments that they have been sympathetic enough to know that when our parents have run their course and have perhaps cannot look after themselves that these places are available to help them do it.

Another matter, Sir, which I have been put very close to for the past fifty years is recreation. I have very much worried about the course that recreation took a few years back. We have heard of the Cadillac systems in all our plans that we are doing. There used to be an old saying one time, you had the trappings of an elephant on the back of a mouse. And I believe, Mr. Chairman, everybody is looking for stadia, everybody wants artificial ice. Everybody wants the most sophisticated equipment. We look at the capital cost of building these, which is considerable, but no one - who could have six or seven years ago looked down the pipe and see what the light bills are costing, what the power is costing to maintain these today. And everybody wants one. Everybody wants a hospital. Everybody wants a school. But nobody worries where these huge amounts of money are coming.

We talk about when we came into power and when I say we, this government took over in 1971. I was Minister of Provincial Affairs and I asked the Premier at the time -

MR. SMALLWOOD: 1972.

MR. MURPHY: It was the Fall of 1971 was it? 1972 was it, well whenever it was.

MR. SMALLWOOD: January 18th.

MR. MURPHY: You know in my recollection I came here in 1962, it seems like about three centuries ago what I have gone through in this House so dates do not mean that much to me. I am just talking about incidents.

MR. MURPHY: So I came in here and I asked the Premier if I could have a look around the Province at recreation and he gave me the power to do it, and I got a few of the younger members to have a look at things that were happening. We talked and talked and talked and looked and the hon. member for Buchans (Mr. Flight) I just looked at his district. I went into Buchans, I went into Buchans Junction, I went into Millertown -

MR. FLIGHT: I wish you would go back now.

MR. MURPHY: -and I chatted with a bunch of young people there then and here they were just fooling around in someone's back garden. There was no little place to kick a football at that time now and I asked them where did they swim - I do not think they could swim in the river at that time, it was kind of dangerous and what not, but what I am trying to get at, Mr. Chairman, is this fact, that no one wants anything today unless it costs \$1 million.

Now I can go through anywhere, and I go back to my years as President of the Newfoundland Amateur Baseball League where I dealt with all the larger areas - Stephenville, we had Stephenville Crossing, we had Port au Port, all these, where a group of people came together on a voluntary basis and put in a lot of time to do things. But as I say again, unless it is a stadium to compare with the Montreal Forum, or a playing field to compare with Ebbett's Field or the Polo grounds we are not satisfied to have it.

But I will say this, and I think this government has been trying to do it, we have got to get into the smaller places. The focus of your playgrounds has got to be your school. When the school is open you have playgrounds there they can use them. When they are not, then we come in afterwards. The question of using school gymnasias has been you know - it has been talked about for so many years that today you know it is sort of like the wolf, the wolf, no one listens anymore.

MR. MURPHY: But I would say this, and I look at my own experience here in the City of St. John's, and I do not know, that is why I asked the hon. member the question when he was speaking, are there any groups or is it possible to encourage groups to come together, and I am talking about ex-pupils of that particular school, to come together and form an association that they could arrange to accept responsibility. And no one blames school boards, to let their places stay open night time and perhaps be wrecked and all the rest of it, and as far as these things are concerned I was astounded, and it was only the other day it came to my mind when we talked about vandalism. During the Christmas season my wife and I had our granddaughter out for a run and I said, Let us visit a few of the nearby churches to see the cribs. I was amazed the number of churches that were locked at four or five o'clock in the afternoon because they were afraid to leave them open any more.

God help us, Mr. Chairman! What stage have we reached where we are spending \$260 million on education and some one says, Let us do this, Let us do that -

MR. SMALLWOOD: \$290 million.

MR. MURPHY: Well, in that area anyhow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the new budget.

MR. MURPHY: On education. Does anybody do anything for nothing any more? Is there a community spirit any more where we can come together and do these things? And I am speaking from experience now. You have the stadium down here which was originally built first,

MR. MURPHY: got out and dug into the thing. Monies were raised for everything and I know there are people here - I was connected with it and many people in St. John's were connected with it - but today we want a stadium and, you know, all we want \$1 million or \$2 million. I think the government guarantees to pay the light bills for them or the power bills now, today.

But if we are going to, Mr. Chairman, and I say this, if we are going to cure the ills of our society today we have to bring our young people back to do something other than what they are doing now. I recall quite vividly the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan). He started a programme in the evening on television and he invited me up as a guest. And he had a few people there that sort of quizzed, and one of the things was recreation because 'John' and I - and I say 'John' - were both very much interested. And this kid said to me, "Mr. Murphy, we have nothing to do." And I said, "You have nothing to do, no fields, no softball, no football to throw?" "Oh no," he said, "not that kind of stuff." I said, "What, what is the young fellow saying, what?" He said, "Some place where we can go in and sit down and drink a Coke and listen to records and this sort of thing." Which was fair enough, eh? But he wanted someone to build a sophisticated club where he could go and sit down and listen to the top recordings of the day instead of, as all of us had to do - and I say all of us, pretty well - some field in some area, I have seen it in the smaller places, where they had an old stocking tied up with hay or something in it and they were using it for a football.

MR. NOLAN: How about a pig's bladder?

MR. FLIGHT: A pig's bladder.



MR. MURPHY: I have not seen a pig's bladder.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: You have not?

MR. MURPHY: I have heard of it but I have never seen one.

Again I say, and I would like to congratulate this government in the first instance because I think we have carried on the programmes that were done under recreational grants and whatnot. But I would say this, if there is any emphasis to be placed on recreation, it is playing the game for the sake of the game, and let us call it recreation and not competition. I think we have gone a little bit overboard in trying to make a Bobby Orr or a Mickey Mantle or this type of person.

Instead of saying, Look, we have one hundred kids in this community; for Heaven's sake let us get them out here. If they are out here kicking a football they are not over there breaking windows or anything else. I think that is something else that has to be done. What I would like, and we all have a responsibility whatever our district to represent, I would like for the members of the districts who have these problems to come together and sit down and talk about what is happening and let us start, as I say again, to use your schools for the focal point. Because I can take you in many areas of this Province today where there is not twenty feet of open space around schools where they can get out to even skip a rope or play hopscotch like they used to years ago.

When schools are being sited I think that should be an important part, that immediately in the area, if possible, there should be some open space so that you can make a playing area out of it, and then encourage those who have graduated, who have received the benefits of an education, to come together and assist.

MR. MURPHY: We have reached the stage now, I think, where the great fat sow, if you like, just cannot dish it out any more; the money is not there. We will have to instill in our youth, if you want to go -

MR. HICKMAN: I have to rise the Committee.

MR. MURPHY: You can rise the Committee and I will finish. Thank you very much.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again presently.

MR. SPEAKER: It being 1:00 p.m. I leave the Chair until 3:00 p.m.

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1977

The House resumed at 3 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House I would like to call for second reading the Bill No. 55, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland And Labrador Hydro (Loan and Gurantee Limitation) Act, 1975".

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman have leave for second reading of Bill No. 55?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed. It is moved and seconded that Bill No. 55 entitled "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland And Labrador Hydro (Loan and Guarantee Limitation) Act, 1975" be now read a second time. Hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, this is a situation which is an unfortunate one which the government or the Province, or at least a Crown Agency of the Province finds itself in. The wording of the present act, "The Newfoundland And Labrador Hydro (Loan and Guarantee Limitation) Act" reads that "The aggregate of monies to be raised by way of loan by the Corporation after the date of the coming into force of this Act, shall not, without further reference to the Legislature, exceed the sum of two hundred million dollars in Canadian currency or its equivalent in the currency of any other country or countries!"

Well, the chief legal counsel for Newfoundland Hydro has interpreted that to mean that that is an all-inclusive amount and that no treasury bills, short-term borrowings, roll-overs, repayments, overdrafts, if you will, of any kind can be transacted by Hydro.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are not overdrafts.

MR. DOODY: Not really. They peak at the bank and the bank says "You know, this is your situation" and they repay it from monies that get during the next months and so on. It is a floating line of credit, as it were.



MR. NEARY: Municipalities, for instance, cannot have an overdraft unless they get permission of the minister.

MR. DOODY: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Can the Newfoundland Hydro Corporation have an overdraft without the permission of the Minister of Finance?

MR. DOODY: No.

MR. NEARY: They cannot.

MR. DOODY: No. There is a line of credit established, which is the same.

MR. ROBERTS: What is the line of credit?

MR. DOODY: Pardon?

MR. ROBERTS: What is the line of credit?

MR. DOODY: The line of credit is - the amount is something that I quite honestly do not know. I know that it is an amount that the financial people, the professionals, feel is well within the limits of the corporation to handle during the next month's income sort of thing.

MR. ROBERTS: What income -

MR. DOODY: And as such the people in finance do not have too much problems with it. I am sorry?

MR. ROBERTS: No, go ahead. I have a couple of questions here. I will wait.

MR. DOODY: The problem with the wording of this particular bill as it now stands is that, as I have said, once the borrowing has been entered into - whether it is a thirty day treasury bill, which most of this stuff is - it is included by definition, or by interpretation of the chief legal counsel of Hydro, as being part of the aggregate of all loans. And the intent of the bill was never that, but during normal business practices short-term borrowings which are paid off during the following month and the sort of thing that I have described earlier would not be included in that, and we are talking about long-term debt from twenty to twenty-five

May 5,1977

Tape 2217

AH-3

MR. DOODY: year money sort of thing that ten or fifteen -  
or even one or two year money-is not included in that, so that  
the net borrowings at any time

Mr. Doody:

when you get to the end of the year by the corporation will not exceed \$200 million. That is the spirit of the Act, and that is the way the Act has been carried out. To date under this Act Hydro has borrowed \$30 million, and it has borrowed \$35 million, which is \$65 million, and we have now another bond issue in Ontario ready to be distributed, ready to be signed on Monday, which is another \$30 million which comes to \$95 million. And there is a -

MR. ROBERTS: The cost was \$70 million.

MR. DOODY: Then there is the Gull Island loan, from the government to the Gull Island Corporation, which may or may not, as the House decides, be interpreted as a loan to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. I think, personally, for all practical purposes, it should very well be included in the Newfoundland and Hydro.

MR. ROBERTS: How could it not be a loan to Hydro?

MR. DOODY: It is a loan to the Gull Island Corporation.

MR. ROBERTS: But Gull Island is a wholly owned sub.

MR. DOODY: Exactly. So as I say, for all practical purposes this House should consider it as part of its total overall Hydro borrowing.

MR. ROBERTS: Is there a legal opinion on that point, by the way?

MR. DOODY: The point I was trying to make is that for the purposes of this Act it is immaterial, because it still brings us beneath the \$200 million level. And since that \$78 million loan to Gull Island is going to be debated in the House, whether under a separate Act by the minister, and if not then certainly under the Supply Bill, the Supplementary Supply Bill, that \$78 million will be debated, which will give us an opportunity to examine the Gull Island operation and the application of that \$78 million, where it has gone and what has happened to it. But as I say, in any event, even considering that under the umbrella of this particular Act it still brings us up to an aggregate of \$173 million in long-term or in normal borrowing.

Mr. Doody:

So we ask the permission of the House for - and I quote the Act - "For the removal of doubt it is hereby declared that in calculating for the purpose of this Act the maximum amount of moneys to be raised by way of loans by the Corporation and of guarantees given to The Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Act - or pursuant to The Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Act, 1975 at any time, no account shall be taken of any amounts raised by way of loan after 25, 1975 that have been repaid or any part of the proceeds of a loan to be raised for, or that has been expended on, the repayment, refinancing, refunding, redemption or purchase of the whole or any part of any loans or securities of the Corporation." So what we are saying is that in calculating the maximum amount of money we still stay within the \$200 million figure but we do not include in the total the amount of these type of financings which I have just read. The theory here is, I think, if we were to accept the opinion of the interpretation by the Chief Legal Officer of Hydro and, of course, the people in Toronto who are involved in the loan issue have no choice but to do that, and of course, the gentleman in question who has given his opinion has done it in good faith and, in his opinion the wording of the Act is too loose to deserve another opinion, then what we are saying in effect that every two or three or four or one or a half million dollar short term note that has been borrowed by Hydro, whether it is repaid in thirty days or whether it is in effect a debt of any sort just adds up until you get to a \$200 million figure and then there will be no more borrowing. That of course was never the spirit of the Act. And so in order to get the opinion cleared that would make the bond issue available to the buyers on Monday, we are asking permission of the House to get second reading, and indeed to pass the Bill in its entirety today. It is something that should have been done. Quite frankly, we should have brought this legislation into the House several months ago because there is nothing strange about it, there is nothing wrong about it,



Mr. Doody:

it was just that the bill was -

AN HON. MEMBER: Sloopy!

MR. DOODY: Yes. I will say it quite honestly, it was sloppily  
drawn up in

Mr. Doody.

the first place. We did not have the correct terminology in the legal sense. It appeared to be defined from the layman's point of view, but the legal people are having difficulties with it. We knew about this some time ago. We should have had it brought before the House prior to this, and I can only say thank you to the members of the Opposition, the official Opposition and the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) for granting us leave to pass this bill. It will not increase the indebtedness of the Province. It will give the necessary flexibility in borrowing that is necessary to allow Hydro to do what has to be done. There are several other questions that have to be answered and have to be debated, and probably will be later on. One of them that weighs on me heavily is; Should Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro be a borrowing entity of its own, and should not perhaps the Government of Newfoundland do all the borrowing and do it under one umbrella? Maybe the Department of Finance should be responsible for all the borrowing of the Province as it is for NMFC. In that way perhaps we can avoid this sort of problem. As it stands now, Sir, we have the high hope and expectation and the permission or the co-operation of the Opposition to get this act through in time to allow the signing on Monday and the distribution of the bond issue. And with that, Sir, I move second reading.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this is a very technical bill that has been introduced into the House in the circumstances which the Minister of Finance has outlined. The government, or Hydro I should say - but they are the same for these purposes, because the Hydro Corporation is by statute an agent of the Crown and in other words the Hydro Corporation's signature on a piece of paper as evidence of a debt is exactly the same as if it had been executed by His Honour, the Governor or by a Minister of the Crown.

MR. DOODY: It has to have the guarantee of the Crown.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the minister points out that it has to have the guarantee of the Crown. In practical terms it does. In legal terms, as I understand it, it would not matter the least whether the Crown guaranteed it or not, because Hydro is a direct agent of the Crown and can commit the Crown specifically. The market may insist upon - but it is not for legal reasons. It is for the satisfaction of those ominous gentlemen up in Wall Street, who seem to be more and more determining the affairs of this Province, it is for their satisfaction. They want to see the name of a minister written across the back of the note, underneath the words which say something like, I hereby guarantee that the government will pay these debts if the corporation for some reason do not or cannot. As the minister has said, the government, or Hydro, have found themselves in a bit of an embarrassing position. They have gone ahead and contracted to sell a \$30 million bond issue, and when they were doing the legal work in connection with it, it was discovered that one of these senior officers, the law officers involved - I am not sure of his title - but the Chief Legal Advisor to the Hydro Corporation, Mr. Cyril Greene, a man of great service in the Province, a former Deputy Minister of Justice, a former legal advisor to the Executive Council of this Province, I understand Mr. Greene has raised a legal question. And the legal question, if I understand it correctly, is fairly simple to state, and equally simple to straighten out. It is simply that Hydro is limited by the act, which is amended by this bill, to a debt structure which shall not exceed in amount \$200 million without subsequent or further authorization by the House.

The legal point then arises. If the Hydro Corporation borrows \$1 million short-term, a thirty day note or a ninety day note or some form of paper, and subsequently pays it off, whether it borrows more funds or uses other funds that it earns or come to it other than through borrowings, does that \$1 million count as part of the \$200 million or not? Mr. Greene's opinion, based on the wording

Mr. Roberts.

of the act passed by this House about two years ago, is that it does count as part of the \$200 million total. The effect of that then I gather is that if we do not authorize this bill there is considerable legal doubt as to whether Hydro have the power to sell the \$30 million bond issue which they have contracted to sell, in other words to borrow the \$30 million extra. Well,



MR. ROBERTS: that is a very technical point and the simple way to resolve it is in the form which the government have undertaken and that is simply to add a clause in the words of section one of this bill which begins, "For the removal of doubt it is hereby declared." We are quite prepared to go with that, Sir, and in fact if the government wish to ask the House to consider the bill at all stages today we are quite prepared to consent to that.

The minister mentioned that Monday is the, I do not know what, the closing date - is it? - of the bond issue, and it will be very helpful, I am sure, if by Monday they had an opinion from Mr. Greene, whose opinion I guess would be central to this as the chief legal advisor to the corporation, if they had an opinion saying that in his opinion it was proper for the corporation to issue these bonds and it in fact had authority under the relevant statutes to do so. I would think it would be very interesting if that opinion were not present. I suspect the bond purchasers would be reluctant to pony up \$30 million when there was some doubt on the question.

Well I think Mr. Greene is to be complimented, Sir, for having raised such a fine point of legal analysis and having brought it to the attention of the government promptly, as I have no doubt he did, and the government in turn have responded.

Mr. Speaker, there are just one or two other points I would like to make in connection with the subject matter of this bill, which as I understand it is the debt structure or the debt operations of the Hydro Corporation. First of all, I think it is worth recalling the circumstances in which this bill was passed by the House two years ago. At that time the government were still maintaining the fiction that they could go ahead with the Lower Churchill development. They had not then admitted that the Lower Churchill development was as dead then as the dodo. The Premier was

MR. ROBERTS: preparing to go around the Province to blow off the tops of mountains and generally to hold it out that the Lower Churchill was going to go ahead. And as part and parcel of the window dressing, and that is all it was, the window dressing in connection with that scheme, we had brought into the House a bill to constitute a Hydro Corporation.

Now I do not know the exact name of it and it does not really matter. All that it did was change the name, gave the draftsman some fine work to do, and we had a new bill brought in which essentially did very little except change the name of the corporation that had existed for three or four years before that, and replaced it with the name which we now have which I believe is Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Corporation. But it is the same animal. It is the same monster no matter how we dress it. Was it Gertrude Stein once said, "A rose is a rose is a rose?" Well, Hydro is Hydro is Hydro.

Now one of the clauses in that bill, Mr. Speaker, led to a dence of an argument here in the House because one of the clauses in that Hydro bill would have permitted Hydro, and Hydro is the agent of the government as well as the creature of the government, would have permitted the borrowing of unlimited amounts of money on the credit of the Province. There was no restriction at all. Hydro could have gone out, and if somebody had been willing to lend them money Hydro could have borrowed any given amount of money, any amount that anybody could have lent them, and could have pledged in return therefore not just the credit of Hydro but the credit of the Province.

Well there was considerable debate here in the House, Sir, and considerable angry debate because many of us felt that that was an improper course for the government to pursue. Well as a result of that the government undertook to bring in the bill which subsequently became the Newfoundland and Labrador

MR. ROBERTS: Hydro (Loan and Guarantee Limitation) Act, 1975.

Oh, they maintained that it was their plan all along, and some of us, I think with legitimate cause, feel that that is glossing over it somewhat. But be that as it may, eventually a separate bill came in and the separate bill because the limitation of Loan and Guarantee Act, the 1975, No. 49, the one we are now amending. That said as I recall it, and I do not have it in front of me right now, as I recall it it said in so many words that Hydro cannot borrow more than \$200 million without coming back to the House for further approval.

Now I agree with the minister when he says the intent of that act clearly, and certainly speaking as one member of the House who was involved in the debates, my understanding of it was clearly that the intent was exactly as he stated, that it was \$200 million gross as a ceiling. If there was some roll-overs involved that did not anybody

MR. ROBERTS: really affect anybody because what we were concerned with is the total to which the credit of the Province was pledged. Well, that is fine. The problem is now - and I am not suggesting that the ceiling has been pledged; I accept the minister's figures. I have no cause or reason in any way to doubt them and I do not doubt them at all - the problem is now though that Hydro, Sir, and the government are their willing partners in this, have breached completely the intent of not just this financial legislation, but the main financial legislation, which is the limitation of borrowing act, whatever name we put on it. It is the Financial Administration Act, I think is the appropriate title.

Hydro have now borrowed - in addition to the two or three bond issues to which the minister referred, and in addition to whatever short-term borrowing they may have made, either thirty day notes in the market, sixty, ninety, whatever the instruments they are using, or for that matter their line of credit at the bank, what presumably would be caught up under the terms of this particular act - Hydro have now borrowed, in addition to the other amounts, they have borrowed or undertaken to borrow \$78.8 million from the government. I think \$75 million of it has been borrowed and there is an undertaking to borrow an extra \$3.8 million and there is the appropriate place in the estimates, which are before the Committee of Supply now, a provision to allow the government to finance that \$3.8 million.

As the Minister of Finance said, that loan has yet to be debated here in the House. The \$3.8 million portion may have been debated and passed in the House. I think it is in the Finance Department estimates, and since the Finance estimates have been carried then, you know, the item has been considered to be carried whether it was actually debated or not.

The \$75 million, Mr. Speaker, has not been debated, it has not



MR. ROBERTS: been discussed, it has been barely adverted to and in fact if one had not been reading the supplementary warrants very carefully one would not have known two or three months ago when the warrants were tabled that the government had lent \$75 million to Hydro.

MR. DOODY: I deliberately read it out.

MR. ROBERTS: Well then I did not recall that but I certainly accept it. The minister, when he tabled the warrants, made reference to it.

MR. DOODY: Could I -

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, sure.

MR. DOODY: I remember it was shortly after the time when His Honour made a ruling that documents could be considered tabled if they were passed to the Clerk of the House, and I felt that this may in many cases be a reasonable and fair thing. But in the case of warrants, such as the magnitude of some of the warrants that I brought in, this may not have been the intent and so I deliberately brought attention of the House at the time I brought in this warrant that there was a \$75 million loan to Hydro and it was done deliberately to bring to the House's attention that this had happened. It could have been tabled.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I thank the minister for refreshing my memory and I am grateful to him. He did the right thing and I think he did it for exactly the right reasons, and we should all appreciate that. But that does not take away from the import of what I am saying. The import of what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the government borrowed on the market and lent - it happened to a Crown Corporation - \$75 million without any prior authorization from the House of Assembly. In fact, there has been no subsequent authorization as yet. There will be either in supplementary supply or, it has been indicated by the minister on occasion, perhaps in a separate bill. However the ministry -

MR. DOODY: In supplementary supply.

MR. ROBERTS: However the ministry intend to handle it. I mean, there will be a minister who will sponsor a piece of legislation. Now, I am not saying the loan was unlawful, I do not think it was. The loan was made properly under the authority of the Financial Administration Act the special warrant was drawn, a special warrant was issued according to the rules. The money was borrowed or taken from wherever it was taken, it was lent to the subsidiary of Hydro, and I have no doubt the proper pieces of paper went back and forth between Phillip Place and Confederation Building and everything is hunky-dory and above board.

But the single significant factor remains that at no time was this House given any opportunity to discuss this, to debate it, to decide upon it or even to find out what was in it. And here it is gone now, the money is spent, this is part of the \$80 million that the government have ploughed into the Lower Churchill. We did have a debate on that a year and a half ago, it was about eighteen months ago now. And that is the last time the House was given an opportunity to do it.

Now I agree it was lawful. I have no reason to question the legality of the procedure and even if I did it is obvious that the law officers of the Crown were satisfied and it is their opinion that counts on matters such as these, not mine. But still must maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the whole process was an abuse, and I venture to say a

Mr. Roberts:

deliberate or a knowing abuse, even if it was not deliberate, a knowing abuse of the whole special warrants process, a knowing abuse of the principle which this government has espoused and advocated so many times, but has not lived up to, has not honoured, the principle that the government would not borrow money without prior authorization from the House of Assembly.

Now, Sir, the government can take refuge behind the fact that it was legally in order, but I will say, Sir, that if that loan was made under the Financial Administration Act as it was, under authority of a special warrant drawn under the Financial Administration Act, that that is a perversion of the purposes and intent and principle of that Act. I accept it is within the wording of the Act. But when the Act was drawn up it never occurred to anybody, and indeed would not have occurred to any reasonable person that the government would ever use it, would ever use a special warrant to borrow \$75 million to plough into a project. Special warrants, Sir, are a very limited, and a very special, and a very specific type of financial procedure. They are supposed to be issued, and I do not have the wording of the Act before me, but they are suppose to be issued only when there is an urgent and emergency need that cannot be met out of the supply voted by the House. They are a means of getting around the House of Assembly. And the House in authorizing them, and they have been, the procedure has been authorized by the House, and it is not new to the Financial Administration Act; it was only in the old Revenue and Audit Act which was the basic financial legislation of this Province for twenty-odd years - what? twenty-five, in effect, from 1949 until the Financial Administration Act was passed in 1974 or 1975. The Revenue and Audit Act allowed special warrants. And I think they are a necessary administrative device, They are circumstances which cannot be anticipated, circumstances in which the government must spend money, and if they have not been authorized by the House to spend it then there must be a procedure to enable them to pay the bills.

Mr. Roberts:

That is fair.

But the Gull Island case, Mr. Speaker, is not such a procedure. The Gull Island case was perfectly - could be anticipated with perfect ease, ought to have been anticipated when the government drew up the 1976-1977 Budget they ought to have known, and I will venture to say that some of them did in fact know they would need most of this money in the 1976-1977 fiscal year; it ought to have been provided for, it ought to have been authorized by the borrowing legislation. It was not, Sir.

We used to hear a great deal about the borrowing legislation. The gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is like a broken record, and quite a tuneless record on the question of borrowing and prior authority by the House to borrow. Well he is right in what he said. But let it be recognized that the legislation of which all the hon. gentlemen on the other side claim to be so proud does not prevent borrowing, does not prevent the commitment of vast sums of the credit of this Province without prior authorization of the House of Assembly. We had the Alberta loan and we had the case of the \$75 million Hydro loan.

The money has been borrowed, and in due course it will be authorized by the House. It would be a pretty pickle if it was not, if this House were to turn down the Supplementary Supply Bill, or if this House were to turn down whatever the - if this Bill, the Bill now before us is turned down, all that happens is we have defaulted on a \$30 million loan; we have made a contract to buy \$30 million on certain terms, and the minister and the Hydro people will not be able to honour that contract, they may or may not be open to some damages, perhaps a penalty is provided. But that is different.

The Hydro loan, Sir, has been borrowed by the government, lent to Hydro and is spent and gone. And what happens now if the House, unlikely the House would do it; the government have a majority; they will say, Well we have got a majority, we will put it through. I suppose they know that, and they certainly believe it, the majority will stand



Mr. Roberts:

by them. But the fact remains the money has been borrowed, the money has been spent, and the House of Assembly has not even been consulted. Indeed, until the Minister of Finance tabled the warrants, but I do not have the date on which he tabled the warrants but it was shortly after the session began in February month, the minister tabled the warrants and pointed out this particular proceeding had done until that had happened nobody in the House was aware, nobody in the House knew, might have heard somewhere outside but one hears lots of things around St. John's and around the Province, but the government had not said that we put the Province another \$75 millions in hock.

Now there is no point of my getting choleric over that, because, of course, I cannot change what has been done. And in fact, you know, the money is spent, the money is gone; the contracts are made, they ought not to have been made. A number of us in this House voted against it when a resolution was brought in in December of 1975 to authorize some expenditures at Churchill, not a resolution in the financial sense, but a resolution giving the sense of the House.

But it should be

Mr. Roberts.

pointed out that the government's oft vaunted claim, the government's oft trumpeted statement that, We will not pledge the credit of this Province without first going to the House of Assembly and getting approval; that that particular claim is nonsense, balderdash, stuff, foolishness, ridiculous rubbish. They have done it time and time again, and that is all I am saying. They have done it in the case of the Hydro loan. They have done it, I maintain, in the case of the Alberta loan, although the minister by - he and I disagree on that. I think legally - I do not question the legality of it. Obviously the thing is legal or nobody in Alberta would have lent us the money. But they have not acted in the spirit of this act, and they have not acted in the spirit of the Financial Administration Act. They have not acted in the spirit which they trumpeted. They have not acted according to the principle which they enunciated. They are taking refuge behind the narrow words of a statute. Legal, I agree, Sir, legal, lawful, but not proper. It is certainly not the way a group of men ought to act. This is not an emergency. The \$75 million was not an emergency. It was perfectly foreseeable. It ought to have been foreseen. It ought to have been included in last year's budget. One can speculate why it was not. It ought to have been included in the 1976 authorization of borrowing bill. One can only speculate why it was not. That is my point, Mr. Speaker. There is this fiction that this present administration will not borrow money without coming first to the House. Well that fiction, Sir, is only that, is a fiction. It is a pile of nonsense, a pile of rubbish, and they have shown by their actions that the principle is nothing more than words. It is not a maxim on which they will act.

The \$75 million was borrowed; the \$75 million was spent in the sense the government gave it to Hydro or lent it to Hydro who in turn paid the bills with it, and the House was never consulted nor thought of first nor last. The government stand indicted of that. Indeed

Mr. Roberts.

they cannot plead anything at all, Sir, except guilty to that charge, because they are guilty of having breached the principle of the Financial Administration Act, the principle of the whole fiscal policy which they have so often trumpeted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me make two other points, one a very short one - which I will make very quickly. The minister adverted to it again. Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro has a number of subsidiaries. Churchill Falls Corporation Limited is a subsidiary, at least two-thirds of it. Gull Island Power is 100 per cent owned by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. For all I know there may be other subsidiaries, but these are the two big ones. I would like an assurance from the minister that the act which is now before us, and the act which it amends - and they will become one in the same when the amendment is adopted, as it will be - apply equally at least to Gull Island Power. Now CFLCo is in a different position. It is a going operation; it is an operating entity; it has a Board of Directors, interesting, by the way, some of the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. I assume they are friends, at least, political bedfellows, of hon. gentlemen opposite who end up on the Board of Directors. But, you know, it was always thus, and it will always be. There may be some changes in the names, I guess, from time to time.

