



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 1

1st Session

Number 42

VERBATIM REPORT

Thursday, June 29, 1972

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

PETITIONS:

MR. A.M. DUNPHY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the citizens of Gallants. Gallants is situated approximately thirty miles from Corner Brook on the Trans Canada Highway to the east and about twenty-five miles from the next nearest town, Stephenville Crossing, to the west. The prayer of this petition is that the citizens of Gallants wish to obtain a fire truck or some adequate fire-fighting equipment for the community of Gallants. Now Gallants is a very heavily wooded area, at least it is surrounded by dense woodlands and there is always a threat of forest fires in the area other than fires that happen through accidents within the homes. There are a considerable number of homes there. It is not a large community but this petition is endorsed or signed by approximately seventy people from that community.

I think not only should this fire apparatus, fire-fighting apparatus be placed in Gallants for the protection of the people there, life and limb, but also for the protection of the forest nearby. The information I have from the Forest Protection Association that last year 1971 was an extremely good year and we lost 6,103 acres of timber land. I will go back a little further to what was a rather rough year for forest fires and there were one million, in 1961 there were over one million acres of prime forest burnt and it seems a shame that for the sake of the amount of money that is involved here, I do not think this would exceed anymore than \$12,000. It was only prior to last October the former administration were going around giving out fire trucks, money to purchase fire trucks, like they were going out of style. Unfortunately the little Town of

Gallants was not included in that scheme and they are still without this equipment.

So I beg for the people of Gallants to the department concerned which can do something along these lines, presumably Municipal Affairs, and that this petition be placed upon the table and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. S.A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I support the petition as presented by the honourable member for St. George's on behalf of his constituents in Gallants. There is nothing that I can add to what the honourable member has already said. He presented a very strong case and if the barricades come down in the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Sir, I would be very happy to see the Minister of Municipal Affairs place the matter of a fire truck for Gallants high on their list of priorities.

Sir, we have seen a lot of petitions presented in this honourable House in the last few weeks, mostly concerning highways, and I am sure that the honourable Minister of Highways, who is back in his seat today and I am very happy to see him here, Sir, I hope the minister is well on the road to recovery. I am sure when he returned to his office he must have had a terrific stack of petitions down there from the people.

MR. F.R. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, the community of Gallants has historically performed the very great function on the West Coast of a timber cutting community brought about largely through the efforts of the late Jim Collier. In the last three years Gallants has not been as thriving as it was before but we hope that with the cutting of wood for the linerboard mill at Stephenville that it will thrive again. It is said to be one of the most scenic areas of the province and as the honourable member for St. George's pointed out it is very vulnerable during the forest fire season and a fire truck for this area would be a great boon to future development there. So I support this petition wholeheartedly.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Garden Cove, Placentia West. The prayer of the petition being that the residents of Garden Cove hereby petition the House of Assembly to widen and pave the four miles of highway connecting their community with the Burin Peninsula Highway, it being now very rough and narrow, in places impassable in early spring. Mr. Speaker I take pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition. I think that enough has been said on other occasions in the House, when petitions for paving have been presented, to need that very little be said at this time. But, I think, it is obvious to us all that people who live in areas where roads are unpaved have as their highest priorities the obtaining of pavement for their roads. I would ask that this petition be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the prayer of the petition, from the residents of Garden Cove, for the reconstruction and paving of four miles of road which will hook them up to the main highway. I feel sure that this is a vital necessity to this community. I am quite sure all members on this side of the House supports this petition as I believe every member of this House will support the prayer of the petition. I sincerely trust and pray that our Minister of Highways may see fit to bring the prayer of this petition to reality.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, I take leave of the House to present two petitions from two different groups from the town of Trepassey. The first petition; The prayer of the first petition is that this House of Assembly have an area known as Northwest Trepassey excluded from the boundaries of the town of Trepassey. Apparently, Mr. Speaker, Northwest Trepassey was taken into the town without any consideration being given to the services it could or would receive.

Northwaast is a two mile area, has a total of ten homes and is

situated some six miles from central Trepassey. It is not included in the town's proposed water and sewerage system or any other proposed plan either now or in the future. The prospect of building homes at north-west Trepassey is remote, as serviced lots are available only in the centralized area of the town and are for sale by the Newfoundland & Labrador Housing Corporation. The petitioners therefore pray that this House accepts the petition and have the area known as Northwest Trepassey removed from the municipal district of Trepassey.

MR. T. DOYLE: The second petition, Mr. Speaker, is signed by ninety-nine residents of Trepassey who are members of a committee who are called "The Action For Trepassey Area Committee."

Briefly the prayer of the petition is as follows: As part of a ten year Southern Shore Regional Plan, 1968 to 1978, which was commissioned by the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing and prepared by Project Planning Associates, the municipal plan was drawn up for the Town of Trepassey. In the opinion of the petitioners, no one in Trepassey including the Town Council was consulted. No one represented Trepassey in any of the planning stages. The Town Council, the official representatives elected to govern the affairs, had no knowledge of any plans being formulated and were being presented with the completed plan before they were even aware of its existence.

One main result of the municipal plan is that land in Trepassey is so tied up that we cannot get an acre to build on. The ninety-nine people who signed this are a sample and I am sure, as the people who presented the petition to me said, that they could get almost everybody in Trepassey to sign it if need be.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, before asking that these two petitions be laid on the table of the House, that in my District of Ferryland there is quite a problem with housing generally, as it relates to the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing. I have had discussions with the honourable the minister on this matter. He is well aware of them, and these are just two examples of what my constituents have been talking about and about which I will have something to say when the estimates come up.

I pray that these will be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department to which they apply.

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

HON. H. A. COLLINS: (MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING): Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling here the Annual Report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation along with the financial statement for the year 1971.

MOTIONS

HON. T. A. HICKMAN (MINISTER OF JUSTICE): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Law Society Act."

HON. DR. A. T. ROWE (MINISTER OF HEALTH): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask permission to amend The Mental Health Act, 1971.

QUESTIONS

HON. J. C. CROSBIE (MINISTER OF FINANCE): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 119, asked by the honourable member for White Bay South on the Order Paper of June 27.

HON. E. M. ROBERTS: (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, an answer to a question to the Minister of Highways. In so doing may I say how glad we all are to see him back in the House. Indeed I think it is his first appearance in this House of Assembly, He was with us for the one-day assembly and is back again now. We are delighted to see him and looking so well after his illness. I suspect the minister has the answer to the question because he and I discussed it just before the House met. But I wonder if he could tell the House, Sir, about the situation in Port au Bras up in the District of Burin. The Community Council there have asked me, in fact they say they have no satisfaction from their member, they have now asked me to ask, Mr. Speaker, why this morning all the cars on the Southside of the community were moved so that the road could be made ready for paving and then eleven o'clock this morning the project was cancelled.

June 29, 1972

Tape 1101 (afternoon)

PK - 3

MR. ROBERTS: I would like for the minister to tell me whether these facts are correct and if so what they mean.

3530

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the honourable member for White Bay North; first of all I would like to thank him for his very kind remarks and to express my appreciation to him and his colleagues for their patience and forbearing during my absence from the House, I would like to let them know that the Departments of Highways and Public Works will have available any information that may not have been available to them during my absence from the House.

I would also like to say about the Port aux Bras situation, that it will be paved and the contractor moved in today but there were some difficulties which turned up since then. We have ironed them out since that time and this will go ahead.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the minister very much, Sir, I know the community council there, Mr. Dillon will be delighted to have the information.

May I ask a question of the Minister of Economic Development, Mr. Speaker? Have the government accepted or rejected or have they taken any action and if so, what action with respect to the offer by Bowaters, made after talks with officials of the government and members of the government, to cut wood at Main Brook in Hare Bay, which is in my own constituency, at Tommy's Arm, in the District of Green Bay, and possibly other places throughout the province, cut wood for use in the government's Labrador Linerboard Mill at Stephenville.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it is an offer in that sense of the word. There have been continuing discussions with Bowaters and other logging contractors on the Island of Newfoundland in connection with the purchase of wood, the proposed purchase of wood for the Linerboard Mill at Stephenville. No agreement has yet been entered into with Bowaters. It is a question, as the honourable gentleman knows, of price and other requirements. We will be reviewing the situation tomorrow generally in connection with the Linerboard Mill. This will be one of the topics to be discussed then but there is no contracts entered into with Bowaters yet but there has been considerable negotiations.

MR. ROBERTS: Supplementary to that question, I apologize for not having the opportunity to give the minister notice as I normally would on this matter, but I only got the information myself just before the House met.

Can the minister tell the House whether there will be a quick decision, I say this because the Bowaters people have informed me that unless a decision is taken quickly, it will not be possible, in their opinion, for them to cut the wood, the amount of wood, the 70,000 cords which has been the amount under discussion. Can the minister tell us whether there might be an early decision on this matter.

MR. CROSBIE: There will certainly be an early decision on it, Mr Speaker, if we are in a position to make an early decision. I will not know that until tomorrow.

As I say, it is a question of what Bowaters want, the terms and conditions, suggestions that we should put up money for equipment purposes and other purposes, In other words they are trying to make as good a deal for themselves I suppose as possible. That is the way you would put it.

I do not expect that there will be any long period of time before a decision is made.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, a further question for the honourable gentleman with respect to the Linerboard Mill: Last night the Premier stated in the committee that the cost had gone to \$180 million, Is that correct?

MR. CROSBIE: Anything the Premier says, Mr. Speaker, is necessarily correct, but on that exact figure it depends on how you look at the cost of the Linerboard Mill. The figure given in the Budget Speech is \$159 million some odd, which includes working capital. We will be reviewing the latest figures tomorrow. I think the indication is that it is going to be higher than \$160 million but I do not think it will - I think \$180 million is too high,

MR. CROSBIE: but it will be something in excess of \$160 million, We will be dealing with the whole thing tomorrow, but it will not be, \$180 million is still out, I certainly hope we will not reach that.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, seeing that we are dealing with the Linerboard Mill, may I direct a question to the honourable Minister of Economic Development? Is there any truth or fact to the fact where I have heard quite a lot of publicity given, that a 30,000 ton ship has been loaded at Goose Bay and now finds itself unable to enter the Harbour at Stephenville? If there is a delay I think the statements or at least the ones that I have heard, that the ship was costing \$200 a day would be very much out of line, It would be closer to \$3,000 to \$5,000 a day.

But can the honourable minister inform the House if the ship can get into Stephenville or not after departure from Goose Bay with the wood.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I said something on this the other day. The position is that there is dredging required at Goose Bay and at Stephenville for the satisfactory use of these ships, of which the one the honourable gentleman mentions is the first. There has to be dredging at Goose Bay to bring the depth, by the wharf, to thirty feet, so the vessel can take a full load of wood while at the dock.

The situation at Stephenville is, the federal government have agreed to do the dredging at Goose Bay and at Stephenville. Now I will have more up-to-date information tomorrow. But the position certainly was several days ago that the dredging at Stephenville had not yet started and unless that gets started, removes a dog leg, I think the term is. That is in the way and there is some other work where the vessel cannot -

MR ROBERTS: In other words, the Premier was not correct.

MR CROSBIE: The Premier was partially not correct.

MR. CROSBIE: cannot get into Stephenville Harbour and that is correct. It is therefore essential that this dredging be started immediately.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where is the dredge now then?

MR. CROSBIE: She is between Goose Bay and Stephenville, I presume.

AN HON. MEMBER: When she gets to Stephenville...

MR. CROSBIE: When she gets to Stephenville, then I will have to go out and swim in with it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: I would certainly try.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is dedication, (Remainder inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentleman will have to ask the Government of Canada about that. We have been requesting that that this dredging...

AN HON. MEMBER: Who owns the ship?

MR. CROSBIE: We have the ship on charter. If we are going to move sufficient wood from Labrador to Stephenville, it has to start now. On this I can give a fuller report on tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, the position is this, the Federal Government has been requested by us to do this dredging. The request was made a considerable time ago. We have been in touch with the Department of Transport constantly on this. How long it will be before that dredging is done, I do not know. I hope it will not be very long.

MR. ROBERTS: What is to be done in the meantime?

MR. CROSBIE: We will have to see when the ship gets there.

I will have to tell the honourable gentleman tomorrow. I am not in daily touch with it.

MR. ROBERTS: Can the minister find out the cost per day as well?

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentleman will do his best.

MR. ROBERTS: Bless him!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, in view of the alarming report in today's "Daily News" concerning the C.N. Dockyard, I would like to direct a question to the Deputy Premier. I would like to ask the Deputy

Premier if the government have received a study conducted by W.G. Pearce of London, Ontario, who was the C.N. consultant? If the government has received the report, would the Deputy Premier inform the House of what action, if any, or what representation, if any, the Government of the Province have made to the Government of Canada or to Canadian National Railways, to safeguard the jobs at the C.N. Dry Dock here in St. John's and to ensure the future of the dock as being essential to both local shipping and to ocean going ships?

MR. W.N. ROWE: No answer?

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not know who is the Deputy Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: It seems the honourable member should direct his question to a person rather than the Deputy Premier.

MR. NEARY: My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that the Deputy Premier is the Minister of Justice.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is no such animal.

MR. HICKMAN: I tried to make the position clear the other day to honourable gentleman, maybe the honourable member for Bell Island was not present in the House at the time. There is no such office in this province as that of Deputy Premier. There was an announcement, about August 1969, that there was to be a Deputy Premier. I know of no legislation ever brought before this House to create that office. My second portfolio is that of President of the Council. If the honourable gentleman has any question to direct to me in that office, I will do my best to answer it.

The other position is that it was announced by the Premier that when he is absent from the Province, as President of the Council I assume the office of Acting Premier, if I am within the province.

MR. ROBERTS: Will he be absent today?

MR. HICKMAN: No.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there must be some minister in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Ask us, ask us.

MR. NEARY: Well, I would like to direct the question to the President of the Council or Acting Premier, whichever he is wearing today.

MR. HICKMAN: As President of the Council, Mr. Speaker, all I know of the information that has been referred to by the honourable member for Bell Island, of which the paper very carefully said "it has been learned without any substantiation..," That is what has appeared in the paper. I have no knowledge of any such report being presented to the Government of this Province. I would assume that if it were done as an internal matter by the C.N., they would

not feel inclined to give it to us but if it is given to the province or if it is in the hands of the province obviously any policy decision by the Minister of Transport to instruct his Crown Agency, CN, to close down his dockyard would be treated with a great deal of alarm and protestation from this administration. The honourable member for Bell Island can rest assured that if the hon. Mr. Jamieson so then directed **Canadian National, the Government of Canada will hear from the Province of Newfoundland.**

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways. We are quite happy to see the minister back in his seat. In view of the fact that the Newfoundland Safety Council is extremely concerned because to date the yellow markings do not appear on the Trans Canada Highway and also because of the fact **that I asked** the question in this House on Monday, June 19, at which time I was told that the markings on the Trans Canada Highway were underway, could the minister tell me if this work is being carried out on and at what date does he expect the completion of this work.

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like more detail. What is he referring to?

MR. THOMS: The Trans Canada Highway.

DR. FARRELL: The yellow lines, white lines? The yellow lines are being done at the rate of thirty-one miles a day and they are well east of Grand Falls at this time. This is my latest information. The white lines will be done when the yellow lines are completed. The yellow lines are lines which separate opposing traffic and the white lines are lines which separate traffic going in the same direction. I think it will be rather late in the year when all these lines are done this year but they are going as fast as they can.

MR. DOODY: May I answer some questions, Mr. Speaker? I have my usual large collection of questions from the honourable member for

Bonavista North and since he has gone to such great trouble in researching the questions and since the staff, Sir, of the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources have gone to such great trouble in finding the answers, I think I will read those questions and the answers, if that is acceptable to this honourable House.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave of the House.

MR. DOODY: This is question 109 on Tuesday's Order Paper of June 27.

It says on question (1) "Since January 18, 1972 have the Government received any reports from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police or the Newfoundland Constabulary concerning any accidents involving a motorized snow vehicle or all-terrain vehicle which resulted in injury or death or property damage exceeding the value of \$200.00?"

The answer is no. Question (2) says, "If so,—" No, number (2) is not applicable. Question 110, the following information and so on.

(1) "Since January 18, 1972 have the Government received any reports made by any drivers of a motorized snow vehicle or all-terrain vehicle which was involved in any accident which resulted in injury or death or property damage exceeding the value of \$200.00." The answer is no.

Question number 111 (1), "Have the Government issued or arranged for the issue of salmon licences to any tourists who were or who may be passengers aboard the vessel 'St. Ninian' who are non-residents of the Province of Newfoundland, and if so, what type or types of licences were issued or have been arranged to be issued to said persons?" I would assume that the honourable member meant complementary licences rather than licences. The answer is no. So number (2) is not applicable.

Question number 112 and this I think, Sir, with no degree of levity, really deserves to be read into the record because it is a matter of great concern to a lot of people in Central Newfoundland. "What is the total number of moose licences issued for the current

season for the moose management area which includes or is in the vicinity of the communities of Sandy Brook and Badger, showing the numbers of moose licences issued to persons for each community located in or served by that moose management area?" Now the people in my department and myself are not quite aware of what is meant by served by the moose management area because all, of course, areas in Newfoundland are open to applications from residents from

all of the province. So, I would assume that the honourable member meant people who lived in the immediate area. Of the three hundred moose licenses that were issued, breakdown is as follows: Twenty-two for St. John's. Four for Mount Pearl. One for Portugal Cove. Six for Manuels. Two for Kelligrews. One for Witless Bay. Seven for Bell Island. One for Bay Roberts. Two for Carbonear. One for Clarenville. The honourable member for Burin might take this, one only from Grand Bank. One from Catalina. Two from Little Catalina. Two from Gander. Three from Lewisporte. One from Twillingate. Twelve from Botwood. One from Norris Arm South. Two from Trinity, Bonavista Bay. One from Moretons Harbour. One from Beadman's Bay. One from Triton. One hundred and twenty-eight from Grand Falls. Forty-six from Windsor. Two from Badger. Five from Bishop's Falls. Two from LaScie. One from Baie Verte. With great respect for the member from Gander, one only from Peterview. There are 186 or more from the immediate Grand Falls - Windsor area may be about thirty or so from St. John's area. I think that a lot of people had the impression that a great many people from this particular area of Newfoundland had an excessive number of licenses in that draw. I am glad the question was asked because it is important that it be on the record.

From Badger, we had two only drawn from Badger. But, No. 113, this is one that is to provide a schedule of quantities, kinds and values of all skins or pelts or fur-bearing animals exported during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, for both (a) the holders of fur exporters' licenses or resident of the province of Newfoundland (b) holders of export licenses who are not residents of the province of Newfoundland. the total value of the resident license holders was \$82,000.85.. The non-resident license holders is \$1,184.00. The breakdown by pelts is here and we are only too happy to supply it to the honourable member if he so desires this information.

Question No. 115: Nobody.

Question No. 116: None.

Question No. 117: February 12, I went to Toronto and Ottawa for a meeting of the Agricultural Ministers in Ottawa. I spent my time, most of four days, waiting at the various airport lobbies trying to get back to Newfoundland because there was a strike of people who controlled the traffic of aircraft. I never did manage to meet my counterparts of the other provinces. It cost the province the airfare back and forth plus the per day in the lounge which they very generously allowed people such as I. On April 23, for two days I attended in Ottawa meetings relative to the Gros Morne Park, That was a \$204 air fare and \$40 per day in the lounge, which of course more than amply covered my small needs. May 7, I went to Ottawa with the Premier and other honourable members of this House and members of the government. We were there for three days. The usual per day was allowed me, which I think I may have received and I also got my air fare paid back and forth. May 24, in company with the Deputy Minister of Mines, I went to Halifax. I rose at an ungodly hour, six a.m. and returned at two oclock the following morning, \$88 air fare, there was no per diem as I understand, because I did not spend any money.

money. On June 2 I went to Sweden. I enjoyed that very much. It was a two week effort, all the expenses were paid by the federal government. They mailed to me a return ticket, first class on Air Canada all the way, and I hope all the honourable members of this House join me in the pleasure I received from this opportunity to participate in international decisions at a high level.

Would the honourable member for Bell Island please forgive me for just one moment? It is not very often I get the chance. I want to share in the knowledge and pleasure that my resources are being utilized to advantage.

AN HON. MEMBER: It depends on which resources.

MR. DOODY: All of them, Sir, they are all available to the advantage of this province. Any time that you need - which you probably do not. Your wants are simple. Your needs are few. Let us leave it that way.

I was there for eight or nine days. It is a little bit vague but - I could have stayed for two weeks but the honourable Premier suggested that I come home quickly, so I did.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you have any encounters with pollution?

MR. DOODY: I am having them daily, Sir. I am doing what I can to correct them.