But I would like an assurance that this act applies to at least Gull Island Power and to the non-CFLCo subsidiaries. I guess CFLCo does not borrow very much now. It may have a bit of a line of credit at the bank to enable it to pay its wages and things like that, you know, the normal float that really any business must have, although CFLCo may have enough working capital even to enable it to handle that. CFLCo's borrowing days are over and done with. CFLCo's debt is very large, but it is secured, and it is being serviced, you know, according to the undertaking.

Mr. Roberts.

But Hydro, through Gull Island, will - they have already borrowed a large amount of money, \$75 million at least. They may have some other debts that we do not know of. They may have some of which we do know. I know of two million or three million dollars worth which Gull Island Power still owe. But, you know, if the act does not apply to the wholly owned subsidiary - and I do not know whether the words are adequate; if they are not, we have got to make sure there are words that are adequate - then the whole procedure is wide enough open that Gull Island Power could go out and borrow any amount of money, pledging what amounts to our credit no matter how you slice it, and thus



MR. ROBERTS: driving a coach and four right through the whole principle of the act now before the House.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, may I repeat a point which I have made and which I am going to go on making until it is heeded, because I think it is a sensible one. We have had a lot of talk in this session of the House about the fact that a number of the Crown corporations have got, when I say 'out of control' I am not suggesting that they are doing thing improperly or unlawfully, but have got beyond the control of this Legislature; and the Housing Corporation we had a slice at a couple of days ago is a prime example of that. They raise rents without any regard to anybody or anything.

Hydro is the classic example. It is a monstrously large corporation, and I am using the adjective in the adverbial sense to modify the large, not to say Hydro is a monster, it threatens to be a monster at times but at this stage it is only monstrously large. I know it reports to a minister and the minister sits in the House, but getting information out of ministers is a difficult job, Sir, is a difficult job to say the least, and the House is not a forum that is particularly suited to getting information of this sort.

We do not get reports from Hydro. I do not know when Hydro last made an annual report. The last document on which I could get my hands is a glossy little coloured brochure with some lovely little photographs in it and a few figures that really do not tell very much.

AN HON. MEMBER: Does it have the minister's picture?

MR. ROBERTS: No, being Minister of Mines and Energy in the present administration is like being Minister of Finance, it is far less sought after than admired.

MR. FLIGHT: He inherited a mess.

MR. ROBERTS: But my point is we do not get very much information. Now I know if you call Hydro, and I have occasion to on occasion, or my people do and, you know, we find them very co-operative, if you ask for a bit of information they will give it to you. But the people of this Province, Sir, have no idea of what Hydro is up to. I confess if I were asked what the annual sales of Hydro are I probably could not give it to the nearest \$10 million. I do not know what their activities are. I do not know what their balance sheet is and I do not think anybody in the House does, except probably some of the Cabinet.

MR. PECKFORD: There is an annual report now, I have had it since Friday.

MR. ROBERTS: Fine. That is fair enough. The minister has an annual report and in due course it will be presented to us. But it is kind of late and even then annual reports tend to conceal more than they reveal. I mean they are very cleverly written documents, they are written for a purpose, a legitimate purpose, but the purpose for which they are written is usually not to reveal information.

So I am going to repeat a suggestion I made before. I made it in connection with the Linerboard mill. A year or so ago Mr. John Crosbie accepted it, but was unable obviously to carry his colleagues in the Cabinet on the point. I will repeat it now in respect of Hydro. I think these Crown corporations, Sir, should be subject to scrutiny by committees of this House in exactly the same way as they are in Ottawa. All of the Crown corporations appear before the committees. For example, the other day the Salt Fish Corporation, there were quite a number of news stories in either yesterday's papers or the day before, the Salt Fish Corporation appeared before the appropriate standing committee in Ottawa, officials, Mr. Maloney, and

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Crewe, or whoever the senior officials, Mr. Lou Bradbury, the Chairman of the Corporation was there. Members of Parliament were able to ask him questions, answers were given, points were made.

MR. NEARY: They were too busy getting his slate lined up for City Hall.

MR. ROBERTS: Could be. As a non-resident of the city I am not familiar with that.

MR. MURPHY: Was that a public session there?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, these are public and minutes are kept and everything.

MR. MURPHY: Right in the House.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not think they are held in the House. I think they are held in committee rooms.

MR. MURPHY: Rather than an open session like we are here today but perhaps down in a committee room where the member -

MR. ROBERTS: Like our Public Accounts Committee in fact and they can be very useful. Sometimes political debate breaks out, sure, but often the debate is carried on at another level. And they are not perfect but they are a big improvement. Now I know a House of 260-plus, members specialize. There are two or three members in Ottawa who know an immense amount, say, about the CNR you know and have gained it in this way. Now when the Salt Fish Corporation was before the - whatever committee it was, I suppose the Fisheries Committee, I doubt if most of the members were very interested but Bill Rompkey was there and Jack Marshall was there and Lloyd Crouse was there, to name three whose names were in the paper and all of them have an obvious interest in the operations of the Salt Fish Corporation. And it is a very good forum. Well we do not need as many committees, Sir, I would certainly like to see one or two. I think we ought to have one on Linerboard. Over the years I think it would have made I think everybody's life a lot better. We ought to have one on Hydro. Officials can come before them and can ask questions, can make points. They do not get ballyragged.

MR. ROBERTS: I never heard of officials being ballyragged in these situations. And if they are you know, ministers are there quite capable of defending them, or the government, if they have a majority in the House- as they do have a majority on committee - it is a process in which there are protections against abuse if anybody were to try that. But I think members of the House ought to be able to make points to Hydro, and I think Hydro ought to be able in turn to make points back.

CAPT. WINSOR: It would save a lot of time in the House.

MR. ROBERTS: And my friend from Fogo says it would save a lot of time in the House, make the whole thing more meaningful. Perhaps the budgets could at no point will this House ever discuss the budget of Hydro. They could be spending hundreds of millions of dollars down there doing what they may, but there is no way in which we can discuss it unless - oh we can raise it sure. You can bring in a petition, perhaps on the estimates, but the estimates time is so limited we ought not to get into it.

The same with the Liquor Corporation. I think there are some members who have legitimate concerns about some aspects of the liquor corporation's operation. I am not saying there is anything wrong but, you know, questions to be asked, procedure that are questioned. Hydro, the Housing Corporation: You know, we are getting more and more into the age, and I guess we have to have it, where we have to have these large corporations to enable the public service to deliver services to the public. And it has been decided, and I agree with this as a principle that in many cases the delivery of services can be performed more effectively by a corporation.

I do not know how many we have. We have Hydro, we have MCP, which is a crown corporation and is never debated in the House unless somebody wants to bring up, you know, a particular aspect



MR. ROBERTS: of their operations. -

AN HON. MEMBER: St. John's Housing.

MR. ROBERTS: St. John's Housing, Newfoundland and Labrador Housing. At some point presumably we will have some kind of Corporation in Labrador.

SOME HON MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Harmon.

MR. DOODY: Any corporations that are shell corporations.

MR. ROBERTS: And I am not talking so much of the operating companies of Confederation Building Limited or these things.

I mean they are held -

MR. DOODY: Burgeo Fish Limited.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. But there are a lot of operating Crown corporations. I mean there is one called the Grace Hospital Ltd. It is hardly an operating one, the Grace Hospital is run by the Grace Hospital board. But if I am not mistaken there is still a Crown Corporation called Grace Hospital Extension Limited or some such thing that -

MR. PECKFORD: In any case they are still operating it.

MR. ROBERTS: Well they are legal entities because they have bonds outstanding and they get revenue each year and pay off the bonds and all that sort of thing. I do not know who handles it, Mr. Harry Dustan at one stage was handling about forty of them as executive vice-president or something, and handled them very well. But I am concerned with the operating -

MR. PECKFORD: NID.

MR. ROBERTS: No, the crown corporations -

MR. PECKFORD: NIDC

MR. ROBERTS: NIDC has them under its wing now.

AN HON. MEMBER: The parent corporation.

MR. ROBERTS: But my concern is not so much for those,

MR. ROBERTS: You know, Confederation Building Corporation Limited, whatever its name is called.

MR. DOODY: It makes a payment every year.

MR. ROBERTS: It makes a payment every year. Do the government pay the rent for the building we are in and the corporation pays the rent to the trustee for the bond holders and everything is hunky-dory. There is nothing much about that. But the Workman's Compensation Board, the Liquor Commission, the Hydro Corporation and the Housing Corporation, Medicare, Marystown Shipyard, Burgeo Fish, Linerboard - which will continue to be a corporation, it has got several hundred million dollars worth of debt to try and come to grips with even if the mill is closed - these are all items which we can debate in the House, Mr. Speaker, sure, but we cannot really discuss them, we cannot really get very much information.

And so my point quite simply, and I guess I am making it at length but I think it is an important one, is that I think the government ought to act to provide a procedure whereby these corporations can be scrutinized by members of the House. And I think that the appropriate way to do it would be through committees. We have had a lot of talk, The present Premier is a great hand at talking about committees, and I think he means to set up committees; I think he is genuine in his intent, but in five years in office he has done nothing at all.

The Public Accounts Committee has been set up but that is, with all deference, no credit to the government. It is sort of - I am sorry.

MR. MURPHY: That was talked about a great many years before.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, yes! There was a Public Accounts Committee back in 1971, The Minister of Justice, as he now is, and myself and Mr William Callahan were on it. And indeed we had begun a very ambitious project when unfortunately an election came and things

MR. ROBERTS:

changed somewhat. The Minister of Justice and I were back here, but Mr. Callahan was not when the dust was settled.

MR. MURPHY: I think we talked about all these committees back as far as I can remember 1962-1963.

MR. ROBERTS: But, I mean the point is a valid one -

MR. MURPHY: But I agree .

MR. ROBERTS: I would like to see them set up. I would like to see them function. I think it would help members, I think it would help the House. And I think we have got to be very tender of the fact that this House of Assembly, as imperfect as it may be, and you know, we all get grudgey and grouchy and we all run down what we do and all these things, but damn it,

Mr. Roberts:

this is the House of Assembly; every member in it is here by the legitimate electoral process, and it may not be a perfect instrument of government, but it is by far the best that anybody has ever able to work out, this system we have. It is important that we make sure the system works. And because we are getting big government in Newfoundland -

MR. SMALLWOOD: What did Churchill say?

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. SMALLWOOD: What did he say?

MR. ROBERTS: Churchill said -

MR. SMALLWOOD: "The worst form of government even adopted except for all the others."

MR. ROBERTS: Right, or something along, you know, as my friend from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), "The worst form of government ever adopted except for all of the others than anybody had ever tried."

AN HON. MEMBER: George Churchill.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes it was George Churchill, it is just down behind the rock in Fortune, yes, yes.

MR. MURPHY: A taxi man from Portugal Cove.

MR. ROBERTS: But, Mr. Speaker, the point is a very, very valid one. We have a big government now in this Province, What is it? \$1,200 millions the Minister of Finance is going to lash out this year, and add in an unbudgetary - what? \$1,500 millions of the public's dollars being spent this year?

MR. DOODY: At least.

MR. ROBERTS: At least \$1,500 million, \$1,600 millions being spent. If we were to add in, you know, Medicare will spend \$30 million or \$40 millions this year of which only a few millions is requested in the estimates of the Department of Health.

MR. DOODY: It is all there now.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry, it is all there now under the new formula, was it? \$50 million or \$60 million?

MR. DOODY: \$50 million or \$60 million, is it?



AN HON. MEMBER: \$36 million.

MR. ROBERTS: \$36 million, Well my guess was \$40 million, but it is a lot of money.

A lot of money. And we have a number of other unbudgetary items which do not always show up in the estimates and are not always debated.

So all I am saying is I would like to see the procedure improved. I would like to see Committees set up. And I think it would help members, it would give members the opportunity to become more familiar with some of the Crown corporations and with their operations. I think we would see criticism, but I think it would be more constructive. Criticism now often is founded on less than a full knowledge of the facts, Sir, because the facts are not available, or to get them is so difficult as to make them unavailable.

So those are the points that I want to make on the bill, Sir. I realize I am probably using a broad interpretation of the principle of this particular Act, but I think what I have said is in order. The Act itself, as I began by saying, is a very technical piece of legislation necessary to clear up a legal point, and certainly we for our part have no desire to inconvenience the - I mean the bond issue is bargained for and sold. We need the money. Hydro, I guess, has probably spent the money; if not they have committed it. They need the money and we are quite willing for our part to do what we can to accommodate them.

But I would ask the minister to deal with these other points, and I hope that out of them could come some changes in our procedure which I think would be a considerable improvement. Sir, we will support the Bill. And also, as I have mentioned, if the government wish to ask leave to put it through Committee stage and third reading stage today, we for our part, Sir, will consent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, during this session of the House to date, Sir, the hon. Leader of the Opposition and myself seem to be getting a little closer together on some issues, and still far apart on other issues.

MR. MURPHY: I do not know what will happen in the next two months.

MR. ROBERTS: While the light holds out to burn -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, sometimes I would almost feel that I should make the move to unite the party in the best interest of the people of this Province.

MR. ROBERTS: A wedding would be interesting but the consummation would be frowned on.

AN HON. MEMBER: I wonder how come, Sir, you have to worry -

MR. MURPHY: You do not have to worry about me.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is still a few - as I say we are getting close, we are close together on some issues but we are still far apart on other matters. But nevertheless, Sir, I do not think there is anything that is insurmountable. I believe that the other things that we are far apart on could be resolved.

However, Sir, on this particular matter the Leader of the Opposition and myself are in complete agreement. I agree with the statements that were made by the hon. gentlemen that this bill gave too much power to the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council, too much power to the government, took the power away from the Legislature. And if my hon. friend will remember, when we amended the legislation we even reduced it down, further down to \$200 million. I remember it was in a moment of weakness that the official Opposition agreed to \$200 million, we wanted it much less than that. I believe, it was \$50 million was the figure

MR. NEARY: that we had agreed on and that we would not surrender, we would not agree to allowing one cent more than \$50 million to be approved for the Newfoundland Hydro Corporation without the prior approval of the Legislature. I do not know what happened, but somebody weakened and then the figure - whether we were getting near the end of a session, whether the members were getting uptight -

MR. H. COLLINS: The hon. member has some gall. after knowing what went in this House during all those years to make that statement. Carry on!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, however, in a moment of weakness we agreed to the \$200 million.

Now, Sir, Mr. Greene, the Chief Legal Advisor to the Executive Council, has found a technicality, has found a loophole to get this matter back before the Legislature again. And the technicality, of course, is that the Newfoundland Hydro Corporation, according to Mr. Greene's interpretation, has borrowed in one way and another, through loans, guarantees, overdrafts, interim financing, one way and another has borrowed more than the amount specified in the Bill, \$200 million, and the government now finds itself in an embarrassing position. There are \$30 million to be picked up in Toronto, I believe it is, just waiting for the signatures of the officials of the Newfoundland Hydro Corporation, and the government cannot authorize the Hydro Corporation to go and pick it up because their Chief Legal Advisor says it would be a violation of the Act, a violation of the law of this Province. So the minister has to come in today and ask leave of the House to have an emergency debate, try to get the Bill through today, because if not it will be a source of embarrassment to the Province.



MR. NEARY: It could very well affect the credit rating of this Province. It could make Newfoundland the laughingstock in the international financial business world if this bill is not approved today so that Monday the officials of Newfoundland Hydro can go and sign the documents that are necessary to pick up a cheque for that \$30 million. Now, basically, Sir, that is the situation as I see it. I do not believe I am too far wrong. I think it pretty well confirms what the minister said in his introductory remarks. There may be other points that I missed but generally speaking, Sir, what we are faced with here now, and again all the members of the House are put in a sort of a situation where you would be damned if you do and double-damned if you do not.

We could dig our heels in and we could say, No, to the government, you are not going to get leave today, you are not going to get the unanimous consent of the House today to pass this bill. We could have first reading today, second reading on Monday, probably third reading on Tuesday or Wednesday -

MR. DOODY: Committee on -

MR. NEARY: Committee of the Whole, third reading, and then, I presume, the administrator or the Lieutenant-Governor would have to come in and sign the bill, because that is the next step. Once we go through second reading, Committee, third reading, then the Governor or the Administrator will come in and sign the bill. I presume, I do not know, the minister did not mention this, or at least if he did I was not in the House, will the Governor be coming in today to sign this bill if it is passed?

MR. DOODY: I understand the Minister of Justice has arrangements made to have His Honour sign it.

MR. NEARY: Today if it is passed.



MR. DOODY: If he is available at that time.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, I hope His Honour manages to get up in that -

MR. DOODY: No, the Administrator.

MR. NEARY: Oh, the Administrator, My friend the Chief Justice is going to come in. Very good! I will look forward to seeing the Chief Justice in the House. The hon. the Lieutenant-Governor, I presume, is travelling.

MR. DOODY: In Honolulu.

MR. NEARY: Honolulu? Well you cannot get there in that gas-guzzling limousine, I suppose.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, that is basically what we are faced with now. We could say no to all of this if we wanted to. But I am not going to say no, I am going to give the government leave. But

Mr. Neary.

I am going to do it grudgingly because I tell you this that I am not very happy about the behaviour and the attitude and the performance of Newfoundland Hydro up to the present time. And I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if hon. member's realize that this \$30 million that the minister is talking about now, that has to be picked up, is going to cost the taxpayers of this Province \$105 million to pay back. It is a \$30 million loan for twenty-five years, ten per cent. And not only that, it is going to cost \$105 million. We get \$30 million. We pay back \$105 million, and we only collect ninety-eight cents to the dollar.

MR. DOODY: We got a sinker in there to protect us and it sort of lowers that. But you are not -

MR. NEARY: Too far wrong. And there may be a few other penalties, I believe. There are one or two other penalties that I do not know - I just cannot put my finger on what they are right now.

So what we are doing, Newfoundland Hydro can, under the authority of this bill, outside of this Legislature without any prior consultation, commit every man, woman and child in this Province to substantial amounts of money without any input from this Legislature. And in this case it is going to be \$30 million, ten per cent interest, pay back \$105 million. A noose around the necks of the taxpayers of this Province for the next twenty-five years! Our economy, Sir, cannot stand it. Our economy cannot stand it. And, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how long more this can continue. Newfoundland Hydro - we have not had, as my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, we have not had a substantial report of the activities of Newfoundland Hydro, as long as I can remember, since Joey's days. We have not had a report from that Crown corporation. They are becoming all powerful, God almighty. They are doing as they please. They are almost as bad as Treasury Board, not quite yet. But they are getting there. The same gentleman who indoctrinated some of the Treasury Board officials is the gentleman in charge

Mr. Neary:

who would neither lead nor drive when he was the Deputy Minister of Finance and Comptroller of the Treasury. He quit his job, and then went away, and then was brought back again for a salary, I believe, of - what is he getting now? - \$100,000 a year.

MR. DOODY: Who is that?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Groom.

MR. DOODY: Seventy-five thousand.

MR. NEARY: Seventy-five thousand, plus a pension plan, plus a car, plus an office in Montreal, plus a CFLCo jet to jet around on. What else? What other benefits? Early retirement, and it will be earlier, Sir, when the government changes. It will be an early retirement. He better have a pretty firm contract, I guarantee you that.

MR. COLLINS: Is that a threat or a promise?

MR. NEARY: That is a promise, Sir. That is one promise that I will make the people of this Province.

MR. DOODY: Will you be in the government?

MR. NEARY: Well, I am hoping to. If everything continues to go as smoothly as it has been going between the Leader of the Opposition and myself this session,-

MR. DOODY: Any secret meetings?

MR. NEARY: No secret meetings, Sir. Everything that I do is open and aboveboard. And I believe we are getting nearer the day.- I believe the Leader of the Opposition and myself are getting nearer and nearer to the day when we will be united and we will be united in matrimony for the betterment for the people of this Province.

MR. DOODY: It is not the hon. Leader's marriage that worries me, it is the consumation.

MR. NEARY: Well, the hon. leader is probably speaking from experience. I do not know. But, Mr. Speaker, I have asked so far the Minister of

MR. NEARY:

Mines and Energy in this session of the House, I have asked the Minister of Mines and Energy nine questions, nine questions, most of them in connection with Newfoundland Hydro. And so far I have gotten four answers from the hon. gentleman. And these questions have been outstanding as far back as March. Some go back to March 1. One of the questions I put on the Order Paper for the hon. gentleman, March 1, 1977, question No. 169, I asked the hon. gentleman to lay upon the table of this House all contracts and agreements, oral and written, involving work on (a) the Gull Island hydro development project, the transmission line



MR. NEARY: from Gull Island to the Island of Newfoundland, the tunnel across the Straits of Belle Isle joining the Mainland portion of the Province to the Island of Newfoundland, and indicate in each case that public tenders were called, if not, why not? In cases where public tenders were called, was the contract awarded to the lowest bidder? Now why do I not have the answer to that question?

MR. PECKFORD: First of all, because it has been done up on a master sheet and there are a lot of contracts and jobs involved so I want to give it to you on one sheet rather than give it to you in a whole bunch of series of chapters. So I have it all taken off for you and I will have it for you tomorrow.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it seems that the only way you can motivate ministers, Sir, is to get up and repeat the questions orally. Yesterday I had to do it with the Minister of Health. The day before that it was the Minister of Finance, and today it is the Minister of Mines and Energy. We are going through the proper procedure of putting questions on the Order Paper and we are not getting the answers. We have to pry the answers out of the ministers. We should have that information today, Sir, while we are debating this bill that is before the House.

MR. SPEAKER(DR. COLLINS): Order, please! I would like to remind the hon. we are debating the principle of the bill so I would ask that he would not wander too far afield.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Your Honour. We are debating a bill, Sir, that will authorize the Newfoundland Hydro to borrow \$30 million over and above what is called for in the bill.

MR. PECKFORD: No, that is not right.

MR. NEARY: No, that is not quite right.

MR. PECKFORD: No, you are wrong.

MR. NEARY: No, hold on now. Can the minister straighten me out on that? Will the figure still be \$200 million?

MR. DOODY: \$200 million would be the aggregate figure. That is still the maximum amount, there is no change in it.

MR. NEARY: That is still the maximum. That is what I thought, yes. And so, Sir, that gives us a pretty wide-ranging debate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know from the minister, and I do not care which minister answers the question, I would like to know what this \$30 million is going to be used for. I have an idea in my mind. I have some ideas of how I think the money is going to be used, to what use it is going to be put, but I am not sure, Sir, and I would like to find out. I hope that in winding up the debate that the minister will be able to give us some idea of how that \$30 million is going to be spent or how was it spent. In all probability, in all likelihood, it is already spent, and if it is spent, how was it spent? What was it spent for? I would like to find out for instance, Sir, how much of that money was spent on building a gas operated turbine generator at Stephenville?

I have another question on the Order Paper for the Minister of Mines and Energy. Is the minister in his seat? If the Minister of Mines and Energy can hear me, I asked the minister a question back in the early part of April about the cost of construction of a gas turbine generating station at Stephenville, the reason for building this gas turbine. You know, Mr. Speaker, we would have never found out about that gas turbine that is located near the Linerboard mill in Stephenville - it is hid away in over the hills. I have driven in and had a look at it, - we would have never known it was there only for a CBC programme one night done by a freelance gentleman, I forget his name now, in Stephenville. What is the fellows name in Stephenville?

AN HON. MEMBER: Pike.

MR. NEARY: Pike. Roger Pike did a story on it one night on Here and Now, otherwise we would have never known it was there. They tell me it is the most expensive way in this world to generate power. It is apparently, Mr. Speaker, it is a gas turbine generating station

MR. NEARY: that guzzles the gas like a jet plane. That is the principle on which it operates, so I am told. And I have been trying to find out the reason for building this gas turbine generating station,

MR. NEARY: the names of the firms that were involved in the construction, were public tenders called? If so, did the contracts go to the lowest tender? I also would like to find out, if somebody could tell me before we finish this debate, the annual cost of operating that gas turbine generating station in Stephenville. Does the government have plans to build any more? Is this what part of this \$30 million is going to be used for, to pay for this gas turbine generating station in Stephenville? Will any of this money be used to build any more of these gas turbines generating station? If so, give us the locations of the future construction of these gas turbine generating stations.

Mr. Speaker, I would not mind finding out either, while we are at it about, what is happening over here in Holyrood in connection with the thermo generating plant. Is this what is making it necessary for all this financing, this financial manipulating and wheeling and dealing and interim loans and bond issues and overdrafts? Is this the reason for this expansion that is going on down in my hon. friend's district of the thermo generating plant. How much is that going to cost? Were public tenders called? Were all the contracts awarded to the lowest bidder? If so, what is going to be the cost of operating that thermo generating plant annually? Can we afford it? Have we looked at other alternatives? Have we looked at, for instance, as I have said so often in the last few weeks in this House, have we looked at the potential of our smaller rivers and streams? What about the Lloyd River? Have we abandoned that?

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my hon. friend who shakes his head, Sir, the hydro potential of the Lloyd's River, so I am told, can be developed without affecting the environment, in any way shape or form, and it can be done with the technique that Baron Pothschild showed me a year ago when he was here in Newfoundland. When I was hobnobbing with Eddie, Lord Baron de



MR. NEARY: Rothschild, when I was hobnobbing with Baron Rothschild and the Hon. John G. Crosbie then, but now dishonourable, when I was hobnobbing with these two gentlemen, right down on the third floor of Confederation Building, I looked at a system, Sir, called Straflo. It is an underwater generator. It is installed under water, you can hardly see it. As a matter of fact, one of the things that intrigued me about this, my hon. friend the Sergeant-at-Arms may be interested in this, that during the Second World War the Allies were trying to find out the locations of the German's hydro sites. Because they wanted to bomb and put them out of commission. This was one of - part of their strategy was to put out the hydro producing sites. They could not find a lot of them. They were wondering where they were. They did not discover until the latter part of the war that all the generators were under water and they could not see them. That is why they could not find - they could find the big ones but they could not find, you know, a lot of these smaller one and that is how Baron de Rothschild got the idea of this straight head generator.

It is not a new idea. My hon. friend from Eagle River indicated the other day that the company is now doing a pilot project in Zurich, in Switzerland. They formed a company in Canada. I wrote them. I wrote Baron de Rothschild there some time ago and he wrote me back. He said: "Dear Mr. Neary;"

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that a hand-written -

MR. NEARY: No, but I have his autograph. No, he says, "Dear Mr. Neary:" He could probably say "Dear Joey" because they are very close friends, the Baron and - I remember, I am not sure if it was the Premier or Baron Rothschild was telling me about their wine drinking escapades when the Hon. the Premier,

MR. NEARY: the former Premier, wined and dined with Baron Rothschild during one or two of his visits to the other side. But this -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, if the hon gentleman would yield for a moment, I can say that Baron de Rothschild—and the name is not Rothschild, it is de, d-e, de Rothschild—and I never caroused. But I have never gone to London yet when he did not send me to my hotel if he knew I was in London, when he did not send me up a bottle of wine, one bottle of de Rothschild wine from France.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I suppose he keeps a stock of it and he sends me a bottle of wine. Make the most of that.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That does not make me a boozier.

MR. NEARY: No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It does not make me a carouser. Nor does it mean that I have been bought and paid for by Baron de Rothschild. We are close intimate friends and that is all there is to that.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, I hope my hon.

AN HON. MEMBER: No television?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no television, only an occasional bottle of wine.

MR. NEARY: I thank my hon. friend for that piece of information. I hope my hon friend is not getting sensitive because -

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, it is too late to get sensitive.

MR. NEARY: It is too late—yes—and I must say that I have also enjoyed Baron de Rothschild's hospitality indirectly because the hon. former Premier gave me a bottle of Baron de Rothschild's wine to take home to my wife for saving his life.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right, right. If the hon gentleman will allow another slight interruption it is this, that I still have in my possession four or five bottles of champagne of two dozen bottles

MR. SMALLWOOD: given to me by the late Lord Beaverbrook, who was a great connoisseur of champagne, and to me I never did care whether I saw or tasted champagne. And the two dozen - the Premier is listening intently. If he would like a sample, if he would like a bottle of champagne -

MR. DOODY: He will let you look at his television set!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will see that a bottle of champagne of rare vintage, Lord Beaverbrook's champagne is delivered to him, if I can do it without being misunderstood and if he can accept it without being misunderstood.

PREMIER MOORES: There are a lot of people who misunderstood it but I will not so that is fine.

MR. MURPHY: He will be an accessory after the facts.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And if the member for LaPoile would like a bottle of Lord Beaverbrook's champagne it is his for the asking. And if he does not want it maybe he could take it home to his wife because she did practically save my life once.

PREMIER MOORES: You do not mind if I just send him to court for the obvious reason?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I accept. But I want to tell the House that today I feel rather dehydrated and I might have to wait a few days before I can really enjoy it. But, Sir, I did write Baronde Rothschild and I got a reply back: "Dear Mr. Neary, Thank you for your letter of the 16th of March and I am passing it over to Mr. Tom Schur, S-c-h-u-r, in Montreal who is the sulzer, s-u-l-z-e-r representative and also -" Beg your pardon!

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not the Sulzer with the Athabaskan tar sands.

MR. NEARY: "and also is dealing with the straight flow turbine with rim generator, Yours sincerely, Edmond de Rothschild."

But I have not heard from the gentleman in Montreal yet but I am

MR. NEARY:

going to call him in a day or so if I do not - probably the early part of next week to find out about this system because I believe this has great possibilities for this Province. And even though I have been assured by the hon. the Premier and by the Minister of Mines and Energy and other spokesmen for the government side, Sir, I do not believe that this thing has been gone into thoroughly enough. I believe it has great potential, I believe the smaller rivers and streams in this Province have great potential. And I know another case down in - I am researching it now, down in Maine where a steel mill is operated from a little small river. A steel mill and practically a whole town is supplied with electricity from a small river in the countryside of Maine, and I am getting some information on that. Because, Sir, these gas operated turbines on the thermo generating plants, the fossil fuel operating plants, the diesel fuel, are going to break us. And not only that, as I said the other day they are making slaves out of Newfoundlanders, they are making us slaves to the Arabs, so we have got to develop a new energy policy in this Province. And before we start giving Newfoundland Hydro a blank cheque



Mr. Neary:

as we are doing, Sir, in this bill, before we give them a blank cheque, they should come in and give us an accounting of their stewardship into this House. And as the Leader of the Opposition said, let us cross-examine the technicians and the accounting people of Newfoundland Hydro, and let us find out what they are doing. That is fair enough, Mr. Speaker. Either that or make them subject to a Committee of this House.

We are told, Sir, - I was told in one answer I got from the Minister of Mines and Energy that the remuneration for the CFLCo directors in 1976 was \$57,000. I would like to have a breakdown of that.

MR. ROBERTS: Who has got all of that?

MR. NEARY: I do not know who got it, I would like to find out who got it. Can the minister tell us before we pass this \$30 million.

MR. ROBERTS: Whose was the \$57,000 worth of CFLCo director fee?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in answer to a question that I put on the Order Paper, the minister told me that the CFLCo directors in 1976 received \$57,000. Well I would like to know who got it and what it was for?

And, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to find out when the office in Montreal is going to be moved to St. John's. And I would like to get a log of that aircraft,

MR. DOODY: Space ship.

MR. NEARY: That space ship that is owned by the Newfoundland Hydro, the jet. I have never seen that one. I have heard quite a bit about it.

MR. MURPHY: Is that a fact? It is owned by Newfoundland Hydro too.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir. It is owned by Churchill Falls Corporation but it is used by Newfoundland Hydro because Churchill Falls comes under Newfoundland Hydro, and Newfoundland Hydro comes under this government, so it would not be the first time that a high ranking member of this administration was seen climbing aboard, going up the steps of the Churchill Falls jet headed for God only knows where.

MR. ROBERTS: Has the hon. gentleman heard of the lawyers in Corner Brook who went up to Montreal for the weekend?

MR. NEARY: The lawyers who went up for the weekend? I have heard about that. I do not know, we are only asking. We can only put the questions to the administration.

MR. ROBERTS: If Otto Lang can -

MR. NEARY: The people have got - that is right - the people.

MR. ROBERTS: If Otto Lang will do it why not the minister?

MR. NEARY: That people have gone up to Montreal to do their Christmas shopping aboard the Churchill Falls jet. Well I know of passengers who travelled on the Churchill Falls jet, I have talked to these passengers, talked to them face to face.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you want a flight on it?

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon? No, Sir, I do not want to go on the Churchill Falls jet and I do not want to go in Craig's helicopter, I do not mind taking the odd trip on the Government aircraft on district business or on government business.

MR. H. COLLINS: Do you not mind being left out?

MR. NEARY: No I do not mind.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we found out a few things about this plane. The number of captains and first officers on the CFLCo payroll, and the number of times, Sir, the aircraft has been aloft in the last twelve months? And the destinations of the aircraft, and the number of passengers transported on each trip, and the names of the passengers transported on each trip?

Mr. Speaker, I do not have too much more to say about this matter except that I cannot help but going back again, Sir, to the earlier part of my remarks about the administration that have the Almighty gall to come into this House, Sir, and ask this House to give Newfoundland Hydro a blank cheque. When that was one of the strong points that they used in the years prior to the change of government in this Province when I was sitting over on that side of the House and the Opposition was over here as my hon. friend is aware and my hon. friend cannot contradict this -

MR. MURPHY: That is right.

MR. NEARY: - my hon. friend cannot contradict it, when we used to get the broadsides across the House for taking the authority out of the Legislature and putting it in the hands of the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council, the Cabinet. And now the shoe is on the other foot. What does my hon. friend have to say about it now?

AN HON. MEMBER: It is gone now.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. MURPHY: It is gone now from under the Act.

MR. NEARY: It is under this Act. We are giving the government, Newfoundland Hydro, the authority to borrow up to \$200 million without the prior authority of this Legislature.

MR. MURPHY: Well you give them the approval to borrow up to \$200 million, that is the story on it.

MR. ROBERTS: They borrowed \$75 million - the government borrowed \$75 million extra without approval from anybody, -

MR. FLIGHT: It did not even come to the House.

MR. ROBERTS: - special warrants, so-called.

MR. MURPHY: They did not ask me about that.

MR. ROBERTS: Pardon?

MR. MURPHY: They did not ask me.

MR. ROBERTS: He would just as soon not talk about that one, I guess.

MR. MURPHY: It it was fifty or sixty cents I would called in but on the millions.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, these are just -

MR. ROBERTS: It is those damn zeros. It is those damn zeros, boy.

MR. MURPHY: Nought. Nought. Nought.

MR. NEARY: I am not to mention, Sir, another thing that bugs me too is the number of contracts that are let by Newfoundland Hydro without calling public tenders. We never know what they are doing. They awarded a contract recently for security services. I put a question on the Order Paper about that back on March 10th. Would the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment not agree that the government has sufficient time to research and give me an answer to a question that was asked on March 10th concerning a contract let by Newfoundland Hydro for security services?

MR. PECKFORD: They did not let any contract.

MR. NEARY: Well, they have commissioned the work to be done. They have, Sir. Mr. Speaker, they have. I do not know if it is Duff Robbin's outfit that is doing it or not.

MR. DOODY: Duff Roblin.

MR. NEARY: Is it Duff?

MR. DOODY: That is what I would say it, is.

MR. MURPHY: Who got the contract mentioned?

MR. NEARY: I do not know who got the contract but I would like to find out how much it is costing a month for these security services and I would like to find out if public tenders were called and if they were not, why there were not public tenders called?

MR. MURPHY: Why do you not ask me later. I do not -



MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we have now let Newfoundland Hydro go far enough and it is about time that they were stopped dead in their tracks.

MR. DOODY: Turn off the lights.

MR. NEARY: No, do not turn off the lights.

MR. DOODY: Let in the light.

MR. NEARY: Let in the light, take over.

MR. DOODY: Bring on the light.

MR. NEARY: Nationalize Newfoundland Light and Power Company, provincialize it -

MR. DOODY: Let there be light.

MR. NEARY: Because, Mr. Speaker, the only way that the taxpayers, that the voters, the people of this Province -

MR. MURPHY: 'Steve' you are not serious that we nationalize after what we did with Linerboard and everything else. Well God help us.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, do I have to go through that exercise -

MR. MURPHY: No, do not go through it again. No, please.

MR. NEARY: Do I have to go through the exercise again, Sir, of telling the member for St. John's South, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, how stund we are in this Legislature. We have nationalized the production of power but when it comes -

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible). That is all right. I will pass the message on to Mr. Wells -

MR. NEARY: We have nationalized the production of power. Seventy-five per cent or eighty per cent of the hydro developed in this Province is produced by the people of this Province, but then when it comes to making a dollar on it we give it to the shareholders of Newfoundland Light and Power Company.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A large part is the thermal generated power -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - not only Hydro.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Sir. When it comes to the distribution of

MR. NEARY: it where you can make the money we give it to a middle man.

MR. DOODY: We make money and so do the public.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir. Take away what the shareholders of that company are getting - We just heard that they had \$100,000 concealed, \$100,000 in profits concealed, and the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities would not approve of an interim order granting an increase until there was a public hearing.

MR. DINN: That is why we have the Public Utilities Board.

MR. NEARY: That is not true. That is true, Sir.

MR. DINN: No, I never said that. I said a good reason to have the Board of Commissioners and Public Utilities.

MR. DOODY: An excellent body.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, once in a while through a fluke - But they are puppets, they are only puppets of the government, good as they are. As good as they are, Sir.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Powell is no trouble -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Powell is a friend of mine for a long time.

MR. DOODY: Up until today.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, even past today. I have many a conversation with Mr. Powell. I know his views on some of these matters. But when the government calls the tune they will jump,

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is true, 'Steve', under this administration, but it was not under our administration.

MR. NEARY: Under any administration, regulatory bodies, Sir, are just tools to take the pressure off the government, to get the governments off the hook. The real authority, the people, the elected representatives are the ones that should be - Mr. Powell and his crowd do not have to go out and get re-elected. They do not have to face the voters and when the increases are made, when the orders are given to grant increases, the government will turn around in this

MR. NEARY: House as they have so often done and say, Well, we did not do it. The Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities did it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, but that does not -

MR. NEARY: That is being cowardly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, but that does not make them tools.

MR. NEARY: Ah, Sir, we have to take the blame ourselves. We have to be men enough to - Well, maybe not tools. Maybe that is not the right word, but

MR. NEARY:

we have to be men enough to take the rap ourselves. It is the government who brings in the legislation to establish the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities. It is the government that makes the regulations. It is the government that makes the appointments. It is the government that reports to this House. How naive, you know, are we? These regulatory bodies -I do not care what their names are, who they are -are just instruments, tools to take the pressure off the government. And so when we had the opportunity we blew it. I do not know when the opportunity will come again, Sir, to provincialize Newfoundland Light and Power Company. We are going to have to do it sooner or later. There is \$4 million or \$5 million or \$6 million or maybe \$10 million, it is probably closer to \$10 million or \$12 million, that should be going into the Public Treasury that is going into the pockets of a handful of shareholders of Newfoundland Light and Power Company, most of them up on the mainland in Montreal. And that is not good enough, Sir. And people should not get alarmed. The Minister of Consumer Affairs must not get alarmed about provincializing one of our natural resources. It is the obvious thing to do. Linerboard is a different matter, oil refinery a different matter. But when it comes to one of our natural resources like our hydro development, then we should not be afraid. We should show a little courage and at the opportune time, at the opportune time, Sir, then we should move in and provincialize the Newfoundland Light and Power Company.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having made these few remarks -

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure, we have got to do something.

MR. NEARY: We certainly got to do something, Sir, to protect the consumer of this Province against these scavengers. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I think that is all I have to say about this bill now. I hope either one of the ministers, the Minister of Mines and Energy or the Minister of Finance will give us some straight answers, will shoot straight from



MR. NEARY:

the shoulder and answer some of the questions that I put to the minister. Really, Sir, when you get down to brass tacks, what I am really saying, Mr. Speaker, is that what the government is asking the House to do is to give Newfoundland Hydro a blank cheque, when they have no energy policy they are flying by the seat of their pants. I have been told they have been ordered by the Cabinet to show a profit this year.

MR. PECKFORD: Not true!

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, that is true. They have been ordered to show a profit this year.

MR. PECKFORD: No, that is wrong.

MR. NEARY: That is not wrong.

MR. PECKFORD: That is so wrong.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Let the minister get up and deny it.

MR. PECKFORD: I am denying it right now.

MR. NEARY: Sir, the Cabinet have issued instructions. The Premier has told us in this hon. House that Newfoundland Hydro were told they have to go from a deficit position to a profit position and they have to do it in a very short time.

MR. PECKFORD: No.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir. And that is the reason we are going to see a forty odd per cent increase in electricity rates in this Province.

MR. PECKFORD: No.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir. The hon. Minister of Finance told us. The hon. the Premier told us. Where was the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy? Let the minister get up and officially deny it. It is a political decision made down on the eighth floor of this building. And let not anybody try to cod the people of this Province.

MR. PECKFORD: It is not true.

MR. NEARY: It is true. Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Minister of Mines and Energy now to get up and deny that Newfoundland Hydro are not trying to get from a deficit position to a profit position in a

MR. NEARY:

very short time, in one swoop, one fell swoop. It is wrong. It is morally wrong. It is cruel and it is a political decision. And if the minister says no, the minister can put a stop to it and never mind pawing off the consumers of Newfoundland Light and Power Company with the excuse we are going to set up a regulatory body. A regulatory body will only sit down and look at the figures. And if Hydro can justify to a regulatory body, whether it is the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities or any other body, that they are showing red ink - oh! of course they will get the sympathy of the regulatory body. They will say, "Oh, yes, sure, red ink, yes, yes. You have to show black ink or break even." And that is going to cost the consumers in this Province another forty to fifty per cent increase in electricity rates.

MR.NEARY: Heretofore they were subsidized from the Public Treasury.

the minister deny that? Can the Minister of Mines & Energy deny it? Can the Minister of Mines & Energy deny that Treasury Board, and the Minister of Finance have not indicated to Newfoundland Hydro that you are not going to get any more subsidies from the Public Treasury, that you have to show a profit, that they have to break even. That they have to reduce their deficits.

MR.DOODY: Yes, they have to reduce their deficits.

MR.NEARY: How can they do it?

MR.DOODY: I will talk to you when I can get a chance to stand up.

MR.NEARY: They can do it by getting out and socking it to the consumer of Newfoundland Light & Power. Instead of eliminating Sir, some of the extravagance and waste, eliminate some of the extravagance.

MR.SPEAKER: (Mr. Young) Order please.

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Mines & Energy, and the Administration should do -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, before the administration do what they are doing, make that cruel move they are making, they should try first of all eliminating some of the extravagance and waste in the Newfoundland Hydro Corporation before they start socking it to the consumers of Newfoundland Light & Power Company. That is my big complaint. Up to now we have been subsidizing the Newfoundland Hydro to the tune of what, \$25, \$30 million a year How much?

MR.DOODY: \$19.4 million.

MR.NEARY: \$19.4 million. I would say that 40 per cent increase in electricity rates, and my hon. friend would not even present one of these petitions yesterday for Mrs. Fagan because he might be in conflict of interest. The member for Grand Bank, the Minister of Justice, oh he might be in conflict of interest, refused to present a petition. Might be in conflict of interest all right with the

MR. NEARY: ordinary people of this province. The minister would not be in conflict with his own conscience. And his constituents who have signed this petition, it is the minister's duty to present a petition on behalf of his constituents. The minister refused. Might be in conflict of interest. Might be, that is true. It is unbelievable. Old Mr. Clean himself might be in conflict of interest. But, Sir, the voters down in Grand Bank will remember it, will remember it.

MR. HICKMAN: They will have no conflict of interest.

MR. NEARY: Oh, you know, Mr. Speaker, if I did not have to prove a point to the Leader of the Opposition in the last election, if I did not have to, if I was not - no, never mind I am not going to rehash that again - I know that I would have gone down and had a go at him myself down in Grand Bank. I nearly did it. I was almost tempted. As the song says, I was almost persuaded.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, well there is always a next time.

MR. NEARY: Well, I do not know. I am quite happy where I am, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course, it was a bit of a difficult decision whether Al Evans went out or the hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. HICKMAN: When the Leader of the Opposition is prepared to run in the district where he was born and raised, then he can open his mouth.

MR. ROBERTS: Right! Right! It is my mother's fault that I was born and raised.

MR. HICKMAN: All he has to do is try St. John's East sometime.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right! Right on!

MR. MURPHY: Try St. John's Centre, I would say.

MR. HICKMAN: That is the proof of a man, when you run where the people know you.

MR. ROBERTS: Right!

MR. HICKMAN: And when you can get their votes.



MR. POBEPTS: Fight! That is why I get elected because I run in the same district.

MR. NOLAN: If that is the case, 'Alex', you should run on Bay Street.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of the five districts I ran in I was born in only one of them, I could not be born in the five.

MR. SIMMONS: The Premier could take the minister's advice.

MR. ROBERTS: Alex is one of these men who believes that if a cow has calves -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. NEARY: I did not realize Sir, with my few remarks I was going to start the third world war but, Mr. Speaker, it is shameful, it is shameful Sir, what the administration is doing. It is time that the officials of the Newfoundland Hydro - I have some -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is the hon. member going to continue by leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave! By leave!

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, no, I am finished my few remarks, now I will look forward to hearing some answers from the ministers.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended really to speak in this debate. I do not think I can offer very much to it, but it has been a source of concern to me this past few days to hear Lloyds River being mentioned as often as it was. The Minister of Energy stood up here yesterday and indicated that Lloyds River was the last cheap source of electricity in this Province.

Now the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) indicated that he would like to see - or we may have to develop the Lloyds River, and it keeps coming. The only method of developing the Lloyds River that I will accept, Mr. Speaker, is the one indicated by the hon. member that -

MR. NEARY: If it can be done.

MR. FLIGHT: - if it can be done, Straflo.

So I am going to take a couple of minutes to try to lay to rest once and for all the method of developing Lloyds River, and what brought out the thought that it would be developed. Mr. Speaker, if the \$30 million we are borrowing is to be used by Hydro to steal out the kind of propaganda, the lies, absolute lies can be proven, the propaganda that came out when they were trying to defend the decision to divert Lloyds River, if that is the way that money is being used then it would be better spent, Mr. Speaker, by withholding it from them and using it in the better interest of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, not one minister, and most of them present right now in that Cabinet, issued one word when Hydro was defending the development of the Lloyds, not one minister came to the defence of the people who were asking not to have the river diverted. I have been given credit for having headed up the movement against Lloyds River. Mr. Speaker, the fact is, and this government better start getting down to the people and understanding how they feel about these things. I wrote one letter to the Editor of The Evening Telegram, and as a result of that letter, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. Flight:

all hell broke lose. The fact is that nobody in Central Newfoundland, regardless of how much money was to be saved, was prepared to see Lloyds River diverted. The fact is, in case any hon. members do not know they should get the map of Newfoundland and really consider what diverting Lloyds River would do, and there is not a body of water in this Province that has got - the diversion of which would have the potential for disaster and destruction downstream that that river has got. It is the last feed that Red Indian Lake and Exploits River has got.

Now Exploits River is polluted, at least downstream from Grand Falls, Price (Nfld.) has made sure of that over the last thirty or forty years. You almost wiped out Exploits River when you diverted Victoria River in the original Bay d'Espoir project. The last source of water supply that Red Indian Lake got and all the inland waters of Central Newfoundland got is the Lloyds River, and the crimes, the insult and the crime and what should hold this government up to ridicule is this, that while you were proposing the diversion of Lloyds River, your Minister of Energy was also saying that this was only a stopgap thing, that five years from now the Lower Churchill will be on stream and we will not need the Lloyds River power.

So you people, the administration of the day, were saying that they were prepared to wipe out, environmentally wipe out all of the inland waterways or take the chance on wiping it out, all of the inland waterways of Central Newfoundland for a stopgap measure that would not be needed five years down the road. Now that is the type of involvement that I see Hydro at in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of Hydro, Mr. Denis Groom, stood at a Kiwanis meeting here in St. John's and suggested that the people who were opposing the Lloyds River diversion were bleeding hearts. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have not stood in this House and criticized Mr. Denis Groom or his salary or anything else, but I would suggest this, that if Mr. Denis Groom is going to put himself in that position, if he is going to criticize the people who are paying his salary, then

Mr. Flight:

he will go on the firing line, and his salary will go on the firing line, and the use of the jet and his Montreal office, and he will justify his existence.

A little while later, not very long ago, one of the Executive Vice-Presidents of Hydro in a meeting in St. John's suggested that the people who were against the diversion of Lloyds River were a minority of environmentalists. I would have shown Mr. Reid the minority, Mr. Speaker, had that Lloyds River issue come to a head to the point it was. It was possible to deliver it into this House, and it would have happened, a petition covering every town from Buchans to Botwood. Now that is Central Newfoundland alone. There were people all over Newfoundland who recognized more so than the government did, recognized the danger, what you were going to do if you diverted that river. But still you, as a Cabinet, did your utmost to bring about the diversion of that river. And what is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, - too bad the Premier is not in his seat - when I first became involved in Lloyds River I may have had political ambitions, but I assure you that in the first instance, I did not see the Lloyds River, my involvement in it, as being politically motivated. I will be very honest that with



MR. FLIGHT: wrote the letter and I saw the kind of response that was going to come. I mean, this is the type of thing that an aspiring politician dreams of. But my first involvement was based on nothing but my knowledge of what the diversion of that river could do to all the waters downstream, to the environmental aspect. I was not prepared to see the Lloyd's River diverted at any cost. I could not have cared, personally, what the cause was.

A little later on, August I think it was, the Premier was in Grand Falls speaking to a select group of his supporters, and he had the - it is unbelievable - he suggested to them that that issue would bring about my defeat because the people of Newfoundland believed that, you know, they were prepared to trade off the river, they figured that the Lloyd's River was not worth saving, that because of the high power costs in this Province that the stand I took would cost me.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier went on and won the election. But if ever a man was looking for a way to lose his credibility, making those kinds of statements at any meeting in Grand Falls at that time would have been a sure way to have done it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not know. I will stand up and support the diversion of any rivers in this Province. I know we have to develop the on-Island water, I know we have to produce more electricity in the next three to four years, but there has to come a point when better judgement has to prevail, if what you are going to get for what you are going to sacrifice has to be considered.

Now I understand that the Hinds Lake development will take place over the next year or so, hopefully it will start this Summer. There is

MR. FLIGHT:                   practically no disturbance to the ecology, no environmental damage and I will support it. But certainly this government, you know, that issue alone, the way they were prepared, Hydro was feeding the facts to Newfoundland, the environmental facts. They were giving them the percentage of the flow of the water taken off, and there had been no test, nothing. Nothing. They were just spewing off propaganda. No tests had been done but still they were prepared to in one fell swoop wipe out Lloyd's River and wipe out all the benefits forever more that would have come from having that river the way it is right now and having Red Indian Lake and the Exploits River.

                                  Another point can be made, Mr. Speaker, that at the same time that the Cabinet was attempting to bring about the diversion of Lloyd's River, they had people working, committees and subcommittees and task forces, to find a way to keep the community of Buchans viable. Now if there is anything in that area to develop after the mine goes, it has to be one of the most important, it must be the tourist potential of the Buchans area.

                                  Now the backbone of any tourist potential development in that area is going to be Red Indian Lake, Lloyd's River, Lloyd's Lake, that valley coming down through there. As a matter of fact, it will probably be years down the road, if it left alone, if it is not destroyed, it will probably be the backbone for any tourist potential development in the Province.

                                  While they were proposing the - while they were telling us that they were interested in doing that, that they were interested in finding ways to keep Buchans viable, they were also planning to wipe out the one thing we had up there that we could base a future economy on.

MR. FLIGHT: So, Mr. Speaker, I want to say once and for all - and I do not intend to flog a dead horse to death - but I want to tell you, politics, parties notwithstanding, the people of Central Newfoundland, and I suspect the people of all Newfoundland, if enough of a campaign is mounted, if the people of Newfoundland are educated as to what the diversion of Lloyd's River will mean environmentally, I think it is time for the ministers and anyone else to stop referring to the possible development of Lloyd's River, because it is not going to happen. The people in that part of the Province are not going to let it happen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the money that Hydro is spending. I raised an issue in the House the other day. I asked the minister, and he has not answered the question yet, the cost of Bunker C is escalating, what it is costing to operate our gas turbine generation is escalating, so I have asked the minister to lay on the table what it was costing Newfoundland Hydro to purchase the Bunker C that we are purchasing from Golden Eagle. I asked him if there would be any savings if Newfoundland Hydro went to tender for that product. To date he has not come forward with the answers and I believe he should, Mr. Speaker. I asked the question of the Minister of Mines and Energy, but the Minister of Finance could well

MR. FLIGHT: answer the question if he has the information. And I am suggesting that there may well be considerable savings there, and I am suggesting that if there are savings then those savings should be passed along to the consumer of this Province. And savings or no savings we are intitled to know how much it is costing this Province to purchase the bunker C being used in the generating plants of this Province. And I think we are entitled to have that in dollars and cents and then I think we should determine whether or not there are savings there or what savings are there in going to public tender. And if there is savings we should go to public tender.

So, Mr. Speaker, having said that I rose basically on the Lloyds River thing-I made a deliberate effort having been the person that was probably accused of, anyway, or being very closely associated with the movement to stop the diversion and having not up to this point said very much - as every hon members knows, I am concerned about it. Hundreds and thousands of Newfoundlanders are concerned about it; the people of St John's, if they saw the picture in perspective would be concerned. And I felt that I should serve notice on this administration that if there is an effort, I do not care how it is brought about, if there is an effort made to soften the blow and to indicate - and I cannot really say how the people in this Province feel now with the cost of electricity going up to what it is. Maybe the same people who supported us then will not now, but I am suggesting that if an effort is made or any thought given to the diversion of Lloyds River that the administration is going to run into one awful lot of opposition. It is there and it will come forward at the time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one other comment, and the last one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If they do what?

MR. FLIGHT: If they attempt to divert the Lloyds River. If Newfoundland Hydro, if there is any attempt made to divert the Lloyds River and to feed that



MR. FLIGHT: water back into the Bay d'Espoir system, there is going to be a lot of opposition in this Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him to tell us in a few sentences the basic reason for opposition to that in a world and a Province now that is getting to be utterly desperately short of energy and will be even shorter. What are the basic reasons for choosing not to develop that power? I have never yet heard them, and the hon. gentleman is the leading spokesman against using Lloyds River for the generation of power. In two sentences.

MR. FLIGHT: Well I am not going to do it in two sentences, Mr. Speaker. But when we say this Province is desperately short of electricity, I would say this too, that this Province is getting desperately short of the kind of environments that we have left in Lloyds River. We are watching our environment getting wiped out, and I have heard Lloyds River Valley compared to the West Coast of Canada, I have heard it compared to - people from all over North America visit the Lloyds River. I have heard it compared to - you know, somebody said that if the noblemen had it they would take it and declare it a sanctuary where only lords covet hunt. If the Americans had it they would spend a fortune on it and make a fortune through parks development and what-have-you. And what do we do. We dry it up and divert it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that not true of dozens of places in the Province?

MR. FLIGHT: No, Sir, there is no other place in the Province that compares with Lloyds River Valley, not one, not one, and I have been in -

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is what I call dear love of native land.

MR. FLIGHT: Dear love of native land. Yes, Sir, there is not a river - and here is the problem, the hon. Minister of Industrial Development sometime here recently indicated that we could develop an eel fishery in the Exploits River. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say,

MR. FLIGHT:

and I stand to be corrected, that below Grand Falls the Exploits River is polluted. The only reason the Exploits River is not polluted and long gone and dead is because -

MR. MURPHY: That just is not so.

MR. FLIGHT: The Minister of Consumer Affairs says that is not a fact. Can the Minister of Consumer Affairs tell me how many gallons of pollutant that Price Newfoundland pumps into the Exploits River every day because I can tell him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yield, yield, yield.

MR. FLIGHT: What, what?

AND HON. MEMBERS: Yield for a moment.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to delay the debate, but as far as we are concerned there is a certain - but the Exploits River is not polluted nor is Gander Lake polluted. There might be some degree tending but it is not harmful to salmon or anything like that there, you know.

MR. MURPHY:

Every lake and pond is polluted but to the extent of pollution.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member yield for a moment. I would like on behalf of the members of the House to welcome into the public galleries a delegation from the rural district council of Badger's Quay Valleyfield and Pool's Island in the person of the Mayor, Mr. Winston Ricketts, Councillor Harry Winter and Tasker Sheppard and town manager, Harry Hardy. I trust you will have a very enjoyable stay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. FLIGHT: At the risk of sounding corny, I believe it is my responsibility as a parent, I have three sons, I believe it is my responsibility as a parent to leave them something. I got no intention - Look, why am I living in Newfoundland, you know, why? It is not because I can earn so much money here. It is not because of the climate. It is because I can get in my car and within five minutes go fishing. It is because of the clean air, clean rivers.

MR. MORGAN: Come on! Come on! Do not give us -

MR. FLIGHT: Oh, listen to the Don Juan of the P.C. Party, the P.C.'s bionic man.

MR. MORGAN: Do not get personal now, do not get personal.

MR. FLIGHT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am entitled to be heard in silence. And I want to be defended, as my hon. friend called him, "Jaws" from Bonavista South. And I ask for that protection.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman wishes to speak without interruption.

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland cannot afford to - you know, if we continue they way we have gone this last twenty years we will have wiped out everything we have had a reason to hold dear in this Province. And the amount of electricity that can be generated by the diversion of Lloyds River can in no way pay for the - when

MR. FLIGHT:

Newfoundland Hydro says, points out to the people of Newfoundland the amounts of savings that would come as a result of the Lloyds River, should they not then be made produce figures that would show us the loss to the economy of this Province over the next hundred years of the tourist potential - if the tourist potential in that area were developed. Is it not fair to say that if we are going to look at what we would save by diverting Lloyds River, then what would be the cost to the Province if the natural environment were wiped out and the potential to develop the tourist potential in that area forever was lost to the Province, and it would be lost to the Province. So, Mr. Speaker, I may speak some more on Lloyds River yet. I am not running out of time, but I made a commitment that I would only go so long here. There are other ceremonies to take place here and I do not want to delay them. But there is another question I would like the answer to, the Minister of Finance if you can. I would like the information as to just by how much money, by how many dollars is this Province subsidizing Erco, Bowaters and Price (Nfld.)? Because, Mr. Speaker, I believe when the Lloyds River diversion was being talked about we had figures that indicated that Price (Nfld.'s) natural consumption over the next five years would be exactly equal to the production of the Lloyds River diversion. And I suggest, Sir, that if that is the case these are the people who should have paid the bill and not spread across the consumers of Newfoundland. There was a case being made that the consumption of Price (Nfld.) would rise over the next five years equal to the total production of Lloyds River. And if such were the case, then why were the people of Newfoundland being told you will save \$28 million or it will cost \$28 million. And by how much are we subsidizing these companies, any of the large consumers?