The point I am trying to make was that in Sweden, I believe that is the important one that everybody was concerned about, and Uncle Ottawa came through nicely. It did not cost the Province of Newfoundland one cent and what is even more important is that it did not cost the Doody family a cent.

On June 17, we went to Halifax, the Premier and my humble self, and we discussed the oil resource thing with the Atlantic Provinces. These are the full details of my sojourns on behalf of the province to date. Do not think that this is the end of it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your tolerance, endurance.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: On motion of the honourable Minister of Justice, a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Judicature Act," be now read a first time.

MR. ROBERTS: Could we have a word of explanation?

MR. HICKMAN: Are you serious?

MR. ROBERTS: I am perfectly serious.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, as a word of explanation, the great principle in that Bill is that last year when the Circuit Courts were fixed, for some inexplorable reason, I am sure a typographical error, the Town of Grand Bank was omitted. That has been rectified.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Judicature Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the honourable Minister of Labour, a Bill, "An Act Respecting Termination of Employment of Substantial Numbers of Persons in Certain Industries," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, a Bill, "An Act Respecting Tenancies Of Residential Premises," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the honourable Minister of Supply and Services, a Bill, "An Act To Provide For Equitable Purchases By Government," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The City Of St. John's Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the honourable Minister of Labour, a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Workmen's Compensation Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

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

Heading XIV - Fisheries.

MR. ROBERTS: (14-01-01) Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin the Committee's work this afternoon. I have a number of technical maybe not technical but very detailed questions, I am afraid I do not have them written down, but if the Minister of Fisheries could make a note I would imagine he would have to ask his officials to get the information. They will be there for forty minutes, so perhaps we could have it today. I think it would make the debate much easier and much more to the point.

I am sorry I could not ask for them last evening but to be honest I had not thought of them last evening, I was so overwhelmed by the Premier's defence of the \$2.6 million purchase price that these did not occur to me until I got up this morning for breakfast.

I wonder if the minister could get for the committee, Sir, and let us have a list or a table or whatever it should be, showing, since the government took over the plant at Burgeo, the amounts of fish which have been sold, the quantities of fish. These questions all relate to the arrangement with Carbiou Fisheries. The amounts of fish which have been sold, the price that have been received per pound, it could be on an average, **it maybe**, I realize, a little different. I would like for him to tell us to whom the fish is being sold, if **they** know that, I mean, I do not know if they know or not but if they do know

MR. ROBERTS: I would also like the information, Sir, if it could be broken down into the various categories, such things as the I. Q.F. fillets, cod blocks, red fish, ocean perch, the layer pack, whatever form the production of the plant takes.

I wonder if the minister could also get for us and let us have, Mr. Chairman, the arrangements on the freight. Who carries the fish from Burgeo to Gloucester or wherever it goes? Who carries it? Under what arrangements are those expenses and that sort of thing? Similarly, the insurance. I assume the fish is insured. By what company, what agent? Again at what cost for all of those things? They are fairly technical questions, Sir, but I think this is information to which the committee is entitled, and I have no doubt the minister will try to get the information for us. Also, the minister may be able to let us know today, we were not told last evening, whether it is estimated the plant will make a profit or not this year. I realize it is only an estimate. The plant made a gross profit of \$200,000 in the last full year of operation, if I remember the Premier's figures correctly. It did not make any money last year or I assume it did not. We do not know that for a fact, but in due course we will get the balance sheets and the profit and loss statements and we will know for sure. Could it be indicated whether they expect the plant will make a profit or make a loss this year? I think that is information.

There is nothing in the estimates that would indicate one way or another, indeed there is nothing in the estimates other than the amount which is carried in Economic Development, which by agreement we are discussing now, for the capital payment. I would like to know also, how much money has been paid to Mr. Jack Windsor, because the Premier indicated that the \$2.6 million, the purchase price included the six months salary for Mr. Windsor. I have no desire to pry into the gentleman's personal affairs, of course, but it is public money now. Every other public money expenditure is voted

in the estimates somewhere. Also, could the minister give us some details of the purchase price? We really did not follow last night's explanation. Maybe it is our fault and if so, so be it, we confess. If the minister could give us the information as to exactly what the price is that has been paid for the plant and so forth and so on. Apparently the government has also purchased all the ancillary enterprises. I think the Premier told us that. What do the government intend to do with them? Is the grocery up there, this \$100,000 gross profit operation, is it now being operated by the government? If so, will it continue to show a profit? What plans do the government have? Will they be turning it over to a co-op? Will they be trying to sell it? You know, there is any amount of information that the committee are entitled to.

I asked at the start of the session, start of the committee meeting, in the hope the minister might nip out and perhaps make a phone call or two and have the information. I really think it is very germane to the debate and I think it would be very useful if we could have it. Thank you.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to express a word of appreciation to the Minister of Fisheries, on behalf of the fishermen in Torbay who fish out of Tapper's Cove, for the wonderful cooperation they received recently when they were forced to dump their fish in Torbay, due to lack of markets. I am told, Mr. Chairman, that the dragger arrangement, from the Burgeo fish plant operation, is not the solution to the problem. I think the minister indicated that he did not believe himself that this was the long-range answer. However, it does take care of the immediate situation. I want the minister to know that the fishermen in that area appreciate his efforts and that the minister was available, Sir.

The minister was one of the rare birds on the opposite side of the House at the present time, in that he did answer his phone. The minister did answer his phone and he was available and he did the

best he could. This is very much appreciated by the fishermen in the area.

Sir, last night, when the committee was talking about the strike at the Burgeo fish plant, and I do not intend to dwell on this, Mr. Chairman, because I think the matter of the strike at the Burgeo fish plant has been pretty well covered. The Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation in referring to the strike at Burgeo, made some sort of a foolish statement about the government reversing its decision as far as social assistance to strikers in future is concerned.

The point that he made, Sir, about allowable income, was probably a valid point. Ottawa picked it up that strike pay could not be considered as allowable income, and any grade III student in Newfoundland should know that. But, Sir, under the Canada Assistance Plan, the strikers in Burgeo could not have been denied short-term social assistance based on need, on proven need. This is the statement that the minister made that disturbed me very much, Sir. He implied, he left the impression with the committee that the new Tory Government would not assist strikers in future with short-term assistance. This in my opinion, Sir, is contrary to the Canada Assistance Plan. "We were well aware of the situation in Burgeo and we would have come to the rescue of the strikers there, Sir, providing there was need."

Now, we heard I think, Sir, where there is a strike at the fish plant at Bonavista. If these strikers at the Bonavista fish plant do not get strike pay that would be the equivalent of short-term social assistance, then, Sir, they would be entitled by law for short-term assistance based on proven need. I am willing to forecast now, Sir, that if that strike is a long-drawn-out dispute and it is not settled in the next few weeks, there will be families in Bonavista or Port Union, wherever the strike is taking

place, there are families who will be forced to come to the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation for assistance. When their entitlement is calculated, Sir, the strike pay will be deducted from their entitlement. "No allowable income." Strike pay is not allowable income. I was rather disappointed to hear the minister make that statement. I think it is wrong and I think the government should reconsider.

Now, Sir, when the Minister of Fisheries stands in his place to answer some of the inquiries that have come from this side of the House, I wonder if the minister would enlighten the committee as to how he feels about the Salt Fish Marketing Board, which was a great Liberal concept. Does the provincial government intend to set up a fresh fish marketing board, or does the provincial government intend to approach the Government of Canada to have fresh fish included in the marketing under the Salt Fish Corporation, by changing the name of the Salt Fish Corporation so that it could market all the produce of the sea in Newfoundland?

I would also like to hear the minister's views, Sir, on ocean harvest insurance. I am thinking about the insurance plan that farmers of Canada have. I think the minister vaguely referred to this in his introductory remarks. The farmers in Canada have a scheme whereby they are compensated, Sir, for any crop failures or losses that they might have due to weather conditions or any other disaster that may take place. The fishermen do not have this, Sir. I do not know if a formula could be worked out, Sir, whereby the fishermen could have an insurance scheme similar to the farmers in Canada, but it seems to me that they should have some sort of protection, Sir, against failure. Maybe the answers to it is the guaranteed annual income. I do not know, but I would like to hear the minister go into that matter a little more deeply, because I think it is quite important to the fishermen of this province. I think all the other matters have been covered

MR. NEARY: by my honourable colleague, the Leader of the Opposition and the member for White Bay South. We have covered the management contract and we have been told how the fish is being sold, the government are taking all the chances. Mr. Lake is four percent FOR. We have been told that the fish plant is an old fish plant, that a list of the physical assets. The honourable the Leader of the Opposition has asked a number of technical questions that we hope to get the answers to this afternoon.

So, Sir there is not much more to say under this heading XIV - Fisheries. But I would just like to get back for a moment to the sale of the Burgeo Fish Plant. As I stated last evening, Mr. Chairman, the amount of money paid to Mr. Lake, \$2.6 million, is much too much, Sir. It is ten times more than was paid out by the Department of Social Services to repair 300 or 400 humble, poor, little homes on Bell Island that had rotten windows, clapboard falling off, holes in the roof, sills falling out from under the houses. Ten times more. Sir, all of them. Sir, everyone of them Assistance in that department is based on need, Sir, and need has to be proven. So, Mr. Chairman, it is ten times more. Ten times more. Sir. No crocodile tears from the Minister of Finance, when we lash out, Sir, \$2.6 million of the taxpayers money of this province. Mr. Chairman, the red herring that the members tried to drag across the issue last night was; it went to the people of Burgeo.

Mr. Chairman, it did not go to the people of Burgeo. It did not go to the people of Burgeo, it went into the pocket of a millionaire fish merchant in this province. That is where it went, Mr. Chairman. not to the people of Burgeo. That was a pretty high price to pay. Sir, when they could have had the plant, they could have had the plant and have had all the assets for about \$600,000.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Chairman, just a very few **brief** words on the queries that the honourable the Leader of the Opposition had to ask, the

MR. MOORES: amount of fish sold between March 20 to May 20, which was 991,000 pounds, the price per pound average was thirty-three point six cents.

MR. ROBERTS: Come on now - 991,000?

MR. MOORES: 991,000 pounds of fillets that came from - those were the sales, the shipment of sales. The landings were 3,691,000. The average price per pound was thirty-three point six cents. The type of fish sold, we can get a breakdown on that. It was not available, obviously, unless you check the plant records. The carrier charged \$1.75 for fillets, \$2.40 for IQF.

MR. ROBERTS: Was that dollars, I am sorry, I do not know that much about it.

MR. MOORES: Two point four cents per pound.