MR. FLIGHT:

So, Mr. Speaker, I have to recognize as a responsible person that we have to develop the on-Island sites, our water potential in this Province. But I do not believe in the process of doing it we should wipe out everything we hold dear.

MR. FLIGHT: I do not believe that we should destroy the environment of an area like Red Indian Lake - Lloyd's River. The Lloyd's River diversion, Mr. Speaker, would not only have affected Buchan's, it would have very effectively wiped out the inland waterways of Central Newfoundland from George's Lake right down to Botwood. For the benefit of the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs before he leaves, I will just wind this up, I suggested that the Exploits River is polluted from Grand Falls down. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you do not believe that then you should one day in August, when the river is low with the right evening, go down and stand on the bank, fish in the river below and watch what is floating by you and smell the river. It is polluted. And if we do not stop, and I am not suggesting we do because it probably would force Price into bankruptcy, but if we do not stop the pollution being poured into that river by Price (Nfld) the hon. Minister of Industrial Development will not see his eel fishery work because nothing will live in that river below Grand Falls.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Before recognizing the hon. member I would point out the matters which will be debated at five-thirty. There are two: The first one, the hon. member for LaPoile arising from a question asked the hon. the Premier, the subject matter - government assistance to employers to give work experience to unemployed young people; And the second one, a question asked by the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay of the hon. Minister of Health, the subject matter -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. NEARY: I am sorry he will not be here. He is gone to Baie Verte.

MR. SPEAKER: Well the subject was reported matters of child abuse at Exon House. If the hon. gentleman is not here then there will only be one. There will only be one called.

The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say at the start that I understand the Administrator may be coming in and if that is so all I need is a signal from someone opposite and I will immediately sit down and shut up.

MR. HICKMAN: Chances are we will close it this evening.

MR. NOLAN: Yes, of course. Yes. What are we on, Hydro? Hydro. My friend opposite I believe made some reference to my hon. and learned friend opposite from Burin-Grand Bank that he was in or could be in a conflict of interest position were he to table the eleven or fifteen thousand word-or named petition that was presented in this House yesterday.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order!.

MR. HICKMAN: Before I open my mouth there was some other hon. gentleman here -

MR. NOLAN: Could I continue and maybe I will explain it to the hon. minister?

MR. HICKMAN: What it has to do with this bill is beyond my comprehension but -

MR. NOLAN: We are talking about Hydro, are we not?

MR. HICKMAN: We are talking about the right of Hydro to borrow money.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, of course that is in order because talking about the right of Hydro to borrow money necessarily involves the purposes for which Hydro borrows money because if the purposes for which they borrow money are not purposes which we think fit and proper then obviously we will not approve giving them the right to borrow.

I accept the minister's statement that the understanding of this is beyond his competence but, Sir, I do not think the House has to be governed by that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: What the House has to be governed by are the rules and

MR. ROBERTS: the rules say that a member may give his reasons for being for or against the principle of a bill and that is what my friend from Conception Bay South is attempting to do. The minister may not understand it, Sir, but that is not our fault nor, I submit, is it a consideration which the House can take into account.

MR. SPEAKER: To a certain extent I have to in my mind endeavour to finish the sentence of the hon. gentleman to my right, but if I am right in supposing, and I can only go on that, that he was going to speak upon a matter claimed by the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West with respect to the hon. minister and a petition presented yesterday by people on the South Coast that would be, I think, extraneous if in fact that is what he was going to speak on. I do not really know.

The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: I will have another go, Mr. Speaker. The lady who presented it was



MR. NOLAN:

responsible for the petition in this House yesterday, namely, Mrs. Fagan, stated in my presence that the hon. minister opposite refused to present the petition because he said he would be in a conflict of interest position because of the fact that he was involved in a ministerial capacity with Newfoundland Hydro. Now I am asking the minister to either put up or shut up, Mr. Speaker. It is as simple as that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Public Utilities Board.

MR. NOLAN: Public Utilities Board, that is what he told her, yes. Now if the minister wants to deny that he told her that let him do so now.

MR. HICKMAN: It is not a question of denying. I ask what that has to do with the bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: It has everything to do with the bill, everything to do with the bill.

MR. NOLAN: So we have now established since the minister denies - refuses to deny that - that he refused to present the petition to which I referred. Fifteen thousand people, many of whom were in his district, he found he was in a conflict of interest position, Mr. Speaker. He could not represent in this House those people and what a shame that is for any minister or any member to admit to.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would point out that the contention, the subject matter, for what reasons if any, the hon. Minister of Justice may have stated for not wishing to present a petition, that is something quite separate from the principle of this bill no matter how generously one interprets it. The principle of the bill has something to do surely with Newfoundland Hydro and the minister or anybody else's attitude with respect to presenting a petition is certainly not related to Newfoundland Hydro.

MR. NOLAN: I certainly apologize if I have stepped out of bounds at all, Mr. Speaker. I trust that I have made my point. I have great legislative respect for my friend opposite. We worked together

Mr. Nolan.

closely obviously from time to time on matters of great interest to both sides of the House. But there is no member in the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, who can weasel out of taking a position better than my hon. friend opposite, no one in God's world! No one can walk of egg shells like the hon. Minister of Justice.

Now the Minister of Mines and Energy stated here and shouted from his seat a little while ago, that the Newfoundland Hydro as referred to, I believe, by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), did not intend to make a profit this year. Now I could be wrong, and I am subject to correction, but: in the last six weeks a member of the board, a spokesman for Newfoundland Hydro, stated to the press of this Province that they hoped to make a profit this year. It is as simple as that. Now either you deny it or you do not. And if you do you better know what your facts are.

Now the Minister of Finance sits over there - my old friend - and I know darn well what happens in government. I mean if Newfoundland Hydro are instructed to make a profit or to come up to an equal position they have got to be governed by the Commandant of Finance in this Province, and that is the Minister of Finance and his minions on the Treasury Board. They are the ones who say to the various departments what you will spend or what you will not spend. They are the ones who state what the financial position of the Province will be in the following year. To some extent it is their duty. But here we have a situation, Mr. Speaker, where in my opinion Newfoundland Hydro have been instructed quite clearly by the government of this Province and their financial spokesman, the Minister of Finance, to sock it to the people of this Province. Pile it on them. Give them the financial shaft. And it is all right to squeeze and weasel and say, "It is not our fault. We do not tell Newfoundland Hydro what to do; we do not tell the school boards what to do; we do not tell

Mr. Nolan.

Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation what to do." What a lot of crap, Mr. Speaker, that is, crap! Maybe the word is not parliamentary and if so I certainly withdraw it immediately.

MR. ROBERTS: But it is accurate.

MR. NOLAN: But it is accurate.

So it is a bit disconcerting. No wonder people in this Province pay no attention to what is happening in this House if you have so much buck passing. You have men who are allegedly educated and women. You have people who are elected in their various districts, you have people who hold prominent positions in various ministerial capacities in this Province, and then they

MR. NOLAN: have the gall, the unmitigated gall to stand up either before the press or before this House and say, "Oh, no, Mr. Speaker, it is not our responsibility. Not my responsibility. Not our responsibility. That is the Chairman of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing. That is the Chairman and the Board of the Public Utilities Commission. That is the Chairman of this group and that group!" I mean, who funds these organizations? Who gives them their instructions? Who do they report to? Only one group - the Cabinet. So how can you be so cynical? How can you demean the people of this Province by attempting to indicate that it is not your responsibility? Who in the name of God do you think you are kidding? You are not fooling anyone any more.

You brought in very stringent controls allegedly in the most recent budget on the financing of this Province, including Newfoundland Hydro, Mr. Speaker. Now I will tell you what this budget has done. First of all with the closing or alleged closing of the Linerboard mill in Stephenville, by that alone you have diverted the opinions and the attention of many people in this Province to some of the tax increases and so on you brought in. What you have also done, and you should be ashamed to sit there and accept it, this challenge from me is this, you have now proceeded with the gall for which you are noted to finance the next election, six months, seven months before the next election on will come the paving equipment, the announcements of more stadiums and hospitals and all the rest.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I realize that there has been, and indeed I personally have always been inclined to give a generous interpretation to the application of the rule of relevance because I think that has to be understood and applied in the understanding of the broad area of interests represented by members of the Legislature, etc, but I do think that with that generous interpretation, which I feel should be given whenever possible, that the hon. member



MR. SPEAKER: has strayed beyond its confines.

The hon. member for Conception Bay South,

MR. NOLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In spite of the fact that I have been ruled out of order on this, which I appreciate and certainly respect obviously, I hope that I have gotten my point across and I stand by the statements I made.

Newfoundland Hydro - My hon. friend who is now in deep, closed, closeted conversation with the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) stated in this House yesterday that the abolishment of the executive jet is of no significance or no importance. Now who said so and who does he speak for? How much is spent on the executive jet?

MR. NEARY: \$500,000 a year.

MR. NOLAN: \$500,000 a year. The member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) says it is not important. Since when is \$500,000 a year not important to the people who are suffering under the inexorable crucifixion of the economic state of this Province today. It is not important, eh? Who says so?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman allow me?

MR. NOLAN: Of course.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is misquoting me, of course. I did not say it was not important. I did not say any such thing. What I said was that if you cut the salary of Mr. Groom, cut out the jet, closed the office in Montreal, it would probably have no effect at all on the price of electricity. That is what I said. I did not say that saving \$1 million or \$500,000 or \$750,000 was not important. Of course it is. I, more than any one in this House in the last year and a half have talked about the need, the desperate need to economize and retrench and pull in the belt. So I do not say that saving \$500,000 to \$1 million is not important. What I did say is it would have precious little effect on the price of electricity.

MR. NOLAN: Well maybe the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) thinks 'precious little' is not 'significant'. I happen to differ with

MR. NOLAN: him. I believe that no matter how little it is the people of this Province have a right to expect first of all a responsible attitude from those they have elected to office. I believe that no matter how little it is that the people of the Province who are now out of jobs and have to pay for the heat, to try to feed their children, no matter how much it is it is darn well important, the matter how small that amount is. So maybe the member for Twillingate and I might differ on matter of economics, but let there be no, no doubt that we have a very definite difference and it is as simple as that. If there is \$500,000 being squandered on an executive jet, it is important.

Mr. Nolan:

If there is \$80,000 paid to the Chairman of that Board, it is important; if there is a house provided for that gentleman, it is important; if other transportation is provided, it is important no matter what the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) says.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who says it is not important?

MR. NOLAN: The member implied as much yesterday.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did no such thing. No such thing.

MR. ROBERTS: Are you finished?

MR. NOLAN: No, I am not finished.

I am saying that whether it amounts to the difference in electricity or not, the fact is it is caught up in mismanagement, and that makes a difference to this Province whom we allegedly represent.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I agree.

MR. NOLAN: I am not differing with the member on the cost of electricity. But all I am saying to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, is this, and anyone who is listening, is that if there is a \$1 million or a \$1.5 million, if it is going to go to anyone let it go to the suffering people of this Province and let us not turn it over to the bloody bureaucrats. That is what I am saying.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: It is as simple as that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not disagree. Look, the hon. gentleman is fair. He does not want to be unfair. He does not want to misrepresent me. I told the whole membership sitting here, who were here yesterday when I spoke, to witness that I did not say saving a half million or three-quarters -

AN HON. MEMBER: But you asked the question -

MR. SMALLWOOD: I asked the question would it make any difference in the price of the electricity. And the answer I got was, no. Whether the answer was right or wrong that is the answer. But I did not talk about the importance of that amount of money. I talked about what effect, if any, it would have on the price of electricity. Let us keep the record clear on that.

MR. NOLAN: Okay. Well let me keep my record clear also, it is as simple as this. Let us assume that the Chairman is paid \$75,000 a year. Let us assume that there is transportation involved, and that is the jet of half a million a year. Let us assume that there is a home involved, I do not know if there is or is not, maybe I can be corrected on that.

MR. ROBERTS: Probably a loan, a mortgage loan.

MR. NOLAN: Maybe some mortgage loan. Maybe there are cars and so on and other expenses. Maybe there are so many things. But surely the member for Twillingate will have to agree that that has to be absorbed in the price of electricity in this Province. And I say no matter who the guilty party is, whether it is the member for Conception Bay South or anyone else, then that obviously reflects in the total cost of the price of electricity in this Province, and I am not satisfied to stand by as a member of this House. - we have resettlement in this Province going on right now in my district, men, married men, who have to leave their families, There is resettlement going on but it is not from the islands in Placentia Bay to the Mainland of this Province, They are going to Halifax, Alberta, Toronto; I am suppose to stand silently by and watch this go on, and while we have this sort of situation, and I am suppose to stand here as a member of this Caucus or any other caucus and allegedly by my silence condone it, not on your life. No way. It is wrong. No wonder people look upon all of us in this House with suspicion. It is all right for you to say, on the other side, now that perhaps the member for Twillingate and I differ. We do not necessarily. But what I am saying is we are all being judged, every one of us. Good members in this House, very fine members in this House of Assembly on either side, and I have known them for many years, and I strongly object, my guts boil when I hear some of the references from some people in public, members, citizens that I know in all districts saying, This member is no good, and that member is no good, when, in fact, I know that the member they are referring to oftentimes has little or no control, sad to say, about some of the



Mr. Nolan:

things that are happening in this Province.

The day is gone, the day is gone, Mr. Speaker, when anyone could take the attitude because somebody is Tory they are all bad, or all Liberal is all bad, they are all rogues. Now who has perpetuated this? Who has helped to substantiate this belief, if it is not people who have been involved in public life in this Province over the years. The problems in this Province are enormous, and we know it. We know it.

For example, when you talk about a bill to raise additional funds, for example, for Newfoundland Hydro, will anyone dispute the fact that on the purchase of the Churchill Falls the very Act in itself has not to some extent interfered with the borrowing programmes in this Province since then. I am sure the Minister of Finance will probably disagree with me. But, if so, the Minister of Finance must have very, very little realization of the powers that the Rothschilds have in the bond market of this world, not this Province or Canada. But something for which you will pay for a long while, in my opinion. The bond market is no different than selling socks or selling beef or selling anything else.

MR. NOLAN: There are certain people who hold a lot of power. And I am telling you that we are paying right today. It is as simple as that.

Newfoundland Hydro needs to be opened up. It is a can of worms. It is as simple as that. I am telling you that Newfoundland Hydro dictates to Newfoundland Light and Power what they want for the power. Newfoundland Light and Power cannot defend themselves. They cannot. And I am not trying to defend Newfoundland Light and Power, but they cannot come out and tell the whole truth publicly because if they do they could have the squeeze put on them by Newfoundland Hydro. It is as simple as that. So therefore I will never be satisfied. I do not believe in nationalizing everything. No one has ever heard me preach this. Never. As a matter of fact I have great qualms about it.

I will never forget one time I happened to say to some one in the civil service, in fact, that I was trying to get a job for a gentleman, and a man who is wise in the ways and activities of the civil service told me that perhaps I should not do it because he made reference to a man who was involved in public life in this Province at one time and coming in and apparently insisting on a job for this certain gentleman. And the gentleman got the job. As a matter of fact it was a watchman and I believe it was in a hospital. The man apparently had taken advantage of his position and alleged power, the gentleman was blind and he was a watchman in this public institution.

Now no one wants to in any way attempt to encourage, help, assist and so on anyone who is unfortunate enough to be handicapped by blindness. But to me this was an abuse of power.

MR. DOODY: That is what we are elected for, to help people.

MR. NOLAN: Yes, but you do not necessarily make some one Minister of Finance simply because he was elected, do you? The Premier of

MR. NOLAN: the Province I would think would decide that. He is the one who appoints the Cabinet. Of course you are elected to help people, of course you are, all people, no matter what their handicaps and so on. If you want to mention that you can talk about the public buildings and so on and how they are barring people who are handicapped from getting into the building. Am I going beyond my time for the Administrator?

MR. DOODY: You have enough time. It is just that the committee stage has got to go through and His Honour is due at five-thirty.

MR. NOLAN: All right.

MR. DOODY: It is a good speech and I do not want to - All I am saying is that I will have little time to reply and -

MR. NOLAN: No, I will not delay -

MR. ROBERTS: Why not ask the Administrator if he could perhaps come back after -

MR. NOLAN: No, I will not delay the committee. No.

I would merely like to wind up by saying that any time when any public money is being spent, no matter where it is, unless the facts are on the table, members of the House of Assembly, members of the public have a right to ask where it is going, how it is spent and why. It is as simple as that. They have a right to an answer. Whenever the government or whatever public body says, No, whether it is the university, whether it is the Department of Rural Development or any other department or agency says, No, then automatically there arises in the public conscience the feeling, Ah ha, they are trying to hide something. And that is it. And it is the duty therefore in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, for the elected representatives, for the press, or for any one else who communicates or attempts to communicate with the public of this Province or of Canada to demand, to demand that that information be provided. It is as simple as that.

MR. NOLAN: Now in closing may I say that I stated in this House yesterday and I will say again today, Newfoundland Light and Power has an involvement with Montreal Engineering. Montreal Engineering has members of their board of directors who I believe sit on the Board of Directors of Newfoundland Light and Power and vice versa. It is also a matter that is confirmed by the - I believe the spokesman, the Chairman, or whoever, for Newfoundland Light and Power that, yes, in fact, publicly on television, that Montreal Engineering provides various consulting services and so on to Newfoundland Light and Power.

MR. NEARY: - the last hearing before the Courts.

MR. NOLAN: It came out in the last hearing before the courts. at least publicly acknowledged fact that Montreal Engineering has an involvement I believe with Shawmont. Shawmont in turn

MR. NOLAN: does certain consulting work with Newfoundland Hydro. I want it out in the open. That is all I am asking. I pay taxes as well as every other member in this House, as well as every other person who is employed in this Province. Am I being unreasonable, Mr. Speaker? Am I casting aspersion, innuendo, character assassination on anybody? Is that what I am guilty of? I do not think so. I am asking that the people of this Province, when they go before the Public Utilities Board, be as well armed and as well protected as the people they are up against. We are no longer living in the day when young David attacked Goliath and knocked him down with a sling-shot. You are not going to knock the Newfoundland Public Utilities Board and the Newfoundland Telephone Company or the Newfoundland Light and Power or Newfoundland Hydro with having some poor widow going in with her few little notes on a piece of brown paper torn off a brown paper bag trying to justify her problems within the community and trying to keep a roof over her head and a bit of heat in the house.

They have to be financed properly. They have to have the same kind of expertise, whether they be accountants, lawyers or whatever. By the way, can you not appear before the Public Utilities Board without having a lawyer represent you, or can you?

MR. NEARY: Yes, you can represent yourself but you cannot represent anybody else.

MR. NOLAN: You cannot represent anyone else.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. NOLAN: This is obviously a ploy, Mr. Speaker, written into the act by the Legal Society of this Province and make no mistake about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I have little time,



MR. NOLAN: Could I be heard in silence?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. gentleman wishes to be heard without interruption.

MR. NOLAN: So in other words, a member of the House of Assembly cannot appear on behalf of a group of citizens? Now this has to be, Mr. Speaker, designed in this House, conceived in this House by the lawyers of this Province, a make-work project. And if so, I would expect the lawyers to stand up and deny it, and if they are not guilty to remove it from such legislation. Surely this is wrong. Am I beyond time.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is just about up.

MR. NOLAN: All right. I would not in any way attempt to detain the Governor. But I hope I have attempted to make my point. It is a shame what it going on. You are open to suspicion, and I am ashamed to be a part of it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I think that perhaps I am the only member in this House who opposed the nationalization of Churchill Falls. I regarded it as a tragic blunder and I still so regard it. I think it is one of the greatest blunders ever committed by any government in Newfoundland's history. I thought it then and I think it now, a ghastly blunder. So, Mr. Speaker, the House will not find me defending the head, the organization that is now running the Churchill Falls, and will certainly not find me defending the rates of pay they get or their general running expenses. And let me say furthermore, that more than any other member in this House, I am not the only one to do it, but more than any other member I had championed and advocated retrenchment and economy. And I have pointed to the dire danger Newfoundland is in if she

MR. SMALLWOOD: does not economize and retrench, pull in the belt far, far more than she is doing up to now. Now in that expression of opinion I have shared with the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), the Minister of Finance, John Crosbie, and the Premier himself. But no one in this House has advocated retrenchment and economy more than I have done, and few of them half as much. I hardly need to say that because surely every member of the House knows it to be true.

Finally let me say once again that I did not say what I have just been quoted by the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) as having said here yesterday. I did not say it. I did not say anything even remotely resembling it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What he says I said was that saving half a million or three quarters of a million or a million dollars was not important. I did not say it because it is important, and that is not enough to save it has got to be ten, twenty, fifty times that; I say it has got to be one hundred times that; I say you have got to save one hundred million, I say you have got to save two hundred million and I say you have got to stop borrowing. So to quote me as saying here in this House that half a million is not important is really very inaccurate and therefore a very unfair thing to say about me. And to this moment the hon. member for Conception Bay South has not retracted his statement, he has not withdrawn it. He lets it stay on the record although every hon. member of the House knows that he is wrong, that I did not say that or anything near it or anything resembling it. And how can an hon. member just stand there and insist that I said that or anything like it when in fact I did not. Is the clock right? The governor is due at five-thirty?

MR. NEARY: He is here now, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is here now. But, Mr. Speaker, having put that on the record I have some regard for my personal reputation. I will not live forever, historians will look at Hansard, and I do not want it to stay on the record that I said that this money was - this amount, half a million, was not important.

MR. DOODY: You did not say it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say it, no.

MR. DOODY: You definitely did not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And I would like some of my colleagues on this side of the House to agree that I did not say it.

MR. DOODY: You only asked questions about it, that is all.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon minister speaks now he closes the debate. Perhaps before recognizing the hon member I should point out that according to Standing Orders at 5.30 a certain



MR. SPEAKER: procedure follows so I do not know what the wish of the House is that that procedure go at 8 o'clock tonight or that it be postponed or that it be held tomorrow or that it be postponed until next week or what?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, there is only one question on it to be debated because the hon. gentleman or the second question is not present. I have consulted with my friend the hon. member for LaPoile, who is the only member here with a question and with the unanimous consent of the House he has agreed that he will debate his question at ten off six if necessary.

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

MR. DOODY: I have many notes and many questions and obviously, Sir, it will be quite impossible for me to respond to the many points that were raised by hon. members opposite. And many of them are very important. However the sum and substance of this bill is that the intent of the original bill is to limit the net sum to be borrowed by Hydro under this act is to be \$200 million, and that is exactly what the amendment permits it to do. There is no extra money in here for Gull Island, The \$78 million amount that will be debated later on, as I said, either under the supply bill, the Supplementary Supply Bill or perhaps another bill, but certainly I would take it unto myself to commit that it will be done under the Supplementary Supply Bill.

With regard to a Crown Corporation Committee to look into the operations of Crown Corporations I think that that is probably one of the better ideas to come forth in some time. The Public Accounts Committee is serving an excellent purpose and I think that this committee which has been suggested can be set up and can also serve too. And maybe this is the time to do it before these corporations, crown corporations get completely

MR. DOODY: out of hand and get too big and start having the same sort of affect that the Canadian National or the Air Canada has when it appears before a Commons Committee. The people who do the interviewing are completely outclassed.

I do not know - there are so many things here that I would like to say but I do not want to delay the proceedings. I appreciate very much the leave of the House to allow government to proceed with this closing on Monday. I understand His Honour is outside and I am not trying to avoid answering any of these questions. The Golden Eagle question is one that should be answered and I undertake to answer it. I cannot do it right now because of the committee thing.



MR. DOODY: I have no intention of avoiding it. The \$30 million bond issue has been committed. Government would not be liable technically for damages because there has been no signing, but it would be a tremendous embarrassment to government if we had to go back and renegotiate the contracts with the bond holders and so on. It would indeed be an extremely difficult situation to find ourselves in. On the ERCO subsidy and so on, all these things should be looked at and gone into. Unfortunately the time available is such right now, Sir, that I cannot apply myself to them. I would be most pleased to at an appropriate time, and I think that perhaps during the estimates, and if not in the estimates then in the budget debate I would be most happy so to do.

The intent of the bill has been made, the amendment has been made quite clear to the House. Hon. members are in agreement with the principle of the bill and so I move second reading.

On motion a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland And Labrador Hydro (Loan and Guarantee Limitation) Act, 1975," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House now, by leave.

On motion that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House, Mr. Speaker, left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Hydro (Loan And Guarantee Limitation) Act, 1975."

On motion, clauses 1 and 2, carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred, directed me to report Bill No. 55 without amendment, and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted, bill ordered read a third time now by leave.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro (Loan And Guarantee Limitation) Act, 1975," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Administrator has arrived.

MR. SPEAKER: Admit His Honour the Administrator.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the General Assembly of the Province has at its present session passed a certain bill to which in the name of and on behalf of the General Assembly I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro (Loan and Guarantee Limitation) Act, 1975. (Bill No. 55)

HON. R. S. FURLONG (Administrator): In Her Majesty's name I assent to this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: It being 5:35 P.M. a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the Chair. There is one matter for debate.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am certain that a member of this House of Assembly would want to be deaf, blind, totally unaware of the situation in his own electoral district or criminally callous to be unaware of the most tragic facet of the record unemployment in our Province at the present time, that over fifty per cent, over half of the jobless are in the key age group, seventeen to twenty-five years. That is the bracket, Mr. Speaker, when young people should be getting their feet under them, laying the foundation financially, vocationally, professionally, productively and philosophically for the rest of their lives. And that today, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, is the period when half of our young people are forced to rust in morale eroding idleness, embittered by the feeling that society, government, the educational system, everyone has let them down.

Just think back, Mr. Speaker, to the contract with the day when you and I and our contemporaries in this House entered the work force. We had a choice of jobs, Sir. Today our young people have less than a fifty per cent chance of employment. And, Mr. Speaker, the situation is going to worsen. We are told by academics, by Manpower staticians, economicsts, that we have enough B.A.'s stockpiled to see us through the next ten years, enough M.A.'s for another



Mr. Neary.

fifteen and a backlog of Ph.D's, piled higher and deeper, to do us, Sir, until the end of the present century. Further, Mr. Speaker, generally accepted experts forecast that by the year 2,000 there will be economically, justifiable, productively, essential jobs for only twenty-five per cent, one in four of our population, and that only government, Mr. Speaker, through skimming financial cream off the Gross National Product will be able to finance employment for the jobless on specifically devised economically unnecessary but morally essential projects. Here and now, Mr. Speaker, this House should not only be concerned over the sad, tragic situation, but should do some positive about it. And there is a great deal that we can do other than ask for direct handouts from Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, if we take seriously the plight of those who are pouring out of our training institutions and apprenticeship programmes into the harsh morale eroding world of jobless statistics. Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is much we members of the House of Assembly can do both as individuals and as a group. Remember, Mr. Speaker, the chief hurdle that I mentioned that these young people have to surmount is the achievement of their initial work experience.



Mr. Neary:

I am certain, Sir, that if the members of this House or a group or a committee of well-intentioned, knowledgeable, reasonably imaginative, sympathetic and intelligent members of this House were to face up to this problem instead of shrugging it off on civil servants or an incompetent group like the government's Planning and Priorities Committee, we could come up, Sir, with a practical, practicable solution to providing that precious initial work experience for our young people, for a lack of which they are at present condemned to indefinite and useless shelf life. And the only way we can do that, Mr. Speaker, is to take advantage of the existing Canada Manpower on-the-job training programmes by this administration using the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations to push the Canada Manpower training programme, and, if necessary, the Provincial Government itself get in both feet in subsidizing employers so that they can give our young people that initial experience that they need before they can obtain permanent employment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. J. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge on behalf of the Premier the remarks of the hon. gentleman in his annual regular presentation on this particular issue. He certainly had a very well worded presentation to supplement his concept that he has in his mind. I am a little concerned about his level of pessimism and his choice of words. It almost sounded like I was attending the annual meeting of the Undertakers Association, but I recognized that he means well, and I commend him for a very positive suggestion. What he is saying, I understand, is that perhaps there should be some supplementary Provincial programme similar to what the on-the-job training programme is that exists under the Federal system. He is pinpointing a very important problem, the unemployment of a young person, of course, or any person is pretty well a tragedy that everybody has a great deal of regret for. He is indicating the magnitude of the

Mr. Lundrigan:

unemployment problem among younger people. It does not make the problem any less bearable for somebody at the age of thirty if he is unemployed, of course, if the percentage of unemployment is lower among that age group.

He is not indicating another problem which I think he should get his teeth into, and that is the problem of people in the age group between, say, forty-five and sixty-five or fifty and sixty-five, and these people tend to be in the category where there is higher unemployment and the difficulties of getting employment is much greater because basically in terms of the employer they do tend not to be in the eyes of some employers as employable. We recognize the critical problem, There are two problems, of course, from the point of view of the government, number one, is the financial inability of a government to stimulate the marketplace the way that the hon. member would like to. If is a very good concept, we accept the principle that every effort should be made to get young people into the labour force. It is an awful contradiction to find somebody having spent years in an institutional of learning and then find themselves with all the trades and the educational backgrounds and the like to be rejected because they have not got experience when in fact they have not had the opportunity to gain experience. And I resented very, very forthright, in strong arguments similar to the hon. member's in a different place, and I supplement and support the principle he has outlined here in this institution.

At the same time there is another side to the picture, Your Honour, and that is governments, unless they want to just move in with the taxpayers dollar and artificially create employment, then we have got to be very concerned because this is one of our biggest problems that we have in the Province. Governments traditionally, maybe our government as well with some of our programmes recognizing the harshness of unemployment have tried to force the issue with artificial stimulation. We have done it in various industries.

Mr. Lundrigan:

Very unfortunatley the Minister of Finance in recent days in his budget had to announce something which I am sure was caused partly by governments, the previous government, recognizing the critical unemployment programme and wanting to take a lot of government dollars and put it at risk to force something that was not indigneous or a natural enterprise at that time in history. And this is what we have had, the Come By Chance is an example of something where there was an overabundance of government presence and it did not work. And this is something that one of those fine days I would be most prepared, and I would like the House to get involved in this kind of a debate, because where do we go in a province that has the financial strain it has on it in trying to stimulate, artificially stimulate

MR. LUNDRIGAN: the economy. We accept the principle. Young people, it is most discouraging, not only because they cannot find employment, but because they find their way outside the work force of our Province in other parts of the country. As somebody has indicated, our biggest export is labour and skilled and capable people. We have to be very concerned about this and I think down through history governments have as well.

But I cannot see at this moment any way that we can positively suggest to the hon. the member, or the House, a particular manageable financially supportive way to respond to the concept that is outlined.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the Chair is that the House do now adjourn. Is the House ready for the question? Those in favour 'aye', contrary 'nay', I declare the motion lost. I leave the Chair until 8:00 p.m.



PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD

8:00 p.m. - 11:00 p.m.

THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1977

The House resumed at 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
The hon. the Minister of Justice.  
MR. HICKMAN: Committee of Supply.

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!  
The hon. the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I will try to respond now to some of the questions which were asked during the morning, and I will try to take them in order, although I am not sure of the order in which the Opposition members spoke. I know that the first hon. member opposite to get involved in the debate was the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) and he made some reference to the Exon House. I am sure that some of the words which were used were not meant to be used.

For instance, the member referred to the people at Exon House as patients, and we like to refer to the people at the House, the children there, as guests. Because we are, as I indicated earlier this morning, earlier today, trying to turn around the effort there in terms of a training institution as opposed to hospital. I am happy to have heard the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) say that not only does he agree with that principle, but he says that he introduced that principle some years ago, and I am willing to give him that credit. I am sure he will be one of the first to agree that it is a fairly difficult task and very difficult for one to



Mr. Collins.

going to school, normal day schools. They are taken out by bus in the morning -

MR. NEARY: They should also take a look at Water Street

West. That would probably give them a more - what should I say? - value on life.

MR. COLLINS: Yes. That is very true. So I would like to clear that up in that we do not refer to them as patients. They are guests, and are being trained to the best of their ability. He made reference - if I might use the same words again - to abuse and other words which I am sure are an unfortunate choice of words. I am reasonably sure that the member did not want to be quoted using those terms. I would like to say, however, in response to another remark which he made in that there have been documented cases of child abuse and so on, and, Mr. Chairman, there have been no documented cases, not in the true sense. There have been allegations made, and I can inform the House that those allegations of abuse are being investigated. And I have no hesitation at all to say that if the investigation shows that indeed some of the staff did abuse some of those children, that the appropriate action will be taken, because there is one thing we will not tolerate and that is child abuse at that centre. I believe that I can say that the government's record in that field that the proof is there; because only two or three years ago there was reason to carry out an investigation into the operation at Exon House, and in fact some people were dismissed.

So I would once again reassure hon. members that if the investigation which we are doing now indicates that the people over there are doing anything less than we require, then certainly appropriate action will be taken.

MR. MURPHY: Would the hon. minister mind telling us what the average number of kids attending Exon House is? Would he have some idea?

MR. COLLINS: I gather there is somewhere - I believe there is over 100.



MR. NEARY: Oh, there is well over 100 there now.

MR. MURPHY: I am sorry. I did not mean to put the minister off.  
I just wondered.

MR. COLLINS: There are 127.

MR. MURPHY: 127.

MR. COLLINS: And there are just about the same number of employees, believe it or not. There are a tremendous amount of employees there. There are 117. There are just about the same number of employees.

Mr. Speaker, the member also referred to the very unfortunate action which occurred last Christmas, the fire at the Chafe boarding home. And I am not sure if he said we had done nothing, or he challenged us to say what we had done.

MR. FLIGHT: No, I did not.

MR. COLLINS: No, I do not think the hon. member did say that.

MR. FLIGHT: I did not say that you had done nothing. I just asked for some assurance that something was being done.

MR. COLLINS: He wanted some assurance that something was being done. Well as the hon. member, possibly knows - he might have forgotten about it now - that one of the first things we did was establish a Welfare Inspection and Licencing Authority -

MR. NEARY: That was already there so how could you provide that?

MR. COLLINS: No. The Licencing Authority was already there.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. COLLINS: But we broadened the authority now and made the chairman of it a full-time position as a Licencing and Inspection Authority now. And he is getting staff. In fact, there are four people on his staff, and I believe there are another one or two to come. There has been a complete first safety inspection. All electrical inspection should be completed a few days ago and hon. members might wonder why it took so long, but there are a number of those homes and, of course, the homes are privately owned. They are privately owned. The guests in the homes are supported by the government, but the homes are privately owned by various individuals around the Avalon Peninsula

Mr. Collins:

and other places. I might say that generally speaking, although I have not seen the report yet. because the inspection has just been completed - generally speaking I believe the homes are in pretty good shape. But wherever there were any electrical deficiencies, those have been taken care of on the spot and if they have not been taken care of on the spot, the inspectors

MR. COLLINS: will be going back to check within a week or a few days to insure that all the necessary work has been done. The fire inspections were performed under the auspices of the Provincial Fire Commissioner and the Newfoundland Hydro inspectors carried out the actual work because of their expertise in that field.

I might also say, Mr. Chairman, that the new regulations have been brought in and gazetted and are now in place, which requires security personnel in the homes, all of the homes with five guests or more, and that is about ninety-nine per cent of the boarding homes, and I might also say, Mr. Chairman, that the direct cost of that particular endeavor to the government will be in the order of \$900,000 or \$1 million. While we require the owners of the boarding houses to take the security people on, naturally somebody has got to pay for it, and the cost which will be reflected in the monthly subsidies which we provide, the monthly guest subsidies will amount to somewhere between \$900,000 and \$1 million. So these are two very significant moves which have been made to try and insure that we do not have a re-occurrence of that type of tragedy again.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans also made reference to the dangers to the health caused by smoking and alcohol consumption etc., and I must agree that these are very important matters receiving a lot of attention, not only by the Department of Rehabilitation- which does have responsibility for alcohol at the Alcohol and Drug Foundation, the Alcohol and Drug Foundation - but it is receiving the attention of the Federal Government also. And I might say we are looking forward to the Federal Government now and I believe that we can look to them with some confidence this time, that they will since they have removed themselves from the general health field by withdrawing from the HIDS agreement, the Health Insurance and Diagnostic Services act agreement and

MR. COLLINS: Medicare agreement. We hope now that they will channel some additional funds and some of their energies, more of their energies into assisting the Provinces in finding ways and means of combating what is a very real health problem.

I like to consider the problem of alcohol, the use of alcohol and smoking and others as among the lifestyle problems which we find we have today. And both my Department of Health and the Department of Rehabilitation, whether we have to do it alone or not remains to be seen, if we do we will, but we would hope for a lot of co-operation from the Federal Government and through educational programmes, which is about the only way we can hope to achieve what we are seeking, through educational programmes try and sensitize the people of Newfoundland to the very real dangers which smoking and alcohol and drug abuse presents.

I do not think the problem is as serious with our young people as the hon. member seems to indicate. Granted there are some young people who may be smoking at too early an age and some young people who do consume some alcohol and drugs, but I believe that relatively speaking that the young Newfoundlanders can certainly measure up with the people across the rest of Canada. And I do not believe their problem is as bad as sometimes a lot of people think with regard to our young people, but it is a problem of course at all ages.

The hon. member - I got another note here about the Chafe's Home fire. The hon. member is aware of the fact of course that there is a judicial enquiry in place. That was delayed for some time because Judge Morgan, who had agreed to serve, became ill and a replacement had to be found. I believe it is Judge Gushue. -

Mr. H. Collins:

my colleague, the Minister of Justice, would know— I think it is Judge Gushue who is doing that work for us now, and we are looking forward to that. And I might say that Judge Gushue will be looking at all of the private boarding homes, as well as the homes which are operated by the Department of Rehabilitation.

The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) he agreed, I think, with out approach, as I said earlier, with the approach which we are taking in Exon House. I am happy to hear him say that because he did have something to do with it years ago, and I am sure that he is pleased to know that we are carrying on the same programmes.

Several hon. members made reference to the need for additional facilities for senior citizens. I am not sure that hon. members took note of the figures which I used this morning, which shows that this year the cost to the Province of operating senior citizens homes or nursing care homes, whatever term you might use, or both of them, the cost this year to the Province will be \$16 million as opposed to \$10 million last year. I think that everybody will agree that that is an enormous increase, and the increase, of course, is brought about by the fact that a great number of new homes, mainly what we refer to as inter-faith homes, have come on stream in Newfoundland, and these are very, very expensive, of course, to operate.

I might indicate to hon. members too that - it is the total cost of operating the homes.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. H. COLLINS: The cost, Mr. Chairman, varies in those homes from - some of the boarding homes which I referred to earlier the cost per guest per month varies from around \$330 per month to somewhere in the order of \$600 per month. In the case of some of the Inter-faith homes, especially some of the newer ones coming on, the costs are greater than that, and sometimes as much as \$700, \$800, and \$900.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).



MR. H. COLLINS: In the case of Exon House -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. H. COLLINS: Yes. In the case of Exon House I do not have the exact figure but that figure is up around, I believe it is - I will get the figure in a moment because my deputy minister is outside, But in the case again of the sixty beds which we have opened in the old Western Memorial Hospital, which is a nursing care home, extensive care, the cost there is about \$2,400 per month per person, and of course that is almost similar to a hospital.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. COLLINS: Well, no. This will be pretty much the true cost, and the cost for the beds which we will be taking over at the Waterford Hospital when it is completed will be in the order again of \$2,400 or \$2,500 a month. So you see, Mr. Chairman, the cost is ever increasing.

It is generally agreed across Canada that a satisfactory number of beds per population is around one per thousand, I do not know who arrived at that particular figure, if that is something which is realistic or not, I suspect it is, because many of the provinces have had a lot of experience in that field. And we have surpassed that now; the last figure I saw, which was about a couple of weeks ago, shows that we have about one bed for every 980 people in the Province. So in that particular area in terms of beds per population we have surpassed what, not necessarily the national average, but certainly what can be referred to as the national objective.

There are many types of care, Mr. Chairman, which we are looking at, and it is going to take some time to be able to rationalize our approach, but there are a lot of people who require very extensive care

MR. COLLINS: after receiving surgery in a hospital. We must try and get them away from the acute care hospital bed, which is most expensive of course to operate, and get them into nursing homes whereby they can be given the proper nursing care. There is a lot of other - and be cured and sent back to their homes.

MR. NEARY: Is that, by the way, a bit of a pilot project, an experiment in rehabilitation?

MR. COLLINS: More or less an experiment in geriatrics -

MR. NEARY: And rehabilitation of the -

MR. COLLINS: And Dr. Gus Rowe has done a considerable amount of work out there.

MR. NEARY: Is he not carrying out this pilot project? For instance - If the minister will allow me? - For instance, people who have strokes and that sort of thing and are paralysed teach them how to walk again and try to rehabilitate them, is that the kind of a pilot project that is being carried on there in Corner Brook?

MR. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is right. But what I was leading up to is that there is varying types of care which are needed. For instance, there are some people like we have at the Hoyles Home for instance, a lot of those people might never be able to be cured and sent back home. They might be there for years and years. There are other people who require certain types of care by a nurse or a nursing aide who can do a lot of work themselves and so on. So these are the things which we are looking at to try and reach a position whereby we can better utilize the beds which we now have. There has not been adequate control in that particular area. We know that there are going to be some problems in bringing about some of the changes which we have in mind, but the changes I am sure are worthwhile for two reasons: Number one, because of the cost we want to get maximum utilization; and number two, we want to provide the best possible care for the people who will require it.

I have a note which was just handed to me. The cost per guest per month at Exon House is \$1500 which again, of course, is a substantial amount.

MR. NEARY: What is the cost per month for a bedridden patient at Hoyles Home? Can the minister get one of his officials to pass him that figure?

MR. COLLINS: Yes, it is somewhere around \$2000 I am pretty sure.

MR. NEARY: Bedridden as compared to ambulatory?

MR. COLLINS: Yes, the official will send that in now in a moment.

MR. NEARY: You will get the shock of your life, I think. It is up around \$1200 for bedridden.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, that just about covers, I think, the questions which were directed to me earlier today. And if hon. members now have some further comments I will be happy to listen to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I am rather glad to have the opportunity to say a few comments on this particular department. I believe that this department's assignment represents one of the most monumental challenges in government. It is not a department with a lot of money but then again I do not believe that the kind of mandate this department has requires money nearly as much as it requires an understanding of the situation that is being dealt with. I would like at the outset just to say that I am rather pleased that the deputy minister of this department at the time is Mr. Pike, whom we all know is a first-rate educator and even more important is a person with very deep concern for people's welfare. I think we are fortunate to have that kind of a person in a position of leadership within government.

Mr. Chairman, I want in the first instance to zero in on an aspect of the estimates having to do with rehabilitation. I am doing this for a very particular

Mr. Simmons: reason, not to raise a lot of questions to the minister, but to draw the Committee's attention, perhaps the public's attention, to a very major effort in rehabilitation which is going on in the Province, and an effort in which the government is fairly heavily financially involved. And I refer to the rehabilitation efforts of the Salvation Army.

I think it is appropriate that I draw attention to it tonight in that earlier today in London or near London, England another Canadian, the second Canadian in succession indeed, was elected as the General of the Salvation Army. The new General is Arnold Brown. He succeeds a native Newfoundlander, General Clarence Wisemen, who retires very shortly. So it is at least appropriate that we are mentioning these matters tonight.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is General Brown a Newfoundlander?

MR. SIMMONS: No, the new General is not a Newfoundlander, he is a Canadian, and he is currently the head of the Salvation Army in Canada.

I suppose it might be appropriate tomorrow when we are on routine business to consider sending the appropriate telegram to these gentlemen, certainly the out-going General, General Wisemen, who as I -

MR. PECKFORD: Would the hon. member permit?

MR. SIMMONS: Sure.

MR. PECKFORD: General Wisemen is a Newfoundlander.

MR. SIMMONS: He is from Morton's Harbour. Yes, General Wisemen is from Morton's Harbour, and will be stepping down, I suppose, sometime in the next little while, a month, or two months or three months.

It is also appropriate that I raise the subject tonight because May is Red Shield Month for the Salvation Army, the period during which they launch their one big financial drive of the year. And I would like, in particular, to draw attention to that campaign which gets underway, I believe, in the next week or so, a week from Monday coming. It is a National effort. And we here in the Province have reason to be part of it, we get a fair amount from the



Mr. Simmons:

Salvation Army services here in the Province.

I would draw the Committee's attention then, in particular, to the vote under 907-05, the Salvation Army Treatment Centre. In the last fiscal year the government requested of the House \$80,000, and that amount was subsequently voted. And this year I am happy to note that a similar amount is being requested, and I am sure will be voted. Like every subhead in these estimates there is need for more. I do not know, I have no idea whether the Salvation Army has made application for more. I am familiar with the work that is being done at the Treatment Centre, otherwise known as the Harbour Light Centre on Springdale Street. And I would just like to highlight it for a moment. The Harbour Light Centre - the Harbour Light being a term that the Salvation Army uses across the country for such treatment centres, treatment centres for alcoholics - the Harbour Light Centre on Springdale Street has a staff of eight people and accommodates twenty-three men at any given time. And I want you to note the ratios, a staff of eight for twenty-three is one of the lower ratios, if you like, one of the lower-staffed requirements of any such institution. Indeed, I believe I heard the minister say that in the case, for example, of Exon House, which at all does not compare, I realize, but just by way of a comparison, the staff is almost one to one. Here it is about one to three. So it is a fairly limited staff layout, Mr. Chairman. They appear to be doing an adequate job.

And let me tell you something of that job. I understand that since the centre opened a couple of years ago, the treatment centre, the Harbour Light Centre - Mr. Chairman, there is quite a hum here, you know, Mr. Chairman, it is very distracting. I must say it is awfully distracting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I believe some of the noise is emanating from outside of the Chamber, so perhaps I could ask the Sergeant-at-Arms if he would ask any members and others outside to keep the noise to a minimum.

The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.



May 5, 1977

Tape 2256 (Night)

PK - 3

MR. SIMMONS: Since the centre opened again with aid from the treasury, from the government, from this House,

MR. SIMMONS: opened a couple of years ago I understand the success of the programme has been relatively high. Indeed, in the first year of operation the percentage of success - if I might term it such - is about fifty-seven per cent. Now I understand the way they arrive at these percentages or this percentage is to determine who among the men who went to this center do not go back on the bottle over an extended period of time. They are rehabilitated in the full sense of the term. They are given a three month period within the home, they live in twenty-four hours a day and they are eventually, in most cases, placed in jobs. And they are certainly, at the very least, placed in home situations, either in boarding accommodations or - they are not just sent back on the ninety-first day, back on the street. They are given some transition into a home situation, a boarding home situation and usually into a job situation.

And they have gone back and they have checked on the men who have gone through the center in the first year, and they find that fifty-seven per cent of them are still completely away from alcohol and indeed are adjusting to a very meaningful lifestyle. Now that figure is relevant only if I give it to you in a comparison again. And I understand that that compares very well with the Harbour Light Center in Toronto, which has been in operation for a number of years, and albeit which has a different set of problems than we face here because of the larger urban contacts then they have a larger number of hard core alcoholics. But the percentage is significant. Here it is fifty-seven per cent, and the center in Toronto is thirty-five per cent. Thirty-five per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Why?

MR. SIMMONS: I really do not know. Perhaps the minister -

MR. HICKMAN: Talk to Captain Snook about it. It is a totally different type of individual, I think, goes into it. An alcoholic treatment center is generally part of a hospital, almost a ward.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, yes.

MR. HICKMAN: A very high percentage of medical staff.

MR. SIMMONS: In the alcoholic treatment center?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: I would like to hear -

MR. HICKMAN: I am not sure myself but I talked to my friend, Captain Snook, and he tells me that their unit is quite - you know, is designed - if a person needs medical treatment they send them somewhere else.

MR. SIMMONS: Send them to -

MR. HICKMAN: Generally to Waterford.

MR. SIMMONS: This is not to be construed as an alcoholic treatment center in that context at all.

MR. HICKMAN: No.

MR. SIMMONS: They have no medical staff at all and they refer people who require medical attention. The success rate in the first year was fifty-seven per cent and in the second year it was fifty-four per cent. So relatively speaking they are holding their own and I think they need to be commended. I am sure the minister over the period has seen to it that this organization is being commended, is being told that the House and the government appreciate its efforts which I believe are admirable. I believe the money is well invested in that sense of the term.

Now, I began to say earlier that I felt there is a need for more money, and this is not raised as a criticism of the minister's department at all but as a pointer, I hope, as a flag, so that perhaps if not this year certainly in the succeeding year, in the

MR. SIMMONS: next year there might be consideration given to an additional amount in this vote. Because the Salvation Army has another need here which would augment the kind of service that they can provide with the present center. There is need for an extended care unit, an extended care home.

I am not talking again about a great highfalutin facility that would cost millions of dollars. There is need for what is know in reference to people coming out of prison as a halfway house, a transition house. I advise against using that term, particularly in view of the experience in the past few months trying to get acceptance for a halfway house in the city. Perhaps they ought to be using another term but whatever the term there is need here now for an extended care home and I cannot think of a better organization to do it than the Salvation Army. An extended care home which would take some of the men after the ninety day period and put them into a transition type environment. I do not know how many you are talking about. I think you are talking of a group of twenty-three in any given period. You are probably talking five or six people. And that is not to suggest that the home would only have five or six people in it. Because this extended care home would be for a longer period,

MR. SIMMONS: the guy would be in the Springdale Street Home for just 90 days. But he would be in the extended care home for as much as six to eight months. I understand that there is a very real need in a percentage of the cases, in about twenty per cent or so of the cases, there is a need for an additional period of adjustment. There is need for a prolonged period of care, as I say, perhaps as much as six to eight months, in the case of probably twenty, or fifteen to twenty per cent of these fellows.

So I just draw to the minister's attention the need for such an extended care home and whether or not the Salvation Army is the agency that is asked to administer such a home or to spearhead the drive for a home is another question. I just point out to them that it would be a good marriage. It would be a good combination to have the one agency, the Salvation Army, on the one hand operating as it is doing so well the Harbour Light Centre on Springdale Street and then in concert with that operating an extended care home for some of the same fellows who come out of that centre and then go into the extended care home before going back in society at large.

I had a chat with the administrative of this centre, Capt. Don Snook, just this afternoon and I was interested to learn that very few of the enquiries the home gets are from women. Now it is understood of course that this is a home for men. Perhaps that is one of the reasons why the number of enquiries is low.

AN. HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: It is not - no, it is strictly for men. But I was interested to find whether there was much of a need for such a centre for women. Capt. Snook told me there were very few enquiries. There is such a centre in Toronto operated by the Salvation Army called the "Homestead" for women. This home here can and does refer people to that home except that, as I said, according to Capt. Snook the numbers of enquiries have been very, very low.



MR.SIMMONS: In getting into this brief discussion of the Salvation Army's role in rehabilitation I made no bones about my reason for raising it. Three reasons, two or three reasons: One is that I believe there is a need for additional facilities, as I just outlined, for the extended care function as it relates to rehabilitated alcoholics. I mention also the appropriateness of the time because it is Red Shield Month, and I would impress upon the Committee and upon the public the importance of supporting this particular endeavour, the annual Red Shield Campaign of the Salvation Army. Members will have received this publication entitled "Who Needs It" which was put out in the last couple of weeks as a supplement to the Canadian Magazine which appears in a number of Canadian newspapers although not here in Newfoundland.

And that supplement sums up extremely well the breadth, the scope of the programme being offered to various types of people across the country, the poor, the needy, the alcoholic the homeless. I would recommend it to members if they get an opportunity; if they have it sitting on their desks and have not read it it is an excellent summation of the kind of work that the Army has been doing and continues to do.

I was particularly struck by the statements in this as they apply to poverty in Canada. One statement in this particular document says; "Despite government efforts to redistribute wealth more equitably, the family income of the poorest 20 per cent of Canadians fell by 7 per cent between 1969 and 1974." I think it is a fairly staggering statistic that the poorest fifth of our people here in Canada are actually getting poorer in real terms, thus lending additional credibility to the old dictum that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

Let me say it to you one other way. This document also points out that the poorest 20 per cent of Canadians, the poorest 20 per cent, share 4 per cent of Canada's wealth, Canada's income, 4 per cent. The poorest

MR. SIMMONS:

twenty per cent share four per cent of the income. The wealthiest twenty per cent share forty-two per cent of Canada's income. These, again, as I say, are staggering statistics and point to the need for all kinds of programmes, both public and private, all kinds of endeavours which would attempt to share the burden more equally.

MR. MURPHY: That twenty per cent, would that mean who are earning income or would it include all, you know, pensioners and this type of thing, I wonder. Does it state there - I was just wondering if it is the twenty per cent of the working force, you know, rather than eighteen widows and old age pensioners. I am just wondering.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes. Now the expression 'family income' is there. So I would interpret that, and again I have not read it all through, I would interpret that to mean that of the total population, rather than of the work force, or of those employed. The statements reads, "Despite government efforts to distribute wealth more equitably the family income of the poorest twenty per cent of Canadians fell by seven per cent during the five year period." Again it is not for me to paraphrase this document but I would refer it to members because I think it is well worth reading. Before sitting down just let me make two other points very quickly.

I want to endorse all of the things that my colleague from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Canning) had to say today about facilities for the senior citizen. I listened rather carefully to the minister during his comments tonight, and I did not hear him particularly make reference to some points that were made initially by my friend from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Canning). And a point which I would like to just reiterate for a moment because I would like to hear the minister's reaction at some point during the debate on the estimates, and that is the need for, for the want of a better term, localized facilities for senior citizens, a departure from the skyscraper hotel syndrome, that everything has got

MR. SIMMONS:

to be as big as the Hoyles Home to be functional,

I believe Doctor Gus Rowe, the former Minister of Health, had some very pertinent things to say on this subject quite recently. In the last month or so I saw something in the press on it, and I found myself very much attracted to the ideas that he was espousing, that there is a recognition, there ought to be a greater recognition that old people are not by definition crippled people, useless people, blind people or dependent people. My own father is seventy-three years of age, and I do not know of a more active or more healthy person at that age than my own father. That is just one example. I am sure many of us can either, either pointing to our fathers or our mothers or our aunts or our uncles or older people in the immediate family circle, can point to large numbers of people who have no particular need for institutional care, have no particular attraction to it and indeed would be destroyed by it. That is the tragedy of what is happening in many of the homes. I can think of a lady from Springdale where I spent a number of years and were my friend from Green Bay in his seat, he would know the lady I am talking about, a lady who in the East end of Springdale for a number of years - and I would guess she is about eighty or eighty-two years of age today, a widow for a number of years, a loner in some respects, a do-gooder in our term, a very effective do-gooder - and for a number of years she was almost the de facto leader of the East end of the community. And then came this Carmelite hotel home in Grand Falls. And somebody got the bright idea that that would be a nice place for her. Well she is there, about one day a week. She is so fitfully there. And now she is trying to lead her flock from a distance of sixty or sixty-five miles. And she still continues to be the nucleus of a large group of people in terms of social functions, seeing that the sick are visited, seeing that the lonely are looked after

MR. SIMMONS:

and that kind of thing. She now orchestrates it from a distance of sixty or sixty-five miles. But the mistake was in arranging to have her in that home in Grand Falls, in that particular case. She should still be down physically with the nucleus that she continues to be, spiritually, the nucleus of that group of people. That is just one example and I am sure there are many, many others that could be quoted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon member's time has elapsed.

MR. SIMMONS: If I could just have a sentence to clue up, I would. Anyway I want the minister at some point to respond to what I think is a need for more localized facilities, and Dr. Rowe, Dr. Gus Rowe in particular made the case for day facilities as opposed to round the clock facilities. I do not think there is any need to elaborate because the minister indicates that he is quite familiar with the concept.

And the other point I just want to make in a sentence, Mr. Chairman, is the need which continues to exist and about which very little is being done, if anything, the need for facilities, institutional facilities, combined live-in, dormitory educational facilities. I made some reference last year to this in the estimates debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN(YOUNG): Order please! The hon. member's time is just about up.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, I am about to clue up.

MR. CHAIRMAN(YOUNG): I am sorry. Proceed.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, well I was just about to clue up. I made some reference last year and the minister may recall something of the need for institutional education facilities for the physical handicapped. I am not talking about the blind or the deaf. I think we look after these fairly well, but the other categories of people many of whom had never been to school, or get to school fairly spasmodically because of the lack of facilities at the local level. I am not suggesting that they all be dragged into St. John's but I did suggest last year that we might be looking at four or five centers in the Province where these could be taken care of and in relation to perhaps a high school facility, somewhere where they would be physically near that facility, perhaps connected by a corridor or a surface tunnel, that kind of thing.

These are some of my thoughts, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps we will get a chance to get back to it later. Thank you.



MR. CHAIRMAN (YOUNG): The hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Chairman, in addressing the Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation estimates, just a couple of brief comments on both aspects of that department. I stand with mixed feelings in some ways because, realizing the financial state of the Province and being strapped for money, I almost feel guilty when I stand and say that we in Labrador need a senior citizens' facility and we need a few other things, but I will say them anyway. As a matter of fact, I think in beginning perhaps I should compliment, if you will, the administration on the co-operation that has transpired in the last nine, ten months in terms of finally giving a commitment in that a senior citizens' home would be established in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area of Labrador to serve Labrador as a region. Just in terms of a little bit of background, there was an awful lot of controversy that I am sure most members of the House are familiar with by now through the presentation of petitions and so on when the medical facilities moved from the Paddon building in Happy Valley to the Melville Hospital. The senior citizens and some other groups in the area made representation to me, and through me to the Provincial Government, for the use of the building as a senior citizens' facility and in following meetings and letters and so on. There was quite a lot of hard feelings there on the part of people in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area and other parts of Labrador when it was intimated that the building would perhaps be used as an office building, a regional office building or whatever.