MR. ROBERTS: One point seven five per pound for -

MR. MOORES: That was the regular rate and that varies between "Carlston" and "Blue Peter", the "Caribou" and the rest. I mean those are the boats that are available. The insurance was carried by Lloyds of London.

MR. ROBERTS: ... the agents.

MR. MOORES: Of Lloyds? I do not know. It is Lloyds policy direct with the company right now. The salary of Mr. Winsor, we do not even know, for the simple reason that it was included in the price that will be paid for the plant. This was a service that was being provided, the service was manager of the plant. As we are not involved in the deductions and so on, this was why this information is not available now. We can get it if it is important.

I would like to make a few comments on the management of the plant and the sale of the fish, which we have heard so much about. On the sale of the fish and the management of the plant, we heard last night, too from the member for White Bay South, that it was an unsavoury spectacle how the plant was being managed, from the honourable Leader

MR. MOORES: of the Opposition, it was curious that we would have this kind of a management arrangement.

But I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, where are we suppose to get managers for fish plants for a six month operation, when we hope to have it resold? You do not go out and get competent managers, if they are competent they are already working in other plants, unless that is part of the agreement of the sale with people who have the capabilities to do the job. It is our intention to resell the plant, hopefully for as much as we paid for it. It is our intention in the meantime to get the best management personnel we can and that, in this case, was a management person who has been reporting directly to the government. has not been reporting to Mr. Lake, who has done an excellent job and which was part of the agreement itself. That was the best and only way that the plant could have been managed properly.

The second point I would like to mention is on the commission per sales. It is a four percent FOB commission. That is one percent less than any other broker on the Eastern Sea Boards of the United States. After that the commission agent, the broker, whoever he may be, has to look after his transportation, the sale of the fish, all that a brokerage house has to do in the reselling of the fish, delivered FOB Gloucester or Boston wherever the case may be. It is as well, as good a deal as any fish plant in this province has.

Now to talk about cushy deals, to talk about sweetheart agreements is unadulterated nonsense because either (a) they do not know what they are talking about on the other side or (b) they have not researched it to find out what the facts are. Four percent sales commission is low. The freight rate is competitive and it is shopped and, secondly, the management had to be found if the plant was going to be operational.

Just a few other points, Mr. Chairman, because I think this has been dealt with and until we get the final facts and the final figures it cannot be dealt with in finality.

But there are a few other things: why did we buy the supermarket?

MR. MOORES: If we did not buy it, it would close. And, therefore, as the supermarket was a very intricate part of that community, that is one of the reasons why we bought it, plus the fact that there was no one else to operate it after. It is not the government's intention to make the profits that were made in the past. It is our intention to operate the plant as efficiently as possible until a buyer can be found.

One statement that the honourable the Leader of the Opposition made which surprises me is that it is \$1 million too much, having said approximately five minutes before that; he would wait until he have all the facts. It seems that the facts and political influence are not necessarily the same things, Mr. Chairman. When the final facts are available, they will be submitted and then opinions can be legitimately found and until all the final facts have been established I think we are possibly talking in great depth about something where we are basing our conclusions ~~on our~~ opinions rather than on the facts available.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Chairman, before we press on I would just like to make a few brief remarks on the fisheries. First I want to commend the honourable Minister of Fisheries, his brief outline of his policy in his department. Yesterday, unfortunately, I was absent from the chamber but nevertheless, the reports which I did hear and received were very complimentary indeed to the honourable the minister.

He, as Minister of Fisheries, now is following and improving upon some of the groundwork and the policies laid down by his late father and I think he should feel justly proud in that position to be able to improve on the old, and it is a good thing. He is very fortunate to be in that position.

- This Burgeo transaction, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to belabour the committee on this subject. But as I see it, you had at Burgeo the beginning of it, you had a newly elected or formed union who decided to go into Burgeo to test its strength. That is on one hand.

MR. WINSOR: On the other hand, you had a strong and hard-nosed businessman, who is not too enthused or too willing to have a union come in to his community and tell him how to operate his business. Now maybe there is room for both in our society. But as a consequence, Mr. Chairman, we all know the results. It was not the leader or the union who really suffered nor the owners of the original plan but the unfortunate people of Burgeo.

So we saw a community, a prosperous community slowly die. It was dying as a matter of fact, the burial was almost ready to be performed. However, Sir, we know what happened. I would only say this in referring to the Burgeo transaction, that I doubt very much if

the government of today had won the same majority in October as they won in March, we would probably not be debating \$2.6 million here today. I do not think the government would have approved of it. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say on ' Burgeo. I think it has been beaten about. You cannot beat the thing to death at this point.

There are a few points I would refer to in the minister's estimates but I am only going to deal with one now because as we get down to item by item, I think we would have a better opportunity to deal with them. This is quality control. I am very much concerned with quality control in our fishing industry. Perhaps it has to begin in the fishing boat. If that is so, then I would urge the Minister of Fisheries to engage, if it is the responsibility (I do not know. Perhaps it may be the responsibility of the Federal Department of Fisheries rather than the Provincial) of the Federal Department of Fisheries - perhaps the minister could reply to that when he replies to the questions asked him by the opposition. If we have to regulate or enforce some control in the fishing boat, that may be a major problem. Because, Sir, not all fishermen are too anxious to do anything outside of their general or routine operation. However, if the fish are caught by the longliners or inshore fishermen the problem sometimes does not apply to the boat where we get the degrading of the fish, it is between the boat and the time it is ready for shipping. I was glad the other day when the minister announced that he was taking an inventory of all community stages. Now community stages were very good. It was an excellent idea at the beginning. When the concept was put into practice, the community stage was usually primarily for salting fish. Today a lot of them are used just for holding units . Sir, I would strongly urge the minister to give some consideration to installing in those community stages ice-making machines in order that fish when it is brought in can be iced and kept in ice until it is ready for market or ready for the buyer or the collector whichever does the

collecting. Because, Sir, it is very important in the marketing world today that Newfoundland as well as other countries produce a top notch quality if we are to maintain our markets as we are enjoying today, and in this respect, Sir, the market for fish was never better. The price was never better. The hon. minister's appointment to the Portfolio of Fisheries is a very, very fortunate time indeed. Never in our history has the fishing industry been so bright, both in price but unfortunately not in quantity. However, that remains an act of God and we have very little control over how much fish is produced. We hear a lot of conservation and I am all for it. Who enforces the conservation? Who brings about the measures? How can we produce more fish? Those are the things that I do not think we can resolve nor will the next Minister of Fisheries resolve them. I am sure the present Minister of Fisheries has a sincere desire to improve what he can improve upon and bring about an industry that is, as we all know, the life-line or the bread and butter of a great many of our Newfoundlanders. Sir, I am very happy to note in the estimates of the Department of Fisheries that the Honourable minister is following along the same lines as we did previously. He is engaged or is following the programme of bounty, increase bounty, providing slipways and service stations. This is very good. It is a good programme. Unfortunately we did not have or unfortunately it came in a bit too late but nevertheless there is certainly room there for improvement. These are just matters in passing, Mr. Chairman. As we go through item by item, there may be a little more information we can have.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Chairman, just one correction, if I may on the figures I gave. The average price per pound is 41.1 cents and not 33.6 cents.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to get into this debate and drag it out. I did not intend to. However, as I thought my friend from Bell Island, as per usual, misinterpreted what I said last night and raised the point again today, I prepared a ministerial statement. I did not think it was necessary to make it but I prepared it just in case. I find

Mr. Hickey,

that it is not proper that I present it at this time, so tomorrow I will present that statement which will refute categorically what he has said, which will confirm what I said last night and I now give him notice, if he wishes to get a transcript of what I said last night and compare it with my ministerial statement he may do so. It is just a little bit too much how things are being misinterpreted in this House. I think it is about time to put a stop to it.

MR. HOWARD: I have sat here and listened to the comments from both sides of the House this last day or so. I just want to speak on one point concerning the Burgeo Fish Plant. I have heard honourable members from the other side of the House state that there was no hard bargain when in fact the honourable gentlemen's government of the day had seven months in order to do hard bargaining and all they gave was lip service to the people of Burgeo. There were 350 workers out of work. This entailed several hundreds of people. I think myself that \$2.6 million was very little to pay for the welfare of the residents of Burgeo.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Mr. Chairman, before this item passes, there were a couple of questions raised from the other side which I feel compelled to comment on, in fact the comment was asked for. The first question was from the hon. member for Bell Island. He was asking about the Salt Fish Corporation. I am not sure, Mr. Chairman, whether the honourable member had intended that it should be my opinion that he was seeking for the Department of Fisheries. However, I will endeavour to perhaps cover both aspects of it, if I may. The reason I say that is because the length of time I have been in this position has not really given me an opportunity to be able to view it from both sides of the fence, as it were, in the depth that I would like to before coming to any kind of firm conclusion. The concept of the Salt Fish Corporation when it was set up is, of course, pretty difficult to argue with. The terms of reference were to maximize the returns

MR. CHEESEMAN

to fishermen. I think that, as I say that would be a pretty difficult concept to argue against. However, I believe that once this responsibility is taken on then the onus rests with that organization, regardless of which organization it may be, to make certain that this is carried out at all levels. The weakness that I see in the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation today, viewing it from where I sit at the moment and I am sort of reinforced if you will or influenced if you will by my experience outside, is that I believe there must be greater involvement by the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation

where the action is, if that is the correct term. I do not believe that it is intended nor was it ever intended to be a marketing organization. If it were, then as long as the markets are good and the demand is good, it is doubtful how great a benefit that it serves to the industry. If the salt fish corporation were brought into being to stimulate, to increase production and this sort of thing, then I think that they have a larger role to play than is presently being played.

Now, there are of course a number of opinions about this in some areas of Canada. The honourable member will be well aware exemptions were granted, certain types of fish were taken out of the jurisdiction by agreement with the province entering. Others exempted completely and said: "No, we do not want to do it." Perhaps some of the effectiveness may have been lost without that total unity. However, I think that I would prefer to sort of reserve any final judgement, I am only expressing an opinion at this point. But I do nevertheless feel very strongly and I hope in fact we will have the cooperation of the Salt Fish Corporation in making sure that the figures do not continue to drop as long as the markets are staple and the demand as high as it is now. Then I would hope that the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation would endeavour to influence more the production of fish than has been the case in recent years.

Now, the honourable member also asks about any intention to go into or our intention to go into fresh marketing. I think I can say a flat "no" to that. I am speaking from a department point of view. It has not received any indept study by this government but I feel quite certain that as far as government is concerned at the present time that the marketing of fresh fish is well in hand. It is going along well. Markets, as the honourable member and the honourable member

for Fogo has pointed out, markets are good. Things are generally good. With the exceptions of the comments that I made yesterday, in my opening remarks, that we should perhaps try and diversify our marketing to get away from too much dependence in one area. With that exception I see nothing wrong with the marketing situation as it is at the moment.

On your ocean harvest insurance, this is a concept of course that has been kicked around for years and the answer has always been invariably the same. A man takes "x" bags of seed, he goes out and sets it into "x" acreage. The product grows to a certain height. An Act of God, wind, rain, hail whatever the case may be comes. The man's efforts are destroyed.

It is pretty hard to measure that in terms of the Atlantic Ocean. You cannot put a fence around it. You cannot bar it up. You cannot plant it and grow it or at least you cannot in terms of the broad Atlantic, perhaps in inland waters you can do it. Perhaps in inland waters the concept could be carried through. But I believe it is an area that requires a great deal of study and a great deal of expertise which I am afraid that I personally at this point in time would not have. I can see many problems. I can see the tremendous benefit that it could be and perhaps in time - you see one of the options in insurance for fishermen and the unemployment insurance for fishermen when it was brought in was actually almost a bounty for production rather than an insurance against loss, because you have to have a reasonably successful fishery in order to gain any real benefit. But even in concept it was more or less self-defeating. The man who suffered a loss or bad voyage or whatever you like to call it, he has nothing to qualify on. Certainly I do not think we have reached anywhere near a perfect stage in aid to fishermen in this area yet.

It may, as I say, I do not think, certainly we have not arrived at the proper point in time or the most desirable point yet. Now, just

one comment more and it was in relation to only the investment and the cost in Burgeo. I would like, only in the context of comparative values, if you will. This is not meant to be anything more than a statistical fact. In that sense it is not an easy thing to sell a fish plant. In recent months or even in the last year and a half or so things have brightened up considerably. But two years ago, you know, the fishery was not all that bright. There was some comment publicly about investment in fishery, in this type of thing.

Just as an example, the department or government had been involved in deals recently on a fish plant in St. John's where there are other outlets, I think this is important to bear in mind, where there are other outlets, where employment is not as acute, or unemployment is not as acute as it would be in a one-industry town. But a plant defunct, closed, for three years was sold for \$1,700,000. On the face of it that looks pretty good. I understand that there was something in the order of another million dollars pumped in to bring that to the level that these buyers wished to do.

But in order to get them to buy them, I think this is the important thing, it cost the government in terms of subsidy, \$1,842,422. The only point I make is that if that type of action or that type of subsidy was warranted in St. John's and that type of value established for a defunct operation, one which had been tried and closed up, with ultimate discouragement, I suppose, when anybody looks at it, you can almost say at that point it is a fire sale kind of thing. But if it were worth at that point \$1,700,000 and it were worth the government's input of a further \$1,842,422 to conclude that sale, then I suggest the price at Burgeo is very low. Let me also say, in terms of why governments do things like this; the social problems that exist, the areas which

need help, I would turn to the LaScie fish plant which, as my friend, the honourable member from Fogo will be well aware, is in government control.

In the period from 1962-1963, that is the fiscal year 1962-1963, through to 1970-1971, it has cost the government of Newfoundland \$1,217,757,87. Again I only bring this up to say that there are situations and circumstances under which I do not think that pure relationship between the physical asset and the values or prices at the time can be measured that accurately. However, as I say I only say that for the record.

Now the honourable member for Fogo, in his comments, made reference to quality control and the steps that must be taken. I did in fact mention this yesterday and referred to the changing times, exactly what the honourable member had said himself and which, of course, I would expect him to say, the changing scene in the fishery, the changeover from the salting, the salt-bulk of fish in many of these stages and holding units or community stages or whatever you would like to call them. There is a need for a total new look because of the number of these facilities involved in fresh fish. I can assure the honourable member that this is being very seriously looked at by the department at this present time. Hopefully we will be able to come to a satisfaction conclusion in this regard.

This I think too, the honourable member went on speaking of quality control but rather linked it with the upgrading of community stages and this type of thing. But I think the two are sort of interlocked. As I say, I can assure the minister that that is being seriously looked at.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, before the minister takes his seat, I wonder if he could inform the committee if McLean's Advertising, McLean's Public Relations or McLean's Associates whatever they are called are

June 29, 1972. Tape 1110 Page 5.

they doing any work for the department of Fisheries or the fish industry?

MR.CHEESEMAN: There are no existing contracts in the Department of Fisheries and I cannot see any involvement, I cannot answer that one specifically. I cannot see any connection that it would have with Burgeo but to my knowledge, no.

On motion total subhead 1401 carried.

MR. ROBERTS: (14-02-02) Mr. Chairman, on this item, one brief question, Could the minister tell me if, well I will make it since January 18, if the Department of Fisheries have spent any funds either with Mr. George McLean or with any firm? Has that question been asked? It has been answered then. For my own benefit, were any funds spent with them?

MR. CHEESEMAN: No, the question has been answered. I do not think the two questions are comparable, that is in exact terms.

MR. ROBERTS: They are different questions, in other words.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Yes, that is correct, but I believe that the Premier made reference yesterday, in answer to a question, that there was a question tabled in the House with reference to McLeans participation and that the answer was being provided.

The question that the honourable member for Bell Island asked was if the Department of Fisheries was - that is in these estimates, and I said that no contracts existed.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, has any money been paid by the Department of Fisheries to Mr. McLean since January or include in that any firms in which he is the principal, since January 18.

MR. CHEESEMAN: I think I answered the question. The question was asked in the House, it was tabled and the information is being provided.

MR. ROBERTS: But I am only asking for Fisheries now. We have asked for all departments.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Yes, that is what I was saying, that there have been, and that the information is being provided.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay, so there have been monies paid to Mr. McLean and again including his firm, by the Fisheries Department and it will be swept up in the overall total. But we are on Fisheries now, what services were rendered in return for this and what amounts, not to the cent, but what sort of amounts were there?

MR. CHESSEMAN: Well the answer again is in the course of preparation. I do not know what point but I think the information that the honourable Leader of the Opposition is looking for can be provided this afternoon.

MR. ROBERTS: What I am looking for is simply.... well could the minister tell me whether he, either in his previous incarnation or as the minister, has authorized any payments to Mr. McLean.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Yes and that is in the process of being compiled. In answer to a previous question, we will provide the information this afternoon.

MR. ROBERTS: I want to know for Fisheries, I mean the other question deals with everybody.

MR. CHESSEMAN: Yes, it will be for Fisheries.

MR. ROWE (WM.) Now what did he do for it? Well does the minister not know? He has only been in there for two months.

MR. ROBERTS: No, he has been there since the start.

MR. ROWE: It is not satisfactory, that is the problem, I think. We will keep asking them.

Mr. Chairman, we were quite willing to allow this matter to rest until the minister came up with some information. We want to be reasonable over here, until we were subjected to that kind of nonsense over there from the honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs. What I would like to know and I am sure the honourable Leader of the Opposition would like to know is what Mr. McLean or his firm did for the money, however much it might be, that was paid to him from the Department of Fisheries?

Now the minister has been minister for the past couple of months and before that he was acting, for the Premier I think, in the department. Does he remember it or has he forgotten it over the last two or three months, what the money was paid to him for? Is it a promotion or what?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Chairman, if I as previous Minister of Fisheries, or before the honourable gentleman took over, we will this afternoon supply exactly what Mr. McLean has done for the department and exactly what it cost before this afternoon is out, if that is satisfactory.

MR. ROWE (WM.): Can you control these guys over here while you are at it?

MR. ROBERTS: That would be quite good, they cannot control arrogant Ank, but who can? Can we have it then understood that if there are any remarks or debate on it, Mr. Chairman, that they may be made on the total of this department. Because we may want to say a few words. Would that be in order?

MR. MARSHALL: Oh yes!

MR. ROBERTS: Okay that is agreed, fine.

On motion total subhead 1402, carried.

MR. ROBERTS: (1412-01) on that, Mr. Chairman, the salary appendix, it is not printed in the salary appendix, could the minister just read us what it covers?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, you are referring to Fisheries Development Authority, salaries, I believe. The Fisheries Development Authority consists of a chairman at \$20,540 - is this the information?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, because normally it is in the appendix but that page is not there.

MR. CHESSEMAN: No, it is in the backup notes. Two members at \$40,000 and that obviously is \$20,000 each. Three secretaries totalling \$17,760 for a total of \$78,300.

MR. ROBERTS: But the vote is \$105,000 -

MR. CHESSEMAN: No, excuse me, I was just pausing, I thought you were writing it down.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I will get it from Hansard.

MR. CHEESEMAN: An engineer at \$15,750; chief co-ordinator at \$16,000; co-ordinator of field services at \$10,000; an administrator at \$12,000; a clerk at \$5,000; two stenographers at \$8,000; totalling \$145,000. Allowances for increments and adjustments, \$6,250; a total of \$151,300 and savings due to late recruitment, \$46,300; for a total of \$105,000.

MR. ROBERTS: How many of the positions are not now filled then? Obviously there are some new positions being established, maybe the minister could indicate which ones are new and which ones are not filled and perhaps he could give the committee the names of persons appointed to the new positions which have been filled.

MR. CHEESEMAN: That information can be supplied without problem now I think, but I am sorry I do not have that information at my disposal.

MR. ROBERTS: The only other question I ask, are the commissioners the commissioners and the chairman, Mr. Russell, Mr. Dustan, Mr. Prince - Mr. Dustan being the chairman, Mr. Russell, Mr. Prince, being the members of the Authority, they all get the same salary do they - about \$20,000 or is there a slight difference?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Yes, \$20,000 roughly because the chairman is rated at now, \$20,540 and the others at \$20,000.

MR. ROBERTS: So it is near enough to the same.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Mr. Russell performs actually a dual capacity.

MR. ROBERTS: So does Mr. Dustan.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Mr. Russell, as you probably know, is Chairman of the Loan Board and then he came in as a member.

MR. ROBERTS: But he is only paid under one head.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Oh yes!

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Harry Dustan is just an invaluable fellow in these Crown Corporation.

MR. CHEESEMAN: He has a tremendous fund of knowledge.

MR. ROBERTS: That is the total salaries paid to each of them. There will be no increases paid to any of them this year.

MR. CHEESEMAN: You see, these people are on a fixed salary basis at this point. Mr. Prince came in from another position, Mr. Russell salary having been established, he was appointed.