But a recent meeting three, four weeks ago in Happy Valley-Goose Bay of senior citizens from the area, a number of interest groups from the area and representatives of this particular department and myself attended and discussed the matter for a rather lengthy period and I understand - I do not understand, I know there was an agreement after that meeting that the people in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area agreed or gave consent, if you will, to the government

MR. GOUDIE: move to convert the old Paddon Memorial Hospital into an office building. Then a commitment was provided by the minister a little after that in the House that government would sponsor, if you will, the construction of a new senior citizens facility for the area. And it is not just for the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area of Labrador, I am told, and I think it should serve Labrador as a region - both the member from Eagle River's district, Menihek, and I suppose to a degree the district represented by the Leader of the Opposition, although I would think that the Straits of Belle Isle

MR. GOUDIE: area being so close to St. Anthony the home there will probably service that part of Labrador.

But in any event, I just wanted to express my appreciation, and I think the appreciation of the people in my district in Labrador, for the commitment from the minister recently that this would go ahead. And the only other thing that had to happen, I understand, was to find an inter-faith group, I believe is the popular term, to sponsor the construction of this facility and after reading the newspaper this morning I understand that has been done. The Ministerial Association of Happy Valley in the district have agreed to sponsor that and I understand they are now working with Central Mortgage and Housing to make sure that work on the home will be begin as quickly as possible.

I think something else should be pointed out when thinking of a senior citizens' facility in general. And there is one gentleman I know here in a facility in St. John's, I believe from Eagle River district, or from the member's district. I do not know the man's name but it just illustrates I think a problem that exists when you bring an Inuit or an Indian person into a facility like that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Does he speak no English?

MR. GOUDIE: No. But that is the point I was leading up to. This older gentleman is in a facility where no Inuktitut is spoken. There is a communications problem. The man was there for a number of weeks trying to communicate the message that he wanted a toothbrush and a couple of other little things for his personal hygiene, and until the staff of that facility were able to find someone in the city of St. John's itself to interpret for them, they were not able to understand what the man wanted. And a simple request like that I think illustrates the problem that exists when there are at least three languages, in the Province, Indian, Inuktitut and English, and I do not know

MR. GOUDIE: how many more but at least there are three. So I can see a senior citizens' facility being constructed in Labrador as overcoming that type of problem particularly. If government will bear in mind when the staff is being hired for such a facility that these language problems do exist, and since we are talking about a senior citizens' facility it is the older people of Labrador, the Indian and the Inuit who are not all that fluent in English and they are the people who have the communications problems. So I think when staffing such a facility when it is completed that should be considered by this particular department.

And there is another problem in Labrador as well when you think in terms of care for handicapped people. I visited the hospital in Northwest River during the Christmas break, as a matter of fact to see a little thirteen year old girl from the Coast who has a mental handicap. And the parents tried for ten years to care for her although because of the area in which they lived the parents had to be out hunting, fishing and getting wood and water and so on, so she was not receiving the extent of supervision that she should have. So they requested that the Grenfell Mission take her into the hospital in Northwest River to provide what care they could and she is now what, thirteen years of age. She is mobile in terms of physical movement, if you will. But there is one person on the staff of the hospital to provide care for that little girl and when the little girl has to be practically supervised for about eighteen hours a day, waking hours, it becomes a bit of a problem when you consider that that person has taken care of the little girl for the last three years in that facility.

I know that the appropriate facility on the Island part of the Province has been - not over booked but it is fully occupied right now, I have written the minister on this

May 5, 1977

Tape No. 2261

NM - 3

MR. GOUDIE: particular case. I do not know if I can suggest an alternative or not, It may sound as if I am talking about catching fish or something but perhaps a quota system could be set up when talking about facilities for the care of handicapped people, particularly children.

People with this problem have been brought down to the Island part of the Province for adequate care and perhaps if the requirement exists then three or four or five beds



MR. GOUDIE: or whatever, could be made available when thinking of Labrador as a region so that some of these people up there could be brought down for the type of care they require.

The only other thing I wanted to comment on was referred to briefly by the minister in his remarks, and that was the Recreation Conference which was sponsored and paid for by the provincial government recently in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, which brought together recreation representatives from all parts of Labrador, the Coastal section, the Central section and the Western section. Unfortunately I was unable to attend most of the conference with the exception of about an hour or an hour and-a-half. But I have asked the staff of that particular department to provide minutes and resolutions and so on, so that I can be made aware that way of what transpired.

I think the idea of the conference was to, first of all, gain a firsthand knowledge, if you will, of some of the problems being encountered by recreational groups in Labrador in terms of exchange visits between the two parts of the Province, in terms of competitions in other parts of Canada, sometimes. The discussion, I think, dealt with the Arctic Games and the Summer Games coming up and that sort of thing. But I think one of the glaring things during the conference which came out was the need for some type of co-ordination of sports activity in Labrador itself as a region. Not because we want to be considered a separate region for the sake of being a separate region, but it is a separate region. Having such long Winters, cold Winters, the Winter Games are ideally suited in that way to our part of the Province.

Just perhaps to illustrate, I think the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) may

MR. GOUDIE: very well confirm that up until a couple of years ago the Community of Makkovik started its soccer season in January. They did not have a soccer pitch. All of the people were fishing in the Summertime, including the young people.

MR. STRACHAN: It is still the same.

MR. GOUDIE: It is still the same. The only time to start playing soccer was when the Bay froze up and some of the snow smoothed down and the boys would get playing their soccer in January. They would travel by snomobile from that community to other communities and they would invite other communities to come in -

MR. STRACHAN: They would be a whole week at it.

MR. GOUDIE: That is right, yes - and take part in that sort of thing.

So I think there is a need for co-ordination or perhaps more funding. I realize that that again - when we are strapped for money in this Province it is almost unreasonable, I suppose, to ask for more money. Perhaps we could begin with co-ordination and the appointment, I would hope, of a recreational director for Labrador to help co-ordinate the requests of the various groups. The school groups, the elementary school groups, the high school groups, the other hockey, softball leagues, lacrosse and all of the various sports, when making their applications to government, all of them make individual applications. Perhaps with the appointment of a recreational director, or whatever the title that person would have, may help resolve some of these problems the groups have in terms of tapping into programmes within the provincial structure, and tapping into, not just the programmes from a monetary point of view, but from an information point of view as well.

MR. GOUDIE: I think we have some excellent athletes in Labrador and that is going to become more evident when there is a little more co-ordination within that whole recreation structure.

That is all I wanted to say, Mr. Chairman, to thank the minister and government in general, I suppose, for sponsoring the construction - the upcoming construction of a senior citizen's facility for Labrador as a region, and for the work -

MR. DOODY: Thanking the government in anticipation.

MR. GOUDIE: In anticipation, yes. As I mentioned, I do not know if the hon. member was in the room, but the Ministerial Association in the district -

AN HON. MEMBER: You have to thank the minister for the commitment.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, for the commitment - but the Ministerial Association, if the member read The Daily News today, has agreed to sponsor them so they have begun work with the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation now.

MR. NEARY: With C.M.H.C?

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, that is right. So I just wanted to mention that in passing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: On following up the comments of the member for Naskaupie (Mr. Goudie),

Mr. Strachan.

a couple of points here on recreation that I would like to bring up. I give the minister here some benefit of the doubt. And a recent conference which his staff attended in Labrador brought to the forefront a number of the problems facing the department in Labrador in the area of recreation. In the district that I represent, and being very interested in a great deal of sports and recreation, we have in the whole district virtually no facilities whatsoever. In fact, the only facilities are in the school, and I often think that there is a great deal wrong with an educational system which locks up a school at four o'clock in the afternoon, closes it up for the weekend, and only opens it Monday at nine o'clock, especially in small communities, isolated communities in which there are no other facilities available.

But in the area there is very little money available and very little incentive to the young people there to try to become encouraged in trying to pursue their sports. Like the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) says, When you play soccer thirty and forty below - and I have often played soccer at the time. We play it on the sea ice in which we clean off a patch in the ice and play soccer. In fact the combination of the games, the soccer tournaments and so on, are always held at Easter time on the sea ice. You do not play soccer during the Summer generally. Again there is very little opportunity for hockey or ice hockey which many of the people are interested in. And as the communications become greater, people are hearing on radio and now television in some communities - many communities still do not have television - people are becoming much more interested in sports and, of course, do not have the kind of facilities that they have elsewhere. I agree there are many other areas in the Province and on the Island in isolated communities where the same thing occurs. But I think on the Labrador Coast this is a real extreme case. The people do not have any funds



Mr. Strachan.

whatsoever. It must be remembered that to give a grant to a recreation committee - and many of the communities do have very active recreation committees struggling to try to get something going - to give a grant to a committee on the Labrador Coast - and I will take the community which I live in, Nain - to give them a grant of \$3,000 or \$4,000 for a year is absolutely nothing. It is pure tokenism. One game of soccer, for instance, in which I was involved in, in which the Nain football team wished to play at Goose Bay and Lab. City, one game of soccer in which they had to travel from Nain to Goose Bay alone can cost them \$1,600 in travel alone - \$1,600 to go from Nain to Goose Bay and back to Nain. That is as long as they have some accommodation in Goose Bay to live with friends. So you can see that two games in a year, and you have blown the best part of \$4,000. There seems to be a mentality which still does not understand, regardless of what it is, and not only recreation but everything, that to travel in that part of this Province is extremely and highly expensive. And given money or small grants and so on to these communities only allows them to participate in generally one game a year. And, therefore, they do not feel a part of the Province nor do they feel part of anything at all, nor a relationship with other parts of Labrador.

They are very envious, of course, of Labrador City and Wabush in which the recreation department - or the recreation facility over there organized by IOC - are very well developed. There are football fields, swimming pools and so on, and things like that that they can manage to get into, large gymnasiums in the schools and so on and well-organized curling groups and so on, well-organized programmes. Whereas the coastal communities, isolated communities, Cartwright, for instance, Nain of 1,000 people, close to 1,000, right down to the smaller ones of 100 people and so on, have no facilities whatsoever, and do not participate in any of the rest of the programmes. So I think



Mr. Strachan.

that it requires a whole overhaul of the programmes that the recreation department does in Labrador. I think that the first thing is an understanding of the fact that it will cost a considerable amount of money in travel only, and I think that that has been made very aware to the minister's department in the recent meetings in Goose Bay. And, as I say, I will reserve judgement on that and give him benefit of the doubt that hopefully then we can start off something which will bring to the forefront the fact that we do require these kind of funds if we are to participate within this Province.

Secondly, as the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Coudie) said here, we were tremendously interested at one point in Arctic Games. The Arctic Games in the North have been held right across the

Mr. Strachan:

Northwest Territories, and most of the Northern parts of the Provinces in Canada. The last lot of Games, I think, were held in Schefferville in Quebec, and in this Province here only a point in some observers, some observers to go to observe the Arctic Games, either we are a couple of participants in some things, but only observers to the Arctic Games held in Schefferville. There were four or five people from Labrador who went there, some of them travelled part of the way on their own funds. But we do have a Northern part to this Province, and I believe that they have skills and so on, especially shooting, various other skills, snowshoeing and so on which are all part of the Arctic Games in which people in this Province and Labrador want to partake of. And I think there should be some more emphasis - I think, at one time we could have participated in the Arctic Games or the Arctic Games could have been held within Labrador.

But I think this whole thing of recreation was laid out very clearly to the minister's officials in Labrador two or three weeks ago, I believe, and I think that they have brought up this and I will give them the benefit of the doubt, but I would say that most definitely that means a whole reorganization, a whole sector of recreation in Labrador, some extra funds or the funding of funds to allow people to even just travel and participate and feel that they belong to part of the Province and that they can participate and compete against other parts of Labrador.

The facilities within the communities are negligible. There is virtually nothing there; you scarcely see ice to play hockey on, and you try to find a patch clear of boulders to play, and a game of ball, and that is about all you have on the coast. The enthusiasm is very high and it is warranted by, for instance, two weeks ago the people from Hopedale travelled by snowmobile, and I remember the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) standing up and indicating to the House here a trip which a number of people made by snowmobile 100 miles or something like that, 120 miles in which people travelled in

Mr. Strachan:

the West Coast of the Province -

AN HON. MEMBER: Burgeo to St. George's.

MR. STRACHAN: Burgeo to St. George's, and we congratulated the people on this wonderful trip. Well the people from Hopedale travelling 110 miles to Nain to play a game of football, they travelled on Friday night 110 miles, played a game of football on the sea ice on Saturday afternoon and travelled 110 miles back to Hopedale on Sunday to go to work again on Monday morning, a total of 220 miles or 230 miles all for a game of soccer on sea ice and snowmobiles. So you see that we are not talking about lack of enthusiasm or lack of anything in the people's part they are prepared to do these kind of things. I have travelled from Nain to Hopedale for a game of soccer and back again the same weekend, and the Makkovik and Hopedale people travel constantly every third or fourth weekend eighty miles to play a game of soccer. So there is no lack in the people's enthusiasm. You do not travel at that time of the year on the sea ice -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. STRACHAN: Oh yes! Hopedale travels back and forth, and Makkovik travels to Hopedale, and Hopedale travels to Makkovik back and forth on snowmobiles because it is the cheapest way, To charter an aircraft would cost somewhere in the region of \$600, and they do not have that kind of money, And, of course, an aircraft, a bush plane will not hold the team, you cannot take a total team with you on an aircraft, on a bush plane.

MR. NEARY: When they get stuck -

MR. STRACHAN: No, you haul your gas with you. Generally you load up your gas and your komatik, and you haul your gas with you. So we are resolved that the people are - they are enthusiastic, they want to partake and participate in the sports, and it requires some encouragement. I realize it is a time in which funds are tight and money is not available, but I think that they do require satisfaction

MR. STRACHAN:

for this kind of enthusiasm. But I see some other areas with facilities not being used to the utmost, and people who have maximum opportunity do not take that opportunity, then I think the people in isolated and rural communities who are prepared to make the effort should be given the encouragement they require. And I make that case to the minister and hope that he will consider it, and I also hope that out of the recent meeting in Labrador something will develop.

On the other hand, on the other part here of the department, following up again the member from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) who bought up the senior citizens home. I do not want to get into a discussion or a debate on the Paddon Memorial Hospital versus any other one. But I will say that there is a need within Labrador, the whole of Labrador, for a senior citizens' home. There are people, and there have been people in the past, who have been sent out of Labrador, and they always talk of going in or out of Labrador, and out the coast, who have been here in St. John's who have not

MR. STRACHAN: spoken any English and have therefore suffered a great deal. These people generally feel that they are sent out to die because in essence they never see anyone, they never see friends or relatives from not only month to month but from year to year. So there is a need right along the coast as well as in the member's own district for a senior citizens' home to be built somewhere in the central part and Happy Valley, of course, as we mentioned before, is the hub of it all and hopefully something will develop out of this.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, I separated that all together I have comments on it here. But regardless of it, I think that many people feel that there should be more use made of Happy Valley and Goose Bay as a central point in Labrador and that goes for people right along the coast as well. If you have to travel to St. John's or travel elsewhere you almost always invariably pass through Happy Valley-Goose Bay. And I think that this comes to another point and maybe a contentious point, an argumentative point, and maybe I will gain no pats on the back for stating it, but I think that Happy Valley-Goose Bay is the center and as such it should be made the center now for most of the activities and most of the facilities the coastal people require as well as the central part of Labrador in Naskaupi district.

Everything passes through Happy Valley-Goose Bay and I think it is to that end the Lake Melville Hospital should be encouraged to be the central hospital for Labrador. The days in which people are sent to North West River - and I know the IGA will probably try and defend their position in North West River, if North West River should continue to be the hospital, but I totally disagree. Patients - and I know them myself and many of my friends, who are sent from the coast or come from the coast to hospital - are flown out by mission plane which picks us up,



MR. STRACHAN: and we are sent to North West River and in a sense we are hospitalized in a small community in which it is very difficult for most of our friends to get down to see us. Our friends are very close in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, most people have relatives, very close relatives in Happy Valley - Goose Bay and in many cases we land in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. And I think that the days of the IGA hospital, as it is in North West River, are over. There is no question in my mind nor has there been for a number of years. I know that this will find no great sanction from IGA but most definitely the days are gone which we felt that North West River was the halfway house, that North West River was the place where you sent people in order that they did not get this modern civilization is totally over and patronizing.

There has been extreme patronizing in this effect by the IGA in trying to hold on to an old-fashioned empire and I think that these days are over.

MR. ROBERTS: Colonialism.

MR. STRACHAN: Colonialism, absolutely, totally colonialism.

And I should state that I have been attacked for this many times in the last seven years, and this is the first time publically that I have said so, and I will make that quite clear.

This old type of idea that you must keep native peoples and ignorant coastal peoples in a small North West River community is totally wrong, because immediately the people get out of North West River and the first place they head for is to their friends in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, that is where they normally go. In fact, in North West River they feel very isolated and many times very lonely.

MR. NEARY: And they are looked down on if they go to the other side of the river.

MR. STRACHAN: Absolutely, totally. So what they feel then

MR. STRACHAN:

is that they must therefore move. So I think that what we need is a whole consolidation of the hospital facilities within Labrador and that [ ] Happy Valley - Goose Bay should be looked upon as the service center. And that we should not start splitting up the facilities and going back to the old type of organizations.

And so I think that it requires a new look at that system, a complete overhaul and I realize that there is a great deal of hassle and there has been for quite some time, in the last few years as there has been attempts to change this kind of structure. And, as I said, I have borne the brunt of many attacks by IGA because I said this quietly and never, ever publically, but now I would like to put this on record that I think that what it requires is a consolidation in Happy Valley-Goose Bay and possibly that the hospital, the old hospital in North West River should become, and I feel needs to become a place where children or - not quite an orphanage, I do not like the idea of an orphanage, but it should become a facility which could handle that kind of facility for people from the coast and for people from Central and Western Labrador.

And in that way you could make use of the facility at North West River. But at the same time it does not make sense to me to have somebody flown out from

MR. STRACHAN: the Coast if they require any treatment they have got to move on from Northwest River to be flown out of the Coast and to land on ice or land on open water and especially in the Fall and in the Spring in which it becomes very difficult to land at North West River. Sometimes you use the airstrip but even then the airstrip is very boggy and you cannot use it. And so with a result that you are flown to Goose Bay and then travel back up twenty-five miles of road back to North West River, across in a cable car to get to hospital, and you pass the big hospital in Central Labrador and Goose Bay. It does not make sense at all.

MR. NEARY: Is that where the air plane -

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, the mission plane which crashed a year or a year and a half ago in North West River taking off from a strip and curving around and ran into trouble. So with a result then that I think these are a whole consolidation of these kind of things and a whole new look and it does not have to be a drastic, radical, wild kind of look and we will be attacked for saying that because people want to hold on to their old empires and so on. What we are saying is let us be practical and use the money economically and try to develop some kind of central hospital programme which makes sense.

Here we have the big Lake Melville Hospital with facilities. The move has been made. It has been established. There are many beds in that hospital and at the same time twenty-odd miles down the road we have another hospital handling people from the Coast. That does not make sense at all and I think there has to be some kind of consolidation to make best use of funds. And in this day and age when we are talking about the

MR. STRACHAN: lack of money, then I think that this is a prime example of money being wasted when it could be used to far better purpose.

Now I know that I have knocked a few old heads, taps on the head in Labrador because in Labrador there seems to be tremendous vested interest in the old type of thing. But, however, I feel that the day has come for these things to end and that changes should occur.

I should mention also, and I know this is nothing new with the minister's department, or possibly it has some points, in rehabilitation. And we are very interested and have been, and possibly the Minister of Justice is more aware of it, we are very interested that there should be within Central Labrador, again Happy Valley - Goose Bay, some sort of - we would not like a prison type situation but something of that sort community -

AN HON. MEMBER: A correctional institution.

MR. STRACHAN: I do not know what words you use for it. I am not up on the lingo of the thing. But for people who have committed minor offences to be sent all the way from Coastal Labrador, for instance, and to be sent all the way to a system here in St. John's or - and I have high praise for the Superintendent who has looked after them very well and people are sent generally to Salmonier Camp, I think that it should be within Happy Valley - Goose Bay again this service centre set up in which people can be visited by their friend and visited on visiting time and so on. Because people are generally sent away or sent off in these sentences for three months or four months or five months and never see a soul, never speak to a friend, never obtain a visit unless some of us are prepared to go there, but just a scattered visit, and come back very lonely. And I understand that it is a punishment but they should have the same facilities and the same rights to see their friends and relatives as everyone else. And I think again they need to look at the whole Happy Valley situation, to create within Happy Valley - Goose Bay this service centre

MR. STRACHAN: ... for Labrador, I believe it should be. It should be the hub of the wheel that everything evolves around it and -

AN HON. MEMBER: The West.

MR. STRACHAN: Well you can leave the West. I must admit that the West in many cases to us, and of course us to the West as well, are 10,000 miles apart. Many of the people on the Coast of Labrador in recreation and so on are far more familiar with St. John's than they are with Labrador City and Wabush because there is very little real reason ever to go over there. Very few people travel through Montreal and so they do not generally associate very clearly. And possibly we should maybe get into some of this kind of using recreation as a means of competing against each other and I played two years ago in fact against Labrador City and Wabush in soccer and we were intending to take them on in a number of other games and this way it would bring us closer together because we often do feel very far apart and do not meet each.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. STRACHAN: Labrador City.



Mr. Strachan.

Anyway I have made the points I wished to make on this, and I will be interested in the minister's comments on it.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I have got a few brief comments prompted more by the minister's remarks than by anything else. There is one thing I want to make very specifically clear, that in my reference to the situation at Exon House today, it was not my intention to indicate that the minister was aware that there may have been child abuse or maltreatment or that anyone was aware. All I said, Mr. Speaker, or tried to say, is that when I opened the papers and read the glaring headline saying, Child Abuse and Maltreatment at Exon House, I put myself in the position of the people outside St. John's who opened that paper, read the headlines and said, My God, what is happening in there? I was putting myself, I think, in the position of the parents or the relatives of people who are, as the minister said, guests at Exon House. And if anything I said indicated that I believed that there was abuse or if I indicated that the minister was aware of abuse or anything I did not mean to imply that, but I did mean to imply this, that since the allegations have been made, the minister owes it to the people in this Province to clear that situation up, to have the enquiry determine whether or not there was any abuse, and if there was abuse - and not only do we owe it to the people in the Province, we owe it to the staff of Exon House. And, Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is incumbent upon you, as the minister, or the administration to clear the air on that situation, because it is something that we cannot leave up in the air. The people who are working in Exon House, the people who have relatives as guests or what have you in Exon House, I think that they are entitled to a clear and full explanation as to how these rumours started, whether or not there is - If there is not abuse, then fine, let us get it out. And that is the

Mr. Flight.

message that I wanted to get across, and I stand by that. I think that nothing else should be - there should be no red herrings. There should be a report on as to whether or not there was abuse. That is it.

And I noticed the minister, he answered practically every question I asked except one. He did not address himself of the fact that I made the charge that this administration pulled the blanket ~~out from~~ under Labrador City - Wabush with regards to the Winter Games. And they did. I say they did. I charge the administration with pulling the blanket from ~~out from~~ under people in Labrador City - and the Minister of Industrial Relations is probably more aware of this situation than I am - but people in Labrador City ~~worked~~ for a long time. They thought they had the arrangements made. They had the facilities. They had done the organizational work. They believed they had the Winter Games. They were prepared to host the Winter Games. They had indicated to the administration that they wanted the Winter Games. They had done everything to prove that they could sponsor the Winter Games. They were as well equipped probably as the Island part of the Province. The fact is that we had the Summer Games. And the administration did not recognize it, and pulled the blanket from out under them and publicly - and like I say, when the minister says I do not know what I am talking about, what he is saying in effect is that the people who did the public programmes, who spoke for the organizations in Labrador City publicly accused this administration of letting them down. And it not me the minister got the argument with. It is with those people, and I would like to hear him address himself to it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the recreational aspect. You know, I am aware, as other hon. members are, that in every community in this Province there are dozens and dozens of people who sacrifice their time and energy in organizing sports. And I am thinking particularly in the ~~pee wee~~ bracket, in the minor sports in this Province. Minor

Mr. Flight.

league hockey, for argument's sake, has probably got more participation than any other sport in the Province, and I am aware of communities - I can name, you know, Badger as an example, where ten or twelve or fifteen adults give their Winter to organizing. There are hockey moms. The town finances the operation. There is nothing

MR. FLIGHT: coming out of the administration, nothing but nothing except three-quarters of the light bill of the stadium. And then comes the Spring and the CAHA -

MR. H. COLLINS: What about the stadium itself?

MR. FLIGHT: I said the stadium. In lots of cases there is nothing coming out for the stadium in some cases. As a matter of fact I must pick the minister up on a statement he made in the House and the answer will show it. He was listing off stadiums that his administration had helped support and he made the mistake of listing the Buchans stadium. Would the minister indicate one cent of expenditure that ever this administration put into the Buchans stadium, one penny?

MR. H. COLLINS: I did not.

MR. FLIGHT: Oh yes you did, Sir. It is in Hansard.

MR. H. COLLINS: I probably said stadiums in the Province. But I did not say that this administration put it there.

MR. FLIGHT: No. No. But you indicated that you were supporting the Buchans stadium.

MR. H. COLLINS: Subsidized the electrical bill.

MR. FLIGHT: You listed ten or twelve more.

MR. H. COLLINS: I said we subsidize the electrical bill.

MR. FLIGHT: No, you do not, not in the Buchans stadium.

MR. H. COLLINS: Sure we do.

MR. FLIGHT: In the Buchans stadium?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, for each stadium in the Province.

MR. FLIGHT: No, the subsidy of the three-quarters electric rate, I am talking about providing the stadium.

MR. H. COLLINS: No. No. We did not.

MR. FLIGHT: Now having said that, CAHA, Mr. Chairman, CAHA and the NAHA, two organizations for sponsoring and administering and drawing up the schedules of minor hockey in this Province, tells

MR. FLIGHT: a town like Badger in March that they are going to send two teams to St. Anthony, St. Pierre, anywhere they can work into the schedule. Those teams and the administration come to the Recreation Commission for some assistance in travelling—not a cent, not a penny. Now does that appear to be support for our young people in recreation in this Province, not one cent of funding?

Now the town made the effort. They raised the money, provided the leadership, provided the facilities, but no recognition when it comes to assistance in travelling and meeting commitments that they worked towards all Winter.

And, Mr. Speaker, Lotto Canada, Mr. Chairman - I will get that straight after a while. I apologize, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Lotto Canada, we understood that the revenue from Lotto Canada would be turned back to the sports organizations in this Province. The revenue to Newfoundland from Lotto Canada would be turned back to the minor hockey leagues and to the sports organizations. Now that is what was stated. That was stated. Now I see here, Mr. Speaker, I see revenue from Lotto Canada - \$100,000 and I would like to hear the minister when he stands, and this is the last time I am going to make - I would like to hear the minister indicate to the House what happened to that \$100,000. Did it go into general revenue? Is it or is it not being spent on minor hockey facilities?

So, Mr. Chairman, number one, we have gone into Lotto Canada, as the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said a few days ago, without even this House having agreed. The administration decided to go. We were supposed to have had a debate on whether or not Newfoundland would enter into those lotteries. Well apparently the administration took it on themselves to enter into the lotteries with or without the approval of the House of Assembly.

MR. NEARY: It was all in some old act somewhere or -



MR. FLIGHT: That may or may not be all that important but I believe it is very important, Mr. Chairman, that the commitment be kept to the recreational - to the bodies and groups in this Province and the word was this, that the revenue from Lotto Canada, \_\_\_\_\_ push the Lotto Canada tickets, or \_\_\_\_\_ buy the tickets, the revenue from Lotto Canada will be made available to minor sports groups in this Province.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: No, never agreed.

MR. FLIGHT: It may not have been agreed but it was suggested. It was said. And, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the minister to indicate when he speaks as to exactly where that \$100,000 went and how it was distributed. Has it gone into general revenue? Fine. That is fine. But I believe if it is gone into general revenue then I believe that that is not what was intended. I believe the Lotto Canada tickets are selling the way they are as a direct result of people believing that the funds derived therefrom will help fund and help finance minor sports in this Province and I doubt if you will be having the success in selling those tickets, because I go into stadiums, Mr. Chairman, and people are pushing those tickets and the general public believes that the revenue will go into fund minor sports in this Province and I think that is either what should happen or the administration should come out now and say exactly what the revenue from Lotto Canada is funding. So that is it, I guess.

AN HON. MEMBER: How about the Windsor stadium?

MR. FLIGHT: Oh, it is very good, very good.

Just one more point, Mr. Chairman, I could have made this point on any department. Here is a department, the Department of Recreation and Rehabilitation, Mr. Chairman. With travelling,

Mr. Flight:

somebody should take the time, I have not done it, somebody should take the time and go through this Budget and add up all of the funds that are earmarked for travelling in this Budget. It is unbelievable, \$164,000 in the Department of Recreation, \$164,000 for travelling in the Department of Recreation alone. Now, Mr. Chairman, in most heads in this Budget dollars voted, funds voted from other departments covers aircraft hiring and what have you.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT: I do not know, I have not checked and I am not going to now as to whether this applies to this department. But in some cases there is as high as \$83,000 voted for aircraft travel to a department.

Now I think, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Recreation, I think, every minister as he stands, every head discussed should justify that type of an expenditure in travelling. I would say, Sir, if I were to make a guess right now that if all of the travelling expenses in this Budget were totalled, it would be a fair share of the Provincial Budget, and I would like to see it justified.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT: Pardon me?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT: No. But are you saying that if the Minister of Recreation did not spend -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT: Is the minister suggesting that if the Minister of Recreation did not spend \$164,000 in travelling that he would have to stay in St. John's?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Not only the minister.

MR. FLIGHT: He could take all of St. John's around the world with him for that practically.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not only the minister.

MR. FLIGHT: So, Mr. Chairman, I am serious. I believe that the minister should justify one by one the travelling allowances in their

MR. FLIGHT:

departments. And I believe there is a lot of unnecessary travelling going on in this Province. There are a lot of trips being paid for all over the world and all over Mainland Canada by, not necessarily ministers, but by top civil servants.

AN HON. MEMBER: Name them.

MR. FLIGHT: I am not going to name the civil servants. Do you want me to name them? I will.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: I can name your deputy, your ministers -

MR. MORGAN: Name the officials, do not go making blanket charges.

MR. FLIGHT: No. I am not going to, no. No. I am not going to be sucked in.

MR. MORGAN: Well do not go making an innuendo -

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: No innuendo. No innuendo, Mr. Chairman. All right. I will ask the Minister of Transportation when he stands is he prepared to name the people in his department who travelled outside of this Province this year and it was budgeted for there?

MR. MORGAN: Sure.

MR. FLIGHT: All right fine, then you will do it. Right.

AN HON. MEMBER: We all are.

MR. FLIGHT: All right, every minister in one of their presentations justify their travelling expenses and the trips that their civil servants are taking, and let us face it, you do not send ordinary clerks to Toronto or to Vancouver. It is your deputy ministers, directors, ADMs, these are the people who are having the trips. And what I am suggesting is that half of these trips are not justified, and I am suggesting the ministers should have to justify them. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I think I have made my contribution to this debate. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG); The hon. member for St. John's South.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few comments in regard to this heading, particularly in regard to Exon House. The Exon House has figured fairly prominently in the debate on this heading, and I would just like to comment on two things that were said about it. In doing this, I do not want to claim to have any great expertise in regard to Exon House. I certainly know where it is, I certainly visited it, I certainly know the type of child that is in Exon House and in the Children's Home, but I do not actually work there, and I have fairly limited clinical contact with the children in Exon House and in the Children's Home.

However, just to comment on one statement, there was an impression, I think, left in some respects that we should have more institutions like this, sort of implying, I believe, that all children of a certain type should go into these institutions. Well now, it may well be true that we should have expanded institutions of this nature. But I think it would be wrong to say that all children with handicaps, even serious handicaps, either physical or mental, should go into institutions like this. I think it should be taken as generally accepted that the home is by far the best for all children, handicapped or otherwise. In saying that, of course, one must realize that the ideal is not always attainable, but I think that we should recognize that wherever possible the home

DR. COLLINS: is a lot better, immeasurably better than any institution and that care can be given in the home, perhaps with help to the home, care can be given in the home to many children of this sort. Another aspect of the debate in regard to Exon House, of course we all know that probably that institution would not have figured into this debate if it was not in regard to the recent report made by the nursing association. That report -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

DR. COLLINS: Well perhaps not. I am not saying that it would not have been mentioned, but I say that it has certainly figured prominently to some extent because of that.

MR. WHITE: Probably more prominently than it would after that report.

DR. COLLINS: And I think that we probably will hear more of that report. But at this point in time I do not think we should make too much of that report. I am glad to see that the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans softened, I think, in his second remark—second series of remarks there, softened his approach over this whole matter. I think initially he did mention the word child abuse, and to some people child abuse is a very specific type of diagnosis, if I might call it that. It is equivalent to the battered child syndrome, and the battered child syndrome is a serious health problem. It is certainly present in Newfoundland as well as in other parts of Canada and other parts of the world for that matter of fact. But the battered child syndrome is a serious type of child injury, fairly specific; it usually relates to bone injuries, to serious organ injuries, to serious types of nutritional defects and so on and so forth. It is quite distinct from, shall we say, approaches to the child of a reprimand type of manner -

AN HON. MEMBER: Of a disciplinary nature.

DR. COLLINS: Yes, of a disciplinary nature. It is quite



DR. COLLINS: different from that and I think that it would be wrong at this point in time - until it is proven to the contrary, and I do not believe it will be proven to the contrary - I think it will be quite wrong to say that the Nursing Association report in any way alleged that children at Exon House were in the category of the battered child syndrome. I do not think that they intended that, I do not think that it is true, I do not think it will be proven to be true.

We should be extremely, I think, careful in public debate when referring to this type of subject in regard to institutions and particularly where children are involved. This is a very sensitive area and I think for three reasons: firstly, of course, the parents who though they probably would like if possible to take care of these children in their home -

MR. MURPHY: Can you give our

DR COLLINS: Yes, I will - nevertheless have to put these children in institutions. I am sure that in the vast majority of cases they do not do it willingly, they do it with a certain amount of concern and if there are remarks made that might indicate that this was an unwise decision on their part, it increases that concern immeasurably. And I think that it is most unfair if this is done in any sort of unwise manner. Secondly, I think we must remember that staffing of these institutions is difficult. These children, and indeed in terms of adults also, but certainly these children are very difficult to handle. Their care is very time consuming, it is relatively thankless work and it is very difficult to get the dedicated people that one must have to staff these institutions.

If remarks are made that in any way diminish the ability of these institutions to staff themselves I think it would be most unfortunate. And I am sure that no hon. member - and I say this, I am sure, quite sincerely - I am sure that no hon. member has

DR. COLLINS:

certainly that in mind. But I think that we must be very careful not in any way hiding facts, I think that this would be equally wrong, but I think that in making our points we must try to be as factual and as responsible as possible.

Now the other point, I think, about this, and this might be a little bit more difficult to get across because it is sort of argues against what I have just said, but another point about it I think is that we should not do anything to direct too much attention to the institutions. I think that these institutions have their place in the health care system but on the other hand it would be quite wrong to direct

Dr. Collins:

too much funding into this one aspect of the health care system. And I have done a little bit of figuring - and I am open to correction on this, but I suggest that the figures are not far too wrong - I have done a little figuring, and it seems to me that the daily per patient costs for Exon House and the Children's Home works out to be approximately \$72.50 per day, which for each patient -

AN HON. MEMBER: How much?

DR. COLLINS: \$72.50, you know, an average hospital cost per day for a patient would be, say, \$120; here it is \$72.50. That is \$2,175 a month, that is \$26,100 per year. Now to put that in perspective, remember what you get in, when you fill out your income tax what you are allowed to claim per child, what is it? \$375 or whatever it is, is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

DR. COLLINS: \$375, something of that order. And here we are talking about a cost per patient per year of \$26,000. So one can only direct so much of the relatively valuable health dollar to this sort of institutional care. If you direct it unduly there you have to cut down in other areas.

MR. NEARY: That is not the health dollar, that is the welfare dollar; 50 per cent comes from the Government of Canada via Canada assistances.

DR. COLLINS: Granted! Granted! Possibly 50 per cent, but even at 50 per cent, you are still left with \$13,000 per patient -

MR. NEARY: But it does not come out of the health grants.

DR. COLLINS: It comes out of a sort of health dollar; it comes out of the rehabilitation dollar, which in this instance is very close to the health dollar.

So I just make the point that whereas one certainly should pay - and I am sure the hon. minister and his staff do this - they certainly should pay due attention to the needs of custodial and training care for these patients. Nevertheless we must not overdo

Dr. Collins:

the matter, not that it would not be a good idea to overdo it, but in overdoing it you have to cut down somewhere else, so some other area of the health-care system suffers.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG) The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Will the minister close the debate now?

MR. PECKFORD: Yes.

MR. H. COLLINS: How much time do we have left?

AN HON. MEMBER: It is ten to ten.

MR. H. COLLINS: It is ten to ten.

Mr. Chairman, to respond to the hon. -

MR. CHAIRMAN: (MR. YOUNG): There are seven or eight minutes left.

MR. H. COLLINS: - member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) I thought I responded in my earlier remarks this morning and tonight, but I did overlook to make a response -

MR. NEARY: Why do you not sit down and we will go over it item by item.

MR. H. COLLINS: Look, Mr. Chairman, we have been listening to the hon. member -

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! The hon. minister only has eight minutes and he is trying to finish his estimates.

MR. H. COLLINS: - all day and all night -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. H. COLLINS: - he is almost like Mary Anne.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROUSSEAU: This is Mary Anne?

MR. NEARY: I hope my talks tonight -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is exceptional.

MR. H. COLLINS: What was that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. COLLINS: I will only take a couple of minutes, Mr.

Chairman, if it is the desire to the Committee to get involved in the item by item bit.

MR. NEARY: Sit down and let us run through them.

MR. H. COLLINS: But the Winter Games, the decision to host or to have Grand Falls and Gander host the Winter Games was made before we received any request from Labrador at all. These are the facts now, Mr. Chairman, The hon. member can think what he wants, as the hon. member here knows as well. In the meantime this Winter, as I said earlier today, we did sponsor a Recreational Conference in Labrador which was very well attended. A lot of bouquets were thrown to the officials who were down there. A committee was appointed, and the officials will be going back again. And I can say now that during the ensuing months the coastal sections of Labrador hopefully will be in a better position to be able to participate. And the next Winter Games are going to be scheduled in Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Atta a boy!

MR. NEARY: The Summer Games of the 19 leap year will be in Labrador City.

MR. H. COLLINS: I did not say Summer Games, Mr. Chairman, I said, Winter Games.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. COLLINS: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans also made reference to the enormous amount of travel, not necessarily the amount of travel, but the cost of travel.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who pays for Don Johnson's trips?

MR. H. COLLINS: The Canadian Amateur Hockey Association.

MR. NEARY: And the Province does not pay any?

MR. H. COLLINS: Not a cent.

MR. NEARY: Because he does it -

MR. H. COLLINS: Not a tittle, not a nickel.

MR. NEARY: We pay enough in travelling to send him to the moon and back.

MR. H. COLLINS: Yes, and take Don Jamieson with him.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).



MR. NEARY: Well if Don Jamieson has to travel that is his Department of External Affairs, but Don Johnson does not.

MR. H. COLLINS: They are two pretty heavy men.

MR. NEARY: He has to be the most travelled man in Newfoundland, is he?

MR. H. COLLINS: We are proud of the fact that Mr. Johnson was selected to the parent body of the CAHA, at the invitation of the Prime Minister

MR. COLLINS:

of Canada whom I am sure hon. members opposite must adore.

MR. NEARY: Did he pay for the uniform too, the Mao Tse-tung uniform?

MR. COLLINS: Whatever it has cost them they are going to charge against the Federal Treasury. I might mention in response -

MR. NEARY: It is still the taxpayers.

MR. COLLINS: - to the hon. members charges about the high cost of travel, there are 1,100 employees in the Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation. And many of those divisions are travelling constantly to the various youth organizations across the Province. So all in all, Mr. Chairman, there is a fair amount of money spent on travel it is well spent.

The member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) drew reference to the great job which the Salvation Army are doing in Newfoundland, I would like to echo his sentiments there. As he is aware, of course, we are contributing \$80,000 to the Harbour Light. I might tell him that if Captain Snook, if he has got some ideas, and no doubt he has, for new additional facilities and so on, we would certainly be glad to discuss it with him -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. COLLINS: - because I am convinced that people like the Salvation Army, other groups can certainly too particularly the Salvation Army, can do a much better job than the government could ever do. And monies which we do channel that way, I am sure, are very well spent. We get good value for them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Loto Canada -

MR. COLLINS: Loto Canada - we receive \$100,000. It is mentioned, \$100,000 from Loto Canada. It is mentioned. The winning number is 9,557,581,476.

MR. NEARY: Will that take care of your grant to the St. John's Curling

MR. NEARY:

Club, that \$100,000?

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell us where it went?

MR. COLLINS: It is shown in the estimates here as revenue. So the \$100,000 of the total which we show here comes from Loto Canada. The rest of the money comes from the hard-earned dollars of the people of Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: But I asked where you spent it? (Last part inaudible)

MR. COLLINS: We spent it, Mr. Chairman, - I can read off all the headings here. We spent it in training schools -

MR. NEARY: How about the St. John's Curling Club?

MR. COLLINS: - rehabilitation, the Hoyles Home, the Home for the Aged, the Childrens' Homes, recreational programmes, stadiums, subsidies, baseball parks, soccer pitches, swimming pools, you name it.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. member mentioned we give nothing to Buchans.

MR. NEARY: Anything there for the St. John's Curling Club?

MR. COLLINS: - The Buchans Stadium, last year we paid \$7,396 in electrical subsidies to the Buchans Stadium.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, how about the St. John's Curling Club?

MR. COLLINS: St. John's Curling Club.

MR. NEARY: Did they get any grants or any loans or guarantees or anything from the government?

MR. COLLINS: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman. You are not talking about the YMCA.

MR. NEARY: No, I am talking about the new St. John's Curling Club?

MR. COLLINS: There is nothing in my estimates for the Curling Club.

MR. NEARY: You are sure now?

MR. COLLINS: Not to my knowledge there is not.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. COLLINS: Well, after the performance of the hon. member tonight, I will have to give it some second thought. But notwithstanding anything he might have said, I would not want to take it out on the people in Buchans - Windsor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On motion 901-01 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall all other headings under this heading carry?

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, we still have three minutes left. Your Honour, we can run down through.

On motion 901-02 through to 902-08 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 903-01 carry?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, could I get a quick question off to the minister in connection with homes for special care. Are they all operating now and occupied? And if not, would the minister indicate, specify which homes are not yet open for business? Does the government have any plans to build any new senior citizens' homes in the current fiscal year?

MR. COLLINS: I presume the hon. member is talking about the inter-faith -

MR. NEARY: Inter-faith homes, that is right.

MR. COLLINS: The home in Bonavista will be coming on stream. It is not on yet. The home in Springdale is coming on stream. The home in St. Anthony, it was open; - I opened that about two months ago, a beautiful home down there.

MR. NEARY: I started that one. The minister did not even do me the courtesy of inviting me down for the opening.

MR. COLLINS: The hon. member seems to have started a lot of things. But -

MR. NEARY: No, I started that one.

MR. COLLINS: But there are a lot of them left unfinished.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir.

MR. COLLINS: A lot of them left unfinished. The Lewisporte Home has not been officially opened, I do not believe, but it is pretty well occupied.

MR. NEARY: All the ground work was done when the minister came in.

MR. H. COLLINS: Bonavista and Springdale, Mr. Chairman, are the only two which -

MR. NEARY: How about Stephenville Crossing? Is that one occupied?

MR. H. COLLINS: Stephenville Crossing was officially opened about a month ago also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

On motion, 903-01, carried.

On motion all remaining Headings under Heading IX, Rehabilitation and Recreation, carried.

On motion Head IX, Recreation and Rehabilitation, without amendment, carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Labour and Manpower.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, all I want to suggest at this point, Sir, is that we seem to be entering into the realm of general debate and I suppose I am as guilty of it as much as anybody. But I believe it would be better, Mr. Chairman, that if after the introductory remarks are over by the minister and the spokesman for the - the shadow minister on this side, and maybe I will have a few words - I believe we would be better off getting straight into the analysis, the item by item analysis of the estimates so we can ask ministers specific questions. Because a lot of the things that are happening now could just as easily happen during the budget debate.

Members on both side, I believe, would agree that if were to run down through the estimates item by item we would be better off. It is just a suggestion, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed. Agreed.

MR. ROUSSEAU: It will carry, but wait until the next Heading.



MR. ROUSSEAU: Just a few introductory remarks Mr. Chairman. The department now is under its new name of Labour Manpower. We suggested earlier why that was done, so to avoid the confusion that was arising between the Federal Department of Manpower and Immigration and our own provincial department.

If I may just go down on a few points here, and if hon. members opposite or hon. members on this side wish to raise any specific points certainly we will be in a position to answer them.

I might point out a few pertinent facts that may create some questions or debate in the ensuing hours. The Heading of 502-01, Salaries - General Administration: If hon. members notice there is a change between the revised estimate for last year and this year's estimates, It is down some \$30,000. That is due to the fact that the Human Rights Commission and their staff have now moved to the Department of Justice and is no longer associated with the Department of Labour and Manpower.

The other one I would like to mention, if I may going through, is the Minimum Wage Board. A new Chairman has been appointed. Mr. Andrew Rose resigned recently because he took up a position with the Workmen's Compensation Board. The new Chairman is Mr. H.T. Renouf, and although I have not announced it yet, I might say now that I have asked Mr. Renouf and the Minimum Wage Board to review the minimum wage and all pertinent information across the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: The former Registrar, I think.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes. So I would assume that the review of the minimum wage would begin sometime

MR. ROUSSEAU: probably this Spring or early Summer.

MR. NEARY: Who are the other members of the Board?

MR. ROUSSEAU: The other members of the board are Hollis Duffett, the Management Representative,

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, I am sorry not Hollis Duffett, H.W.Duffett. I do not think so, he is Water Street.

MR. NEARY: Harold Duffett?

MR. ROUSSEAU: The Labour - Employee Representative is Frank Taylor of the Retail Sales Clerk's Union in St. John's. These are the only three members and Mr. Renouf is the new Chairman. I have communicated with Mr. Renouf and asked him to review the minimum wage across the Province.

The minimum wage, as hon. members know, now is \$2.50 per hour, effective the 20th. February 1976.

MR. NEARY: Are there any complaints from the farmers on the minimum wage?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, the farmers are not included in the minimum wage unfortunately.

MR. NEARY: They are still exempt?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes. Yes. To my knowledge they are still exempt. The domestic workers are in it now and certainly I will give more details as we go through that particular subhead. But anyway, I have asked Mr. Renouf and the Minimum Wage Board to review the minimum wage in the Province of \$2.50 per hour. I might also mention an amount in there again of the Labour Management Committee of \$5,000. Last year it was \$5,000 but the revised estimates, Mr. Chairman, were \$13,300 because there was quite a bit of work done.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I am very proud of that one.  
I know it has done much good work.

Montreal leading one to  
nothing. Five minutes played.

The Labour Management Committee,  
\$5,000 and we may need more. You can never tell  
how many committees you will need. These are  
independent people we appoint in various industries

Mr. Rousseau.

across the Province, The various companies in which there are some problems between labour and management, they provide a centre figure to try and bring out any grievances on the table and then forestall any legal or illegal strikes or any grievances or any problems that may occur between the employer and the employee, and that is available merely by requesting the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations to do so, and we provide each chairman with some help, of course, from labour and management, and the government, the Department of Manpower.

There is also an amount there - the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans mentioned - there is an amount there of \$19,000 as well to fund this year's work at the Interim Advisory Board on Occupational Health and Safety. Dr. Leslie Harris, the Chairman - and I have a list of the members - are equally represented by the six members from the employer organizations across the Province and six members from the employee organizations across the Province. They were voted on at the Occupational Health and Safety Conference which was held in October under my predecessor, the present Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, and we have added a few more people to enlarge the scope of that committee. I have appointed a few people from the university and a few people that we think whose experience the committee would benefit from. I have the terms of reference, of course, for more specific questions on the membership actually if members want them.

There is a new thing in there which is conditional on the passing of the new labour standards legislation which is called the Labour Standards Board, and the Labour Standards Tribunal. It is our intention to take a lot of the referrals we have in grievances from employees in respect to labour standards across the Province away from the courts, because there is a backlog in the courts. It takes us an awfully long time to get some of these cases through the courts, and people are reluctant to go to the courts in respect to loss of wages,

withholding of wages and vacation pay and holiday pay and other such grievances against management. So it is our intention to set up, conditional on the passing of this Labour Standards Act, to set up a Labour Standards Tribunal who will act as a court in resolving these problems that arise as a result of infractions to the labour standards legislation.

Also I might mention - and I should have tabled this previously - I have the report of the Workmen's Compensation Board which, of course, is responsible to the Minister of Labour and Manpower, and there is some information there that I hope to table within the next few days but any specific question, of course, I will answer for the hon. members. The aspect of Manpower, of course, is a very wide one in the department. I think there are a number of questions - I hope an amount of debate will be generated on that particular aspect of the department. It has built itself into quite a formidable arm over the past couple of years. I think it is doing a good job. And if hon. members across have any questions on the aspects played by the Department of Labour and Manpower in the manpower aspect of the department, certainly they can raise them.

So outside of these few general comments, I will sit down and let the hon. members come up with any questions that may have and at such time it is appropriate I will try and answer them.

MP. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Terra Nova

MP. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, the Department of Labour and Manpower, a relatively new department in terms of departments, I think probably the Department of Labour - I do not think we had one really until Confederation really. Nineteen hundred and fifty was the first time that we had an official department of Labour and Manpower. And, of course, the reasons for that are related to the uniqueness of Newfoundland history, and it brings us to a point that I want to talk about, Sir, and that is unionism - and for a little while - and collective agreement. In the past number of years we have had



Mr. Lush.

a tremendous growth of unionism in this Province, and with that - certainly since the 1970's a tremendous amount of work stoppages, a tremendous amount of strikes resulting in a loss of productivity in the Province, a loss of income. And, of course, to know the value of the Department of Labour and Manpower, we must have some information relating to its track record. \_

Mr. Lush:

For example, I would like to know in this year how many work stoppages there were, legal and illegal?

MR. NEARY: Forty-eight illegal last year.

MR. LUSH: What is that?

MR. NEARY: Forty-eight illegal.

MR. LUSH: Forty-eight illegal?

MR. NEARY: Yes. Thirty-three legal.

MR. LUSH: Thirty-three legal for -

MR. NEARY: And there is no lockout, for a total of forty-eight.

MR. LUSH: So.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Fifteen legal and thirty-three illegal for a total of forty-eight.

MR. LUSH: So the total altogether was what?

MR. NEARY: Forty-eight.

MR. LUSH: Forty-eight. And in that were thirty-three illegal strikes. Mr. Chairman, that is a lot of strikes; it is certainly an improvement over previous years, but still a lot of illegal strikes.

MR. NEARY: Would the member permit, just to help the member with his speech? I think this would be pretty helpful information.

MR. LUSH: Yes.

MR. NEARY: The number of man-hours that were lost because of these work stoppages was 1,486,736 man-hours lost.

MR. LUSH: A million and a half.

MR. NEARY: A million and a half, roughly, man-hours.

MR. LUSH: A million and a half man-hours lost?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Does the hon. member want a statement? I have the number of man-hours to fifteen legal strikes resulted in a loss of 167,000 man-days, but the thirty-three illegal strikes only resulted in the loss of 18,000 man-days which is quite a difference.

MR. LUSH: And again, of course, I am just wondering whether there are any figures available on what that resulted in the loss of income to the Province? I remember reading a

MR. LUSH:

figure in the matter of a four year period, for example, prior to, in the four year period 1973, I think, that was the year that there was the Royal Commission on work stoppages. At that point in time when that Royal Commission was being compiled, in the four year period, from 1969 to 1973, there was \$5 million lost in income. And that is a fair chunk of money to lose to the economy of this Province. And right now we are talking about thirty-three illegal strikes. And, Mr. Chairman, that is a lot of strikes, illegal strikes. Another question, I am wondering whether the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) could help me on this one: Do we have any idea what men were involved in that? What was the numbers of people?

MR. NEARY: Nothing on that.

MR. LUSH: Nothing on that. And again that is something that would be interesting, and I would like to see that in this report. But this report that is put out by the Department of Manpower and Labour has some information on the work stoppages, the kind of information that the member for LaPoile provided me with, the numbers of people involved because this is significant, the loss of income. And, Mr. Chairman, there is no way that this Province can afford illegal work stoppages through this extent which result of course in loss of productivity and loss of income and there is no way that this Province can afford that kind of loss in productivity and in income. And the other aspect of it of course is that it gives the Province a reputation of an unstable industrial situation, an unstable working situation and this certainly will discourage industry from coming into the Province when they realize that our working conditions, that our industrial situation is very unstable. And certainly we have to improve this situation. And as I have said before that it is certainly an improvement over the years certainly 1971 and 1972 and 1973 but there are still a lot of illegal work stoppages, Mr. Chairman.

And the important point is what causes these illegal work stoppages and what is the Province, what is the Department of Labour and Manpower doing to prevent illegal work stoppages. What

MR. LUSH: are they doing? What legislation do they have? I have read through the various pieces of legislation, I forget the names of both bills now - the Labour Standards one but then there is another one that has not been put forward yet and I think -

MR. NEARY: Labour Relations.

MR. LUSH: Labour Relations. That is the important one. That is the one that will be aimed at. This sort of thing should be but we have had the legislation before and I do not see - It is the salient matter. The major point with respect to these work stoppages of course is the enforcement of this legislation and to date the legislation that is there it has not been enforced. And to come up with new - To bring all of this - All that this is doing now is bringing all of it together I think under one head and I do not think there are any extra powers there.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Labour standards.

MR. LUSH: Pardon?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Labour standards.

MR. LUSH: Labour standards and the other one.

MR. ROUSSEAU: There are a few new things in labour standards.

MR. LUSH: Pardon?

MR. ROUSSEAU: There are a few new things in the labour standards legislation.

MR. LUSH: But nothing to prevent illegal work stoppages.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Oh, no.

MR. LUSH: It has nothing to prevent that.

MR. PECKFORD: You cannot do something with legislation to prevent illegal work stoppages.

MR.LUSH: Certainly there is the human element there. But if the legislation is there, there is legislation there. I am saying that that legislation has not been enforced. It has not been enforced.

MR.PECKFORD: What? Do you propose to stop the legal strike? You say something should be in there, what do you propose?

MR.LUSH: To enforce the legislation that is presently in existence. You see, the legislation is there but we have not been enforcing it. The legislation that we now have is not largely different from what it was under the Labour Relations Act of 1950. It is not largely different. Nothing significantly different. So, we have not - the legislation is still there - the legislation is the same, the procedures are the same, but my contention is we have not enforced that legislation to prevent a legal work stoppages. It is time that we took the bull by the horns and started doing something to prevent these illegal work stoppages to increase the productivity of this province. This we have to do Mr. Chairman. It must be done.

The other point that I want to refer to is the priorities given to the department of Labour and Manpower. Certainly this must be a very important, an important department. When you look at the monies there you wonder to what extent that the government is serious about this department, the \$1.5 million I think which is probably one-tenth of one per cent of the total budget. In view of all the work that has to be done to create a climate of industrial peace, if you will, a harmonious climate in which workers and management and government can work together to increase the productivity of this province. To ensure that labourers and the workers of this province are dealt with in a fair and equitable and just manner, and I am just wondering, as I said, whether or not the dollars are there to do the sorts of things that has to be done and this is some of the things I want to allude to.

Some of the problems related to collective bargaining, some of the strikes, some of the both legal or certainly



MR.LUSH: the illegal ones have resulted I think from a misunderstanding of the process of collective bargaining. I started off by saying that unionism is a new element in Newfoundland history. It is something that we have not had with us for a long time, and collective bargaining is a complicated process and there are many points within the whole process that people do not understand, the process of certification the process of conciliation and arbitration. A lot of our people do not understand it. Not only the - not, mind you, only the workers but I am sure there are many people in unions who do not understand all of the process.

I believe that it is incumbent upon the government to make sure that the people of our province understand the process of collective bargaining, and it is a big job to do this. And I am sure were we to do something to have some sort of a questionnaire to circulate among workers, even among union people, to find out their understanding of collective bargaining, I am sure that we would be appalled at the lack of understanding of collective bargaining. I think this certainly is one of the reasons for illegal strikes. Many people do not understand the - all the blueprint, or the small print that is contracts and sometimes I think people go on illegal strikes and possibly think they are on a legal strike. So I think there has to be a major effort by the government to try and educate our people as to what collective bargaining is all about.

And just as a suggestion, for example, I think something should be done in schools in this respect, that there should be some sort of a course in industrial relations at the high school level which I am sure to my knowledge is not there now - if it is it is pretty new.

AN.HON.MEMBER: Grade X.

MR.LUSH: Grade X is it? When did it start, this year, last year?

Last year, Well that certainly is a good move. This is where we have to

MR.LUSH: start so that the people of the province understand

AN.HON.MEMBER: - (Inaudible).

MR.LUSH: Does it continue on in Grade XI as well? Just in Grade X. Well, I would certainly recommend that we have a course in Grade X and one in Grade XI to instruct people to teach them

---

MR. LUSH:

so that they will know something about the process.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Or the trade school.

MR. LUSH: Yes, right, any of these, all of these, any and all of them.

It is important that our people know the process of collective bargaining, know their rights and know their privileges with respect to collective bargaining. And there are many people, as I said before, who do not know what the procedures are or what their rights and what their privileges are under the collective bargaining. Unions too, of course, must make some effort. But certainly government must provide the leadership. They must provide the leadership in making sure that all our people know about collective bargaining, know something about unions. This they must do. It is incumbent upon the government to provide this leadership and to establish the proper climate in this Province for good labour relations. Certainly this then must be done.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to talk about the labour standards board right now. I think I will leave that until when the minister comes with the legislation on it, and the same thing with the - let me see, the labour standard board, that will be the tribunal. I will leave these until we come to the legislation on these particular points. With respect to manpower, I am just wondering whether, in view of the high unemployment at this particular time and particularly as outlined by the member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) this afternoon with respect to the young people in the age group from seventeen to twenty-five, I think it was, he was talked about, the tremendous high rate of unemployment among our young people, I was wondering in view of this whether or not the department has considered enlarging upon their manpower training programmes. I wonder if there are going to be any new programmes, either by the Provincial Government or by the Federal Government or indeed by both, because there is certainly a need at this present time for an enlargement of our manpower training programmes. In view of the high unemployment

MR. LUSH:

it is certainly important that we train our people during this period. Hopefully things are not going to remain the way they are right now, that there is going to be a demand for skills, there is going to be a demand for jobs in the future. And we certainly cannot relax on our efforts to provide manpower training programmes. It is my feeling that in a time of high unemployment that we should certainly enlarge upon these programmes. And rather than have our young people walking the roads and doing nothing, lots of idle time on their hands, then we should try to provide incentives to these people to come into our trade schools and train themselves to acquire skills and become ready for the job market.