MR. ROBERTS: He came from the Government of Canada too.

MR. CHEESEMAN: That is right and Mr. Dustan of course had been on contract.

MR. ROBERTS: So they are all fixed. Any plans to raise their salary?

MR. CHEESEMAN: In the case of Mr. Dustan, he is contractual,

He is beyond normal retirement age, He is only on extended time.

In terms of Mr. Prince, he came in at an agreed rate and on an agreed base. Mr. Russell, as I say, whose salary had already been predetermined in the previous capacity, was merely transferred or added to his duties as a member of the Fisheries Loan Board.

So there is no immediate intention of making an adjustment.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you!

MR. ROBERTS: (1412-02-02) Could the minister indicate, that is rather a large increase, it is about four times as much, could he give some indication of what professional fees, you know what sort of thing they have in mind?

MR. CHEESEMAN: The number...

MR. ROBERTS: I thought Your Honour had carried (02), this is (1412-02-03).

On motion (1412-02) carried.

MR. ROBERTS: (1412-02-03) Ditto Your Honour.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Professional Fees - \$50,000, provision is made for consultant fees in respect of studies deemed necessary in connection with the continued use of community stages, the viability of seasonal plants, the Lewisport Haulout and the Fogo Island Development Survey, I think the biggest single chunk of that is this recently authorized

MR. CHEESEMAN: Fogo Island Survey.

MR. ROBERTS: Is there any federal recovery on that?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Yes that is **fifty-fifty on the Fogo Island**

part of it which would be, it is considered to be \$25,000 to \$30,000.

The federal would pay fifty per cent and we would pay fifty per cent.

MR. ROBERTS: So that leaves about \$36,000, \$37,000 to come.

MR. CHEESEMAN: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: I am all for all of them.

MR. ROBERTS: (141203-01) This is the major developmental programme.

It is about the same as last year, substantial federal contributions,

Could the minister give us any list? It is a federal-provincial

programme.

MR. CHEESEMAN: General expenses - \$900,000, provision is made for fishery development projects on a cost-sharing basis with the Industrial Development Service Branch of the Department of the Environment, following its proposed programme 1972-1973.

Conversion of stern trawlers and beam mid-water trawling for a total cost of \$140,000. These of course are estimates in anticipated cost. Survey of new fishing grounds - \$20,000; conversion of long liners from mid-water trawling - \$60,000, securing contractually trawler for dutch beam trawling - \$100,000, commercial scollop farming - \$30,000, herring and mackeral drift netting - \$70,000, inshore fishing demonstrations - \$125,000

MR. CHEESEMAN: survey seed weed, eels etc., \$125,000, shell fish development surveys \$105,000, new product further development and consumer development programme \$115,000, fishing, technical upgrading on site, observation of new gear techniques etc., \$10,000 for a total of \$900,000 and by formula the cost to the province is \$266,250, federal contribution \$633,750.

MR. ROBERTS: That has been an on-going programme for a number of years.

MR. CHEESEMAN: These are the - well, I mean these are the items, conversion of boats and

MR. ROBERTS: The items may be new, but the basic federal-provincial -

MR. CHEESEMAN: Yes these are tied into the basic programmes.

On motion item 1412-03-01 carried.

MR. ROBERTS: 1412-03-02 - Mr. Chairman, I should know what it is for but I confess I do not, apparently it is an on-going thing. This is the Stephenville Plant, but why \$1,000? What is it for? Did I ask the wrong question?

MR. CHEESEMAN: No. There is an interesting story here. The International Fisheries and Fish Meal Limited, \$1,000 - the government have a contractual obligation to the company, for reimbursement of losses, if any, sustained in the operation of the herring purse seiners, "Harmon I" and "Harmon II". The government have also a contractual obligation to provide living accommodations for the manager of the plant.

MR. ROBERTS: And this is what this is, is it?

MR. CHEESEMAN: First of all, this involves the government. The boats "Harmon I" and "Harmon II" are owned by the government. My knowledge is that they are given free to the International Fisheries. They are to maintain the boats upkeep and insurance. Any losses are to be paid by the government. If there are no losses, the government have no recovery as far as part of the profit.

MR. ROBERTS: Is this a statutory agreement or a -

MR. CHEESEMAN: So I understand, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: So it went through the House here.

MR. CHEESEMAN: This was part of the International Fisheries Agreement. The reason for the cost is that in addition to that, this providing accommodation for the manager is a rental agreement, \$90 a month is allowed for rental.

MR. ROBERTS: Who is the man, Sir?

MR. CHEESEMAN: It is just changed, there is a new one, the last one is gone, I understand. But anyway that is the explanation.

MR. ROBERTS: He is keeping these things buried in the estimates, you know.

On motion 1412-03-02 carried.

MR. W.N. ROWE: 1412-04-01 - The LaScie Fish Plant, of course, is a matter which is somewhat dear to my heart, being situated as it is in LaScie, in White Bay South. For a number of years, I think the honourable minister read out for a number of years the losses sustained by that plant and the annual subsidies, necessary by the government to keep the plant operating. It is an invaluable asset obviously to the LaScie Area and provides several hundred people with employment every year and also, of course, allows a great number of fishermen and plant workers to get unemployment insurance for a great part of the year as well.

Now last year I understand the plant, for the first time in history perhaps, not only broke even but made a certain profit as a result of their operations. Could the Minister of Fisheries, if he has the information there, give us a general outline as to why that happened, why was there a sudden upsurge in profitability of that plant? I am delighted to hear it, obviously. What is the reason? Was it diversification or was it more efficient management? You know, some of the reasons for that. Also I notice that the revised estimate is a quarter of a

MR. ROWE, W.N. million there. Perhaps that is erroneous. Now if you could give us the actual amount of profit or loss. I think there was a profit for last year. And also I would like to ask the question about the \$50,000 which is being estimated for the operation of that plant this year. I am wondering if the minister thinks that is now going to be sufficient, in view of the fact that the fishery in that area is well over a month behind any other normal year, because of the ice conditions suffered on the northeast coast this year. I think the LaScie Plant, which ordinarily opens in late May or early June, usually in late May, was not open until three or four days ago or a week or so ago this year, for the taking in of fish. Of course, the worry was that the larger fish were not going to be available, the large fish usually being available early in the year. The large fish were not going to be available this year, they would have to rely on small fish and if the overall effect of the weather, the climatic conditions this year would be well nigh disastrous in respect of that plant and the annual subsidy needed, or this year's subsidy would be perhaps an astronomical figure. Generally if the minister could answer those questions.

Generally speaking could the minister give some indication as to what the long-range future of that plant is? It has always been a matter of concern to me, because I used to hear mutterings from various politicians, not necessarily belonging to the honourable minister's party but various politicians talking about the subsidy necessary to keep that plant in operation and mumbling about how they should be closed down and this sort of thing. This used to disconcert me and disconcert the people of LaScie, because I am sure the annual subsidy which is provided to that plant would be more than exceeded by the welfare and the relief measures which would have to be taken if that plant were in fact closed down.

MR. ROWE, W.N. I would like to hear an overall policy from the government on the long range activities of the fish plant in LaScie as well as the specific questions that I have asked.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Right. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think in my closing comments under 1401, I did make reference to LaScie and read out the list at that time. Of course, the honourable member for White Bay South was quite right that there had been a long period of sustained losses up and down. Depending on the season and generally speaking in that area the production is very closely linked to weather. This is the problem in this current season.

Now first of all the \$250,000, which was in the original estimates last year, in effect was \$213,000. In other words, there was nothing one way or the other. That was brought about mainly by market price, the value of fish, the increased value of fish. A reasonably good collection year and a slight diversification in that the plant also produced last year, for the first time, in any quantity, frozen mackerel which found its way actually to the bait service. I understand that this year even more emphasis will be laid on that.

The \$50,000 - because of the present market situation when the figures were put in originally, you know, all things being equal at that time, there was no reason to believe that the LaScie Fish Plant would be in any different position this year than last year. Now the fact, as the honourable member says, that the season is somewhat delayed this year, may cause that figure to change. Hopefully the supply of fish and the market prices and everything will again bring us to a point where we will break even or at least not exceed the \$50,000 which has been in the estimates; but that is anyone's guess at this moment.

I understand last week, although I do not really have confirmation of this but I understand that one of the areas on the Northeast Coast, the honourable member for Fogo may be perhaps aware of this, but I understand that there was some fish from that area shipped down through

MR. CHEESEMAN: LaScie, a week or ten days ago. I am not sure how much but if that sort of situation, if the situation prevailed here that allowed that sort of situation to go on again, it could have an influence on the thing. So it is really almost impossible to say, but hopefully we will come close to this picture.

Now as far as prospects are concerned and, as mentioned before, it is difficult to sell fish plants, you do not sell them every day and you do not sell them in a short season area such as LaScie, or even less frequently. It has been necessary to have a management contract over the years, this has been the pattern established in the government.

Right now I think I am quite safe in saying that our philosophy would be that we should sell, if possible, or lease, if possible, on a more long-term basis, the LaScie operation, provided we are satisfied that it is been taken over for the right purpose, not only the right price or the reasonable price but as long as it serves the need which it has been serving since 1962-1963.

So I do not see that there can be a great deal of difference. The suggestion was made that it could be a large producer of bait perhaps and we are talking up in the millions and millions of pounds when we say that, when we take the demand all over Newfoundland and for that matter in parts of Eastern Canada where mackerel is a high demand bait item and, again, like ourselves the fishery comes and goes. But there are certainly possibilities there and with strong market prices, there is no reason why LaScie should not continue pretty well on its course.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Chairman, in case there is a misinterpretation there; The minister made a statement that LaScie fish plant should be sold or leased. Would he make a clear statement that in any event the LaScie Plant will not be closed, it will still operate.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Oh, yes. But I qualified it even when I said it, that provided we were satisfied that it was going to be a right use

June 29, 1972

Tape 1112 (afternoon)

PK - 6

MR. CHEESEMAN: But it is quite obviously that -

MR. WINSOR: It might be interpreted -

MR. CHEESEMAN: But quite obviously that will be contended.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I thank the honourable minister. The way I interpreted it was that there was no possibility of its closing. I could see where the honourable Premier could possibly get that misunderstanding. My understanding of it is that the plant will be kept open whether it is under government control, whether there is a management contract or whether it is sold or leased. The idea is to keep that plant operating in LaScie.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Yes, I only said that it might be more desirable if more long range.

MR. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On motion, 1412-04-01, carried.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Chairman, before you pass on, I know this is not debatable, but on 03, are there negotiations still going on with the Department of Transportation to take over that service or would the Minister of Highways be in a better position to...

MR. CHEESEMAN: I think, Mr. Chairman, first of all the ferry service was transferred out of the Department of Fisheries, because of its non-application to this particular department and what has transpired since.

On motion, 1412-05-01, carried.

On motion total subhead 1412, carried.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, I assume that I am under the right heading in this respect, but seeing that Labrador South does not have a sitting member in the House, and when we think in terms of the personal community of Labrador South and when we think in terms of fishery development and assistance, there have been a number of complaints over the years from people over the fact that there is no fish plant in Labrador South. There have been occasions when Fishery Products have collected fish in the Forteau - Anse Eclair and hauled it into the plant there. I do not know if there have been cases when

they have hauled fish as far south as Port au Choix. In this case here, where there are a number of fishermen on the Straits of Belle Isle section, from Brig Bay going into the Cook's Harbour Area, who do fish on that particular part of the coast, there is a big demand. Some of them are bringing the fish from the fishing grounds in the Pinware Area over to Flower's Cove and that particular area, then trucking it into the plant at St. Anthony.

The people are of the opinion that this has been a great injustice. When you take a look at the coastline, the number of people involved, I do not know the economics of putting a plant in there, but this is a great fishing area. Primarily it is cod fishing and a number of our people in the Straits of Belle Isle utilize the fishing grounds. I am wondering if the honourable minister has given any consideration to looking into the possibility of providing a fresh fish plant for that particular area. Maybe he would care to comment on this, or if he has done any research in that respect, I am sure that the people of Labrador South would be as anxious to hear what is happening as far as the development of that part of the coast is concerned. If there is a programme for Labrador, Sir, I would appreciate hearing the minister's comments.

MR. CHEESEMAN: This of course - Labrador is no different than any other part of Newfoundland. The requirements and the necessities of that area are under review in the same way as every other area. I indicated yesterday that we have already dispatched someone to the Coast of Labrador to do an inventory. Here again we come back to the same thing that I mentioned earlier to the honourable member for Fogo. The changing aspect, the salt fish production and the fresh fish production and what influence exactly this is having and in fact going to have and whether or not the availability of fish on the Labrador, in what particular area and what species are going to be able to be utilized, I think are matters for ongoing study. It will be kept before the department, rest assured.

On motion, 1413-02-01, carried.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I notice 1413-03-01 is down \$200,000. This is the bounty for cod nets,

AN HON. MEMBER: Inshore gear replacement?

MR. ROBERTS: No, it is inshore fishing gear bounty 03-01. It is down by \$200,000 from the revised figure for last year. Are there many changes in the programme? Do we expect fewer nets or just what?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Mr. Chairman, the fishing gear bounty makes provision for the payment of subsidy on certain types of gear. The honourable Leader of the Opposition will be aware perhaps, that the greatest bulk of that has been in gill nets, in fact. Obviously, over the years it would not continue at the same rate, you would be more apt to lose, run into loss which would be covered under replacement rather than bounty. This would be what the anticipated normal purchases or use in this current year would be.

On Motion, 1413-03-01, carried.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, before we carry this subhead, could I, in view of the fact that the storm damage programme has been cancelled or at least for this year there was none because it was not continued from last year and the insurance programme, I understand from the minister, is not in effect this year, should we experience some damage to inshore fishery gear, is there any recourse for our fishermen to get payment or part payment for their lost gear?

MR. CHEESEMAN: First of all, Mr. Chairman, just to sort the matter, there was no programme last year. You will see that the item that came up, the amount of money was voted in effect I believe June 27, was the beginning of that payment for loss of gear by a number of fishermen in certain areas. As I explained yesterday, and I thought I had covered this one fairly extensively, when I was trying to put figures together in the first instance, it was my hope at that time that we would in fact be able to persuade Ottawa to enter into an insurance scheme which again, as I stated yesterday, regretfully we were

were unable to do. We are having some consideration, not of insurance as such but rather some sort of replacement of major loss. It is not the major loss that concerns me. That will be taken care of by somebody. It is the day to day loss. The fisherman with the five nets, as I mentioned yesterday, to him it is a major loss. Ottawa's attitude and apparently the philosophy of the past has been; "Wait until something major occurs then we will try and cope with it." Then again, as I said before, I think this results in a lot of inequity.

The \$200,000 was in originally as the anticipated contribution the province would make. Quite obviously, it is not insurance in the sense of real insurance, as it has to be used in some form of replacement. But hopefully, if this money is required there would also be some federal contribution. Trying to get an equitable distribution of claims would be the biggest concern in the area.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, if I may just ask a supplementary question on that. The honourable minister says that negotiations with Ottawa came to nothing, apparently, on an insurance scheme. About when would that have been? When did Ottawa give the minister a final word that they would not participate in such a scheme?

MR. CHEESEMAN: No, I am sorry. What I thought I had conveyed - I have had correspondence with Ottawa in February and then subsequently conversations in Ottawa six or seven weeks ago. Both times this idea of inshore gear insurance was brought forward and the Department of the Environment, the Fisheries Section of the Department of the Environment and the minister were not at all happy with the prospect of an inshore gear insurance. The honourable member may or may not remember that in fact some years ago it was tried and there was not the great anticipation that was anticipated at that time. The regulatory control of the thing and the

claims and everything. They just looked at it and said at that point that it was an unworkable proposition, and that could very well be. It is a very complex proposition but that does not nevertheless necessitate the elimination or the elimination of the idea. I think the need is still there regardless of how difficult the solution. But the point is that what Ottawa have said is that we are not in favour of what they have indicated to us, is that we are not in favour of an insurance programme but we are prepared to look at the possibility of some form of major loss programme set at a certain level covering so many nets or so many fishermen, this type of thing. But as I say, that is major again and my real concern is with the smaller losses because, as I said earlier, I think the major loss, Sir, one way or another will always be looked after. I am not sure, does that clarify it?

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Yes. The reason I ask or had pursued this in such a fashion, Mr. Chairman, is that I believe, I may be subject to correction on this as I am speaking entirely from memory, but in the Throne Speech given in the session just prior to this one, which really amounted to an election document, there was mention made of an insurance scheme. Now I do not know if it was specific to the point of talking about insured gear or whether it was generally for everything affecting the fisheries or what it involved really. As I say, I am speaking from memory. I am now surprised to hear that having made the statement in the Speech from the Throne, the government's statement of policy and intention, that after such a short period of time the minister now comes into the House, and I am not blaming the minister, as he was not even in the administration at the time, the minister now comes into the House and starts talking about how difficult such a scheme will be to get implemented and get Federal participation. He has not said nothing will happen. There may be a major loss programme, he starts talking

about how difficult and complex it will be, when two or three months ago anyone who was interested in this sort of thing, fishermen surely must have had their expectations raised somewhat because the statement made in the Speech from the Throne was couched in fairly positive terms I think, and again I am speaking from memory. I think it did involve. it did mention the involvement of the Government of Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: I have the reference here now.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): I have it here now, Mr. Chairman. 'Legislation will be introduced at the earliest possible date to establish in conjunction with the Federal Government an inexpensive shared-cost insurance programme covering losses of fishing gear.' Now that to me, Sir, is a very positive statement, 'Legislation will be introduced in conjunction with the Federal Government, as if at that time the Federal Government, this is not stated in so many words it can only be implied or inferred, as if to state that the Federal Government were in agreement with the Provincial Government on this and it was just a matter of bringing in the legislative authority. Now we hear the minister coming in a couple of months later stating that there is really no possibility. I am not putting words in the minister's mouth, what I am saying or my interpretation is that the minister is saying that there is really no possibility of getting an inexpensive shared-cost insurance programme covering loss of fishing gear. Is that what the minister is saying now?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, in reading the total reference, of course it says legislation will be introduced at the earliest possible date to establish in conjunction with the Federal Government an inexpensive cost-shared insurance programme. Now to be truly technical, of course, if you want to be that then it says at the earliest possible date. The earliest possible date must of necessity be at the time when you have reached an agreement with Ottawa but, as I say, that is being highly technical. The situation here is that the logic, I believe, of the

need is there. I do not think there is any doubt and I do not think anyone in this House or elsewhere would argue it. To me it was, is and will continue to be logical that Ottawa should participate in this and as far as I am concerned, from a personal and a department point of view, we shall continue to pursue, to try and sell Ottawa on a form of participatory insurance or a form of participatory gear replacement loss, some form where the benefit will accrue to the inshore fishermen.

Now more than that, the only indication, as I say, we have is that they do not favour such an insurance.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Chairman, again I must say I am not trying to implicate or blame the minister in this but I am trying to implicate or blame the government that brought in this Speech from the Throne there in the last session of this House of Assembly. I do not know who wrote it, Mr. McLean, perhaps he did, I do not know. Maybe we will find out what Mr. McLean did when the minister gets the answer to our earlier question. I know it was not Mr. Goldfarb.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to state again for the record and for the benefit of members of the House who may be interested in this and for the benefit of the press that the Throne Speech, as delivered on Wednesday, March 1, 1972, just prior to a provincial election in this province stated, "Legislation will be introduced at the earliest possible date," which implies legislation is drafted, ready, it is just a matter of introducing it at the earliest possible date, in conjunction with the Federal Government an inexpensive shared-cost insurance programme covering loss of fishing gear." This to me, Sir, is a positive statement that legislation will be introduced at the earliest possible date. There is no mention of an agreement will be attempted to be reached at the earliest possible date with the Government of Canada, That would be the interpretation that the honourable minister put on it. What I am saying is that this was a misleading statement and I am very surprised and even shocked to hear the minister

come in now, without blaming the minister, to hear the minister come in now and state, not that negotiations are still continuing and some result is likely to be reached shortly or in the near future but comes in and with really a negative statement says that the Federal Government really do not want to look at the type of programme which he would like to see and we would all like to see in the province. This to me, Sir, was a gross misleading of the public of this province, "Legislation will be introduced in conjunction with the Federal Government to establish an inexpensive shared-cost insurance programme covering loss of fishing gear." I hope, Sir, and this is not the first example of this, I hope, Sir, that the press of this province, who have a duty to inform the people of this province what transpires in this House, will give the proper coverage that this particular item does deserve. It was a misleading of the public of Newfoundland just before a provincial election was to take place.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get back to my original question and ask the Minister of Fisheries, at the present time if one of the fishermen in any of our communities in Newfoundland does lose his fishing gear, is there any programme whereby he can be partially paid for the loss of this gear? I know in my own district I have three people at the present time who lost fishing gear last year and one man to the extent of \$4,000. Is there anything that his department can do to help out these fishermen?