Just one other point, and this is with respect to the establishment of good labour relations in the Province, an harmonious climate, if you will, for industry, that certainly this has got to begin at home. And when I say begin at home, certainly the government must make sure that there are good relations with the public service. And, Mr. Chairman, I notice here in this report again it says that the government dealt with - let me see, I think there were in the public service, they dealt with nine cases or there were nine cases referred to conciliation. Again, it does not say in this particular issue whether there were any strikes within the public service. But I am sure - would you again have -

MR. ROUSSEAU: This book here?

MR. LUSH: Right.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes.

MR. POUSSEAU: You know, there are different sections. The one on the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act would be the one.

MR. LUSH: I see nothing there -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. LUSH: Yes. But I see nothing there that refers to strikes. But we have come dangerously close in the public service. I suppose the most undesirable situation that we now face in the public service is the situation at Waterford, a strike that is now going into - what? - eighth or ninth week.

MR. RIDEOUT: Eleventh.

MR. POUSSEAU: February 18th.

MR. LUSH: One wonders, Mr. Chairman, whether or not, you know, that this situation need to be dragged out so long. I am not sure that I have the answers to the government on this particular one, but one wonders whether a strike in the public service, particularly as it is related to a hospital performing indispensable services, almost, to the public of this Province, and for a strike to continue so long! As I have said I have no solutions to it, but I believe that again something should be done, something can be done to speed up the process. We came dangerously close to a strike with the teachers. And I believe that in a lot of the cases that before these cases reach - in the public service before they reach the conciliation process it is too long, that agreements have expired. And I believe this is again a great cause for strikes. Workers become irritated, they become anxious, when they realize that their contract has expired. This happened with the teachers in particular. I believe that their contract expired in August. And the understanding was that the contract should have been ready - it expired in August, and then ready for September. And it was well up into the New Year before that was settled, a period of -

MR. RIDEOUT: It is not settled yet.

MR. ROWE: Right, it is not settled yet.



MR. LUSH. But, at least, it is a paper settlement as far as the teachers are concerned, at least, and that is a question maybe the minister can answer for me. What time will the teachers negotiations be signed, sealed and delivered?

Anyway many of the negotiations in my opinion - they have expired, the contracts have expired before they get into the conciliation process, which is irritating to workers, which certainly is aggravating, and I think is another cause for strikes.

In closing up, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Department of Manpower and Labour should be given a higher priority within the expenditures of the Province. I sincerely believe that in view of the tremendous amount of work that has to be done in this Province in acquainting and familiarizing our people with the work of unions, the process of collective bargaining, and all of it that is associated with this, with the grievance procedure, things that the government have to be involved in, and in an educational programme, if you will, in the high schools, in our trade schools, acquainting our people with the facts of unions and of collective bargaining and of informing our people of their rights and their privileges and of the whole bit related to collective bargaining, I think that in order to do this that the government certainly should assign a higher priority to the Department of Labour and Manpower.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, first of all, Sir, I want to commend my colleague here to my left for developing such a tremendous grasp of the department, the minister that the hon. gentleman is shadowing. Well most of the remarks of the hon. gentleman were well thought out, and I think the hon. gentleman made a very worth-while contribution to the debate so far. I cannot say that I blame the hon. gentleman for being concerned about

MR. NEARY: the lost time in this Province due to strikes, both legal and illegal strikes, and the number of man-hours involved. I would estimate, Sir, that resulting from the number of man hours, 1.5 million, say, roughly man-hours that were lost, that cost the economy of this Province, I would say, somewhere in the vicinity of \$6 million or \$7 million, that we will never recover.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Well there were 1.5 million man-hours lost as a result of these work stoppages.

MR. ROBERTS: Unlawful or illegal ones.

MR. NEARY: No, legal and illegal. And I would, you know, just a rough calculation off the top of my head -

MR. ROBERTS: Is that all the dollar value we lose?

MR. NEARY: Well I would say probably around \$7 million or \$8 million maybe.

MR. ROUSSEAU: You are talking about direct income, wages.

MR. NEARY: I am talking about wages. Now this is only wages alone. Would it be more than that?

MR. ROBERTS: Oh yes, in lost production the Gross Provincial Product could take a real clip.

MR. NEARY: No, well I am just talking about wages now. Direct wages.

MR. ROBERTS: Well let us say \$5 an hour -

MR. NEARY: If you want to put it all together it would probably be up around \$25 million or \$30 million that we lost in production, sales tax, beer sales, licences and everything else.

But no matter how you look at it, Sir, it is a tremendous loss to the economy of this Province, and we can ill afford that kind of a loss. And my hon. friend was on a very good theme there in the beginning in asking questions, thinking out loud. What can we do about this situation? Well I have been about three years now pushing my productivity council. I am not going to push it

MR. NEARY: again tonight. It has been fed into the brain thrust down on eighth floor, the Planning and Priorities, and I will be anxious to see what comes out of the other end. I mean the - I do not mean that in a crude way.

MR. ROBERTS: That is maybe where it will come out.

MR. NEARY: But that is probably where it will come out.

So I am not going to dwell on that, Sir, except to say that most of the things that the hon. gentleman referred to, and the hon. minister who introduced his estimates referred to, most of the things would fall under the productivity council. And a lot of it has to do with education, changing attitudes and impressing upon various groups that with every privilege that they get goes a responsibility, and I think this is probably where the labour-management relationship in this Province has fallen down badly.

Now up to now, Sir, up to the present time I would say that people in authority, elected representatives of the people, have walked very gingerly as far as labour-management relations are concerned. Everybody seems to be worried about the votes. You know, if you talk about this in this way, well you are going to lose so many votes. If you talk about it that way, somebody will attack you, you are going to lose a few votes, and consequently people in authority have had a tendency to back away from the problem. Everybody is afraid of it because you might be accused of being anti-labour or anti-management, or anti-something else. And so we have, in my opinion, failed to come to grips with the problem.

Mr. Chairman, the time may have come, you know, the time may have come - I am not saying that it has, but it may have. I would like to hear some members' views on this, especially the minister's views. We need some pretty tough talking in this Province. Or we need to lay the law down when it needs to be laid down, when the law is broken. There have been violations of the law, whether it is caused by the employer or the employee. It is time, Sir,

MR. NEARY: that we acted as responsible people and carried out the responsibility that has been placed on our shoulders. If we do not, Mr. Chairman, then our whole economy is going to be wrecked.

It is like everything else, Sir, when you are talking about labour-management relations you are talking about a few bad apples that can spoil the whole barrel. And that happens in a good many cases.

AN HON. MEMBER: On both sides.

MR. NEARY: On both sides, Sir, I am not taking sides.

MR. NEARY:

I am trying to be fair about it. And in a lot of cases, Mr. Chairman, I would say a lot of these cases where we had thirty-three - not in a lot of them, probably in most of them, the majority of them - where we have thirty-three illegal strikes, you will discover, Sir, that it is due mainly to irresponsibility either on the part of the employer or on the part of some of the employees. And in some cases it is just the bullies, bullying their co-workers around, the loud-mouths getting their way and embarrassing their co-workers into doing things probably that they regret and that they are sorry for after. We had no lock-outs in 1976 according to the information that I have here, no lock-outs at all, which meant that the employers, although we had thirty-three illegal strikes, the employers did not use that section of the Labour Relations Act whereby they could have locked out their employees. It seems to be a rather odd situation, Sir. I do not know what the reason for it is. Perhaps the minister could tell us.

Mr. Chairman, I believe now it is high time, Sir, that we as elected representatives of the people faced up to this situation, and develop a new philosophy, introduce some new thinking, some new ideas into industrial relations in this Province. I have got a few that I could throw out for the benefit of hon. members of the House. There are - Pardon?

MR. J. CARTER: Are you going to keep me in suspense?

MR. NEARY: No, I am not going to keep the hon. gentleman in suspense. He just got out of his savoury patch and I would not want to keep the hon. gentleman on tender hooks very long. I am sure he must have had a hard day. He certainly did not spend much time in the House today, or any other day for that matter. As soon as the sun shines, Sir, the hon. gentleman disappears. If you get a bit of rain or a bit of snow the hon. gentleman is back in his seat.

MR. CARTER: When the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) gets up that is when I leave.



MR. NEARY: The funny part about it, Sir, that is when the hon. gentleman stays.

Mr. Chairman, one idea it seems to me that would work fairly well in this Province, especially as far as our resource based industries are concerned, and I am thinking mainly about the fishery because we are on the verge now of probably a new dawn in the fishery, a reawakening as far as the fishery is concerned, and we are right on the brink now of entering into a new era as far as the fishery is concerned. And I believe, Sir, that profit sharing with the employees might be opportune at this time in this Province. It seems to have worked in some industries in the United States. I saw a programme on television about two weeks ago, I believe it was - I do not know if the hon. minister saw it - it was one of these people who make the pots and pans. What was the name of that company? Was it not Wearever, was it? Where?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

MR. NEARY: No, well I forget the name of it now. But anyway here was an example of a company and its employees entering into a joint venture, entering into an agreement to share the profits of that company, to arrange loans at the bank so that the employees could become shareholders in the company. And then they would sit on the board of directors, the employees, and they have equal say in the affairs of that company. They practically run the company, the employees. And anybody that saw that programme could not help but be impressed because the president of the company and the employees were on the same frequency.

MR. J. CARTER: Any employees can draw shares from a large company.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that could only be a statement, Sir, of an ultra conservative, a capitalist. Any employee can buy shares in a big company! Where would he get the money to in the first place if he wanted to buy the shares? And I am not talking about gambling, Sir, like you would go to Las Vegas and play the slot machines and buy shares in a company and expect to -

MR. J. CARTER: Where is your friend getting the money to buy his shares,

May 5, 1977.

Tape 2280

RH - 3

MR. J. CARTER:

the person you are talking about. He is getting a loan from the bank, backed by the company. It is the same thing. He has to repay the loan.

MR. NEARY: No, I am \_\_\_\_\_

MR. NEARY: talking, Mr. Chairman, about a man say working for T.J. Hardy's Fish Plant out in Port aux Basques, having T.J. Hardy back a note at the bank, Sir, he can go out and buy shares in the Newfoundland Light and Power Company and expect to get big dividends at the end of the year. The employees working for a given company -

MR. J. CARTER: Okay, the Avalon Telephone, the Newfoundland Telephone.

MR. NEARY: No, well let us take a fish plant which is -

MR. J. CARTER: Well, I am just putting the argument.

MR. NEARY: No, but the employees in actual fact own the company.

MR. J. CARTER: But so do the shareholders.

MR. NEARY: They are shareholders. They own the company.

MR. J. CARTER: There is nothing to prevent them from becoming shareholders.

MR. NEARY: No, the only thing that is preventing them, Sir, is that you would have to indoctrinate all the business and industry in this Province into thinking this way and then they would have to arrange, if their employees do not have the money, they would have to arrange the back notes for their employees to buy shares in the company.

MR. J. CARTER: Who pays off the notes?

MR. NEARY: The employees pay it off through -

MR. ROBERTS: Many of the companies in this Province are privately owned and you cannot buy shares in them.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Sir. They are private companies. You cannot buy shares in them, as my hon. friend points out.

MR. J. CARTER: The larger companies are public.

MR. NEARY: But it is a whole new idea. It is a whole new concept.

MR. J. CARTER: It has been on the go for two hundred years.

MR. NEARY: Beg your pardon?

MR. J. CARTER: It has been on the go for two hundred years.

MR. NEARY: It has been on the go. I believe Westinghouse has been doing it down in the United States for some time and they have not had

MR. NEARY: a strike in years.

AN HON. MEMBER: In West Germany.

MR. NEARY: In West Germany. That is the example I was thinking about. They are doing it now on a wide scale in West Germany and it seems to be working fairly effective. It is a good system and it is very unlikely that the employees would then go on strike because they would be striking against themselves. It is a good philosophy. It is excellent, Sir, and it is one of the alternatives to the present dilemma that we find ourselves in not only in Newfoundland but in Canada as a whole because the employees would have a tendency - they would be motivated. They would have a tendency to work harder, produce more, have input into the company, in the decision making process of that company.

MR. J. CARTER: Would you suggest that the civil servants buy government bonds?

MR. NEARY: No, but there is a formula, by the way, that you can work out for employees in the public service. Mr. Chairman, this is something that can only be brought about by re-educating the employers and employees in this Province, and my hon. friend, the Minister of Fisheries, should keep this in the back of his mind in the future development of the fisheries in this Province. I believe, Sir, that the fish plant workers, the trawlermen, the fishermen should all have shares. They should all be a part, they should have some say in the companies that they are working for. Now that is not nationalization, far from it.

MR. J. CARTER: That is socialism.

MR. NEARY: Well, it is socialism. It is reform.

MR. ROBERTS: It is real genuine capitalism,

MR. J. CARTER: National socialism.

MR. ROBERTS: It is real capitalism.

MR. NEARY: It is socialism in this respect, that it puts the resources mainly in the hands of the ordinary people.

MR. ROBERTS: It makes everybody a capitalists.

MR. NEARY: It practically puts everybody on an equal footing.

MR. ROBERTS: A share in every home -

MR. NEARY: Well, that is right. It is one good idea, Sir. It is working in West Germany. It is now catching on in Canada. It has been tried out for years in industry down in the United States and it is working pretty well.

MR. J. CARTER: Let us hear another idea?

MR. NEARY: Well, that is the only one I am going to throw at the minister tonight because the minister can only grasp one idea at a time and I would not - Not the minister, the member.

MR. ROBERTS: Are you sure the minister can grasp it?

MR. NEARY: Well, I am not even sure if that got through to the hon. minister. But, Sir, it is -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Are you talking about me or the member?

MR. NEARY: No, the member. The other suggestion that I made, by the way, is re-educating our whole population, change the attitudes, indoctrination of the whole population of this Province because -

MR. J. CARTER: From what?

MR. NEARY: From negative thinking to positive thinking. From Toryism to Liberalism.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the reason I say educate the whole population, Sir, is because we have, over the



Mr. Neary.

years, we have developed a Santa Clause syndrome in this Province, that workers, as I have said before in this hon. House, that somehow or other people do not relate what they get in their pay cheque to what they produce, and that is bad.

MR. J. CARTER: It is cut to pieces sure.

MR. NEARY Sure, it is cut to pieces. And our productivity has been very bad in this Province, and our Gross Provincial Product is only going up by one or two per cent a year, and that is not enough. If we are going to continue to live high off the hog in this Province, if we are going to continue to enjoy all the goods and services that we now take as a right, that we feel should not be earned, that the people think are their rights, if we are going to accept that, Sir, as a way of life, then we have to start producing more. We have to up our Gross Provincial Product to at least ten per cent or twelve per cent a year. Otherwise, Sir, we are going to go down the drain. And that is where the Provincial Productivity Council comes in, and I cannot help but referring to it, because I do not know if hon. members feel that when I am talking about a Provincial Productivity Council, I am talking about industrial relations. I am not. I am talking about an organization made up of representatives of business and industry and labour, educationalists, professional people, small businessmen, big businessmen, an organization that will take a look at the economy of the whole Province, recommend industries when they are feasible, when they think they are feasible, change the people's attitudes so that they will work harder for their Province. We almost have to do what the Japanese did after the war. You would be unpatriotic if you did not produce for your Province. The Japanese - they were indoctrinated in such a way that they -

MR. J. CARTER: What does the hon. member produce?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I do not think the hon. gentleman need worry about what I produce, because I do my work, and I think I do a pretty fair day's work for the pay that I get. I think I do.

MR. J. CARTER: You should watch the clock.

MR. NEARY: And if the hon. gentleman only worked one-tenth as hard as I did, the hon. gentleman would make a better contribution to this Legislature and to his district and to the people of this Province.

MR. J. CARTER: You cannot get a word in edgewise here, sure.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, this is a pretty serious matter especially in times of high unemployment, inflation, and people have all kinds of problems. Young people cannot find jobs. When they go to look for a job they are asked how much experience they have. "I have no experience." "Sorry, no job." We have tradesmen today in this Province - and let us see how funny the hon. gentleman thinks this is - we have tradesmen, electricians that are taking jobs today as labourers in this Province, because they cannot get jobs at their trades. It is a pretty serious situation, and this afternoon when I debated - and the hon. Premier was not in his seat when I debated with the Minister of Industrial Development the need to do something about helping young people to get that initial job experience that they need to find a permanent job. The minister got up and took a negative attitude and told me why the government could not become involved at this particular point in time. Well over the next day or so I hope to be able to show the hon. gentleman and the administration things that the government can do, that will not cost all that much money, things that are already available to the administration, and it is only a matter of taking advantage of them, and now that the minister has a manpower training branch of his department, maybe the minister will take my advice and get more involved in programmes such as on the job training programmes whereby Canada Manpower

Mr. Neary.

will pay sixty per cent of the cost. The minister says they are. Well as far as I am concerned not enough, because I have checked out the figures, and I know what the figures are for the past three years for on the job training. I am talking about the sixty per cent paid for by Canada Manpower and the forty per cent

MR. NEARY:

programme paid by Canada Manpower. I do not know if the minister is aware of it or not, but the employers in this Province in 1973, 1974 and 1975 and 1976 there was not one new apprenticeship programme started in this Province. Is the minister aware of that? There are a couple on the go now to be started in 1977. But not one apprenticeship programme, one new programme was started in any of the years that I just mentioned. And the reason, Mr. Chairman, is that there is a surplus of tradesmen. The employers now do not have to run apprenticeship programmes. One time there was a turnover and they had to keep training young people. A young fellow came out of vocational school, come out of high school, out of the College of Trades and went to work as an apprentice. Today -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Just starting to get in full flight, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The questions, unless somebody else has any other points, some of the points raised - the hon. member from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), first I presume he is within listening distance, brought up some very interesting points. The causes of illegal strikes are pretty difficult to define. Of course, there are situations, as the hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) referred to, in which there are employers in this Province operating under assumptions that were probably in the nineteenth century. And there were also, of course, labour unions in the Province whose leaders are not in keeping with the general high level of trade unionism that the Province should have. There are causes on both sides. But normally, Mr. Chairman, the illegal strikes that happen in this Province do not happen on an issue. They happen after weeks and months and maybe years of frustration on the part of the working force. There may be some small straw that breaks the camel's back, something that is significant which causes the illegal walkout.

MR. ROUSSEAU:

The hon. member from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) asks what we were doing. Well as I suggested when we were going down, there may be a little more time to it, is the question of the labour-management committees in which there is funding there for that. And this is a situation whereby on the request of either labour or management the department will provide an independent chairman. And in order to equalize it we ask the union and management to pay one-third and government pays two-thirds. And normally there are ongoing meetings of maybe weekly or monthly at the beginning, maybe every quarter or semi annually as the process develops in which an independent man sits down between labour and management and attempts to work out some of the grievances, some of the problems that might result in an illegal work stoppage at some point in the future. Of course, it is in no way intended to replace the conciliation or the arbitration process in the collective agreement nor any aspect of the collective agreement. But it has certainly been useful to it in some instances. Unfortunately, it has not over the past couple of years met with the amount of success we think it should meet with. We think it is a good tool. We think it is a most useful aspect in management labour negotiations through the life of a collective agreement. Certainly we stand prepared at any point to assist both labour and management in this very important aspect of labour management relations in the Province. Also we have now, we have recertified our conciliation officers who are doing a fine job. And while there -

MR. NEARY: The minister said recertify them.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Recertify them on a different level. We have different levels now. We have what we call a labour conciliation officers two. We have two of them in which these two people are senior, more expert.



MR. ROUSSEAU:

And what they do is they are available to the Province in a consultative manner.

MR. NEARY: They are the heavyweights.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, and they are available in a consultative manner. And as of course, as our conciliation officers at the one level get more experience -

AN HON. MEMBER: Who are the two?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Cyril Churchill and I think Howard Noseworthy. They are both senior people. But I know Cyril Churchill is. I would have to find the other one there.

MR. ROUSSEAU: But anyway these two people are available across to employers and employees in assisting them in respect to forestalling Dan Seymour out in Corner Brook and Cyril Churchill here, two senior officers. They are available - this is certainly helpful in forestalling this sort of situation. I might say that we have a large number of conciliation officers now we are doing a fine job. We have some in

AN. HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well one must assume that one never knows when a wildcat is going to occur and a legal stoppage, whatever it may be. These people are available to industry or to employees should they request on a union basis to sit down at this particular problem which might arise before the situation occurred. So we have the two, we have the senior conciliation officers in the department and we have the labour management committee and like I say it is one-third costing between the government and the union and the employer so these three have a vested interest in it. These are the sort of things that we have come up with in an attempt to stop the illegal work stoppages. The hon. member from Terra Nova mentioned them, while there were 33 there were 18,000 man-days lost. I do not have the man hours. The correct figures \$1.5 million for hours lost. The breakdown, there were 15 legal strikes and 167,655 man-days lost. The 33 illegal strikes that the hon. member referred to is resulted in a loss of 18,187. That was in 1976. All of this I think occurred during 1976, 1975 there was a total of 68 but the figures were just about the same two to one, two illegals to every legal. The figures of course were just about proportionate there were 333,000 man days lost in 1975 as the result of legal strikes and only 15,000 lost as a result of illegal strikes. I say only 15,000 is too many but the relationship is pretty consistent in respect to -

AN. HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROUSSEAU: Very short. But again of course as the hon. member suggested it is a difficult thing. The only thing I can say is this -

MR. ROUSSEAU: I do not condone illegal.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROUSSEAU: It was the one a couple of years ago.

MR. ROBERTS: It has been in about 8 Throne Speeches. I mean, when is it going to be held, or is it called off?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I do not know.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister is the minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, but you know, it was something that was planned and just never came about because - actually it never came about because there was certain -

MR. ROBERTS: Because it was never planned.

MR. ROUSSEAU: It was planned but there were certain problems involved, there were certain diplomatic methods of doing this that were not followed and there was certain problems -

MR. ROBERTS: Like a half-baked idea that became unbaked when they looked at it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, well there were certain problems involved anyway.

MR. ROBERTS: But it is dead now. I mean, it is -

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, not necessarily no

MR. ROBERTS: It may not be buried, but it is dead.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, pretty well.

MR. ROBERTS: You know what happens when they are dead but not buried.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Conferences are necessary and useful, you know. This week we are supposed to have in May a conference of manpower ministers and in the fall we had the occupational health and safety -

MR. ROBERTS: That will be a useful one if something comes out of it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: It will and I hope that - by the way, that was not brought up.

I am sure the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans and the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay will want to talk about that. As the Hon. Leader of the Opposition suggested with the Labour Standards Act, it is window dressing; it is to some extent but I think there are some new ideas in that that while it is merely a consolidation of existing labour legislation it will effect the proclamation of a couple of pieces of legislation

MR. ROBERTS: A longer gestation period than an elephant; an elephant takes eighteen months to reproduce.

MR. ROUSSEAU: You know, it is a long time coming. The only thing I can say is maybe the mistake has been made and that we have been consulting with people and that is where the problem lies.

MR. ROBERTS: That is not why the Labour Standards Act has been held up.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I know with the Labour Relations Act -

MR. ROBERTS: We are going to make it with Standards, not Labour Relations.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Oh, Labour Standards Act was a consolidation of a lot of Acts and there is a lot of tidying up, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows, with respect to language -

MR. ROBERTS: Most of those Acts Bill Keough put on the

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, it is a big job in consolidation. The same as the suggestion I made to the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout), the consolidation of all occupational health and safety. That is ongoing but that is a mammoth too.

MR. ROBERTS: Policy issues in occupational health.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Now I hope to have a report, May or June, that is the annual five year overall report and they are finished the hearings and the report is now being drafted and I am told that sometime late this month or in June we should have the copy and that will be tabled in the House. That will be public information. But they are in the process now of formulating the policy as a result of the hearing and I presume we will put it to writing and sometime late this month or in June that I anticipate having this report.

The question of education is certainly an important one as my colleague the hon. Minister of Education mentioned. We are doing some in the schools. We have a number of pieces of literature and information that would be available but again I would say yes, there is no question about it if people do not understand the very complicated process of conciliation, and arbitration, mediation. There is a number of problems.

Conciliation is really basically a situation where the individuals that we have in the department, and we have a request from either - normally from labour but sometimes from management, requesting a conciliation board because they cannot come together on a new collective agreement. Standard operating procedure is that the minister appoints a conciliation officer and from the time of the request there is a time period of fifteen days in which the minister may let the request lapse so that the union is then in a position to strike within seven days or normally what the minister does is appoint a conciliation



MR. ROUSSEAU: officer immediately. A conciliation officer normally takes a couple of weeks, has some meetings then makes a recommendation through the Assistant Deputy Minister of Industrial Relations, to the Deputy Minister, and to the Minister in respect of whether or not a conciliation board would be useful.

The only time a conciliation board would be appointed is if there was some use to it. And that was normally when people are pretty - you know people are a dollar apart and quite a ways apart in other fringe benefits and issues involved in the strike of course, an appointment is not made and the legal strike is then permitted within seven days but the conciliation officer normally remains in contact with the parties and many times of course a settlement is brought about. The process of arbitration of course is a different process and complicated as well.

One of the big points the hon. member from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) raised and the member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) - is the question of manpower and manpower training. Imagine a manpower training programme - first of all we have been in almost continuous contact with the hon. Mr. Cullen, the Federal Minister of Manpower, requesting more funds and I have to say that Mr. Cullen has been more than co-operative, while we have not agreed on the amount of money and I do not think we every will. We do not think we are getting enough. I think he has been understanding of the problem and I certainly think that Mr. Cullen's department has been very co-operative.-

MR. ROBERTS: Best minister they have had since -

MR. ROUSSEAU: - the past few days in the Stephenville situation, in making his people available. I went up to Labrador City - Wabush

MR. ROUSSEAU: and the number of people we have up there and brought up on this industrial training programme which I hope we can get into in much greater detail. Our problem is a simple one in manpower training. The question of dollars this year and I think may be hon. members might be interested in these figures and I am sure that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will be interested in these figures and the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons).

This is the manpower training allocation funds and we are constantly in argument. I have correspondence and I do not think the correspondence is such that it would create any great furor. I would rather not table them but if the hon. members would like to have me table the correspondence we have had with Mr. Cullen I would like to do that but I think what is -

MR. ROBERTS: Go ahead and table it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: It is available, which I do not have here but I have it in my office.

MR. ROBERTS: You have teased us this far, table it now.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Pardon.

MR. ROBERTS: You have teased us, table it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, no. But I say if they want it I do not have it here but I can get it and table it.

MR. ROBERTS: Bring it up tomorrow morning.

MR. ROUSSEAU: But the problem we have is a simple one and I am talking now about both instructional institutional training allocation and the industrial training allocation which the hon. member for LaPoile referred to, which indeed is a sixty - forty programme, but may be up to seventy-five per cent for handicapped people. Instead of sixty you can get up to seventy-five per cent.

Also the programme referred to as the Unemployment Insurance Recipients, which we have had over the past couple of years and you know in more time probably we can get into more detail on that. The unfortunate problem is that our money is going down this year from last year. Last year we had about \$45,288.

MR. ROUSSEAU:

This year we are only going to have \$15,438. It is not very much, by the way, but it is \$20,000 on \$15 million, but the principle is, of course, applied that the amount of money we are going to get will be lower.

Also this training programme for unemployment insurance recipients, where they can still maintain their unemployment insurance benefits and we are topped up so the manpower training programme is going to be discontinued.

Now Mr. Cullen just wrote me a couple of days ago and gave \$140,000 to finish off the programme for this year, but it is being discontinued. We had hoped - it was a pilot project in this Province and it might be applied across Canada. We thought it was a very good programme but unfortunately it is going to be phased out.

So really what happens is the amount if going from \$15.45 million to \$14.43 million, which is a decrease in the amount of money and will result in a great decrease in the amount of training days. Because what is happening is the administrative cost and the cost of materials are going up and the amount of money is not changing so therefore the amount of training days go down. Unfortunately we have gone from - 1975-76 we had 718,000 training days, in 1976 - 1977 we had 653,000, which was a decrease of some 60,000 training days; and this year we have 590,000 - that is an estimate - which is about 60,000 less again. And we have been arguing and fighting with Ottawa about it and, as I say, I will table the correspondence on this for hon. members.

The amount of money is not sufficient in this Province. We need more money for

MR. ROUSSEAU: training but it is just not there. We are constantly in communication with the federal government on it and the Manpower Training Programme, but it is unfortunate that within the two year period that actually we have lost almost two hundred-and-some-odd training days in Manpower Training allocations. That this Province cannot afford. We are hopeful -

MR. NEARY: Can you make that available?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, I can make it available towards the end because I may need it again to refer to. It is unfortunate but the amount of money is not there.

We would like to talk to the federal government more too on their job creation projects.

AN HON. MEMBER: Does the hon. minister wish to adjourn the debate.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Okay, I move the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having passed estimates of expenditure under Heading IX, all items without amendment and to have made further progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Friday, May 6, 1976, at 10:00 a.m.