MR. CHEESEMAN: I am sorry, I think I have followed all of the commentary, but there were a number of people last year that were excluded from the programme for various reasons other than by areas, the sort of inequities that in fact I was referring to previously and there was a time limit set. When this present administration came in there was not sufficient amounts of money then left in the vote to pay the claims which had been filed within the legitimate time for filing. So an additional amount of

money was then voted to cover the claims which had been received within the specified time and were considered legitimate and for claim, and a further amount of money was voted in order to cover these outstanding claims and that was the end of last year's programme.

Now that is the actual position as of now.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, say for example a fisherman in Bonavista North, in Wesleyville, loses \$4,000 worth of gill nets, what is the proper course of action for him to take to be reimbursed for the cost of these nets?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Well again bear in mind that these negotiations, as I have stated and as I have indicated in answer to a question from the honourable House Leader, this is not yet finalized. As far as we are concerned it is a question which we are still **pursuing** but at this point we have an amount in our budget. Last year there was \$1.00 token vote in, I believe that was the amount, \$1.00 token vote in, and the loss was done on a storm damage basis where the storm was considered of sufficient importance and the loss was great enough to warrant it. This year we have \$200,000 in, so I would hope that whichever way it goes, whether we have to pay it from this fund without benefit of insurance or use it for insurance, that legitimate losses caused through storm damage where a major loss is concerned, because that is the area we are in and that is the area that I am not particularly happy about, that it would be met on the same basis.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would think myself that the honourable Premier, who was acting Minister of Fisheries at the time, has a duty and a responsibility to explain to the people of this province, the fishermen of this province why the legislation that was mentioned in the Throne Speech in the last session of this legislature

MR. NEARY: will not be introduced. Sir, he was the Acting Minister of Fisheries. The honourable Premier and his administration made a solemn promise to the fishermen of this province, Sir, and now we hear that the legislation will not be brought into the House in this session or in the foreseeable future. I think the honourable Premier should explain to the fishermen of this province why it will not be done. This is an unfulfilled promise, Sir. It is a promise. The fishermen of this province have put their faith and their trust in this government and they are entitled to an explanation, Sir.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Chairman, in that Throne Speech that was referred to by the honourable member for Bell Island; "legislation will be introduced at the earliest possible date to establish, in conjunction with the federal government, an inexpensive shared-cost insurance programme covering the loss of fishing gear." This amount in the estimates is what we think it will cost and which is put there for the protection of the fishermen. The reason that the insurance gear policy is not being implemented is because the Liberal Government in Ottawa have turned it down.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, we know what the Speech from the Throne said, and the Premier read it accurately. But as my friend and colleague the member for White Bay South said, the words used in the Throne Speech imply clearly, they make it obvious, they make it clear, Your Honour, that there had to be an agreement with Ottawa but they gave a clear implication that an agreement had been reached. That is what we are going at. It is a clear implication, when it says, "legislation will be introduced." if it were not that, "at the earliest possible date," very firm words. It does not say, "my government" or "my ministers feel that there should be such a programme" and they will get on their horse and go to Ottawa and when they get to Ottawa they will say, "we think there should be such a programme, join with us," That is not what it says. What it says is that legislation

MR. ROBERTS: will be introduced at the earliest possible opportunity.

Now what I want to know is when Ottawa, first of all on what basis that statement was put in. Was there any indication from Ottawa? Now they are on dangerous ground and I merely say that I perhaps know a little more than honourable gentleman might think about this, I would like to know the reason it was put in, not a statement, not a statement. These are considered words. The Speech from the Throne is not a speech in debate, it is not the sort of thing that in committee or in the House we are speaking off the cuff and without preparation, The Speech from the Throne is a considered, a thoroughly considered statement of the government's policy. There are no words used loosely in a Speech from the Throne, I would hope. Why it said legislation will be introduced, why it said that, why it did not say that, "my ministers are convinced that such a programme is necessary, of vital importance," It could say that very easily. The ministry believe that if they do they are right. It is of vital importance.

It makes the flat, categorical statement, "legislation will be introduced at the earliest possible opportunity," implying that the Justice Department draftsmen have done the Bill and it is merely a matter of it coming in.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister is nit picking, of the worst sort. It says legislation will be introduced as soon as possible, right? Obviously that is obvious, nothing will be introduced before it is possible. The Minister of Finance cannot walk on Hogan's Pond before it is possible, not yet, but he is working on it.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is afraid he will meet you.

MR. ROBERTS: Afraid he will meet me, he better be afraid he meets me. He better be afraid he meets me. But, Mr. Chairman, it is serious

MR. ROBERTS: because if the ministry cannot give us the reasons why they put that in, if the Minister of Fisheries cannot stand to say that, then the clear implication is that there were no reasons.

Now at the same time I would like the minister to say when Ottawa indicated to the ministry to the administration of the government of this province, when they indicated that they would not, "I know the answer to it as well," says my friend from Fogo.

First of all on what basis was this put in? Who in Ottawa held out the hope there would be such a programme? What reason did the ministry have for even thinking there would be such a programme, let alone why did the statement say "legislation would be introduced?"

Secondly would the minister be good enough, Sir, to tell the committee when Ottawa intimated, it is the top of page four in the Throne Speech. The Premier read it correctly but we will read it again. "Legislation will be introduced at the earliest possible date to establish, in conjunction with the federal government, an inexpensive shared-cost insurance programme covering loss of fishing gear." That was a commitment, right out on television, that was **the half million dollar session, the famous session.** The day when we knew, some of us knew more definitely than others, there were some men present who knew for certain that House would never meet again. There were some of us who merely suspected and in the event, as the whole world knows, the House only met the one day then we had another democratic exercise, Great fun, it was great fun. There is a story that will come out about that in due course. But that is another story. Now we are talking about this.

The statement was made. It was made. Now the minister comes in and says, "**there** will be no legislation, the vote is not to be used for that it will be used for storm damage, if it is used at all. There will be no legislation because Ottawa will not hear of it" and the Premier gets up and

MR. ROBERTS: says it is the Liberal Government in Ottawa. Well it is true the government in Ottawa is made up of the Liberal Party, it is now and it will be after the coming democratic exercise but again, that is another story.

MR. MOORES: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Right! Right! Right! Right! Never any predictions of victory because I knew. My surveys were just about as good as the Premier's.

MR. MOORES: Well why work so hard.

MR. ROBERTS: Why work so hard? I am working hard now, Sir, and so are my colleagues. It will be four years before we get a crack at them opposite. We are going to go on working hard. If the Premier could get all his colleagues to work hard we would be doing well.

Now, as I was saying, not the Minister of Fisheries, he works hard. I agree. Now we are told by the minister that there is to be no programme, Ottawa will not agree. Well what I want to know is when Ottawa said they would not agree. When? I will not accept, I will have to accept but I will not rest content with an answer that the information was communicated at the May meetings. I will accept, I mean if a member makes a statement I must accept it but I can tell him that I will not rest content and in an appropriate place and in an appropriate time, I can take that matter further, if that is to be the answer, because I want to know if the information were communicated before this.

Furthermore, I would like to know, in any event, on what basis the whole thing went in. My friend from Pogo, who was Minister of Fisheries for two or three years, Acting Minister for a couple of years, can say a few words on it but it is not a new subject, it has been on the go for how long, this inshore programme? Back to the time when Richard Cashin was Parliamentary Secretary to the honourable Mr. Robichaud, then the

MR. ROBERTS: Minister of Fisheries, now the Governor of New Brunswick.

This type of programme was on the go as was the catch-failure programme.

I want to know, you know, it never came to fruition before. We heard the Speech from the Throne and said, "they have done it, they have pulled it off," Now it turns out they have not pulled it off. Well I would like for the minister to tell us on what basis they thought that that statement would go in, because unless the minister can tell us that reasonably and convincingly, then it is obvious that this statement is not correct. That leads to serious implications, Sir.

So let us hear from the minister, because it is an important point. The statement was made and now all of a sudden it is gone to ruins. We want to know why it was made. Maybe the Premier will answer, he was the minister at the time - but somebody on the government side, Pretty well anybody will do, anybody who can speak for them over there. Why was it made and when did the news come from Ottawa that Ottawa were not prepared to engage in such a programme?

MR. CHESSEMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the conversation or the points have gone back and forth. I had hoped the position was clear. As far as I am aware, the subject of inshore insurance was one of the items which this government took as priority. The need for and it was a subject that had been communicated to Ottawa. As to any point in time, when to identify a day or a date, I am not sure that I can do that. I will check the files, however, and see. But the fact of the matter is that the \$200,000 is in there.

Now insurance goes by many names. If we want to bring in a contributor, assuming that the government wished today to bring in an insurance policy and made the fishermen part of it and in fact did charge

a premium, as was projected, then perhaps the province and the fishermen could go it alone. I do not feel really that that is fair and equitable, I believe we need this other portion too and I have indicated previously that, for my part, I do not intend to see the matter stop there or consider Ottawa's decision or indicate it, because we do not have a flat denial, again to my knowledge. No, we will not. The fact is that they are not happy with this type of programme and in

my last conversation with the officials in Ottawa they were still looking at and exploring the possibility of some form of aid towards gear loss. So I do not think that we can sort of close the door and say that it is irrevocably out at this point. But the \$200,000 is in there and the government could make a decision to charge the inshore to a premium but I am afraid the premium would be relatively high without the federal government aid.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Chairman, I recall having gone to Ottawa on at least two occasions, one as late as December 1971, on that same matter, to try and get Ottawa's participation in the insurance scheme for the fisherman. I was informed by the minister, through the minister, through his deputy-minister, that they would not be participating in such an insurance - as late as December. I was flabbergasted when I heard the Speech from the Throne read by His Honour, reference to which has been made here now, that the present government would bring in legislation to bring in such an insurance.

Mr. Chairman, it is a misleading statement and I would say, without any confirmation at all, from Ottawa, that such a participation would be entered into between Ottawa and the Province of Newfoundland. I tried when I was minister of Fisheries, on two or three occasions, and was turned down. I cannot see where the present government got any encouragement at all from the government at Ottawa, that they would participate. So, Mr. Chairman, the storm damage as mentioned here now, does that include the damage by longliners or does it include only the inshore fishermen? Because there is a vast difference between the storm damage of inshore fishermen and the loss of nets by longliners. Could you clarify the two? Does it apply to longliners as well as inshore fishermen?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Well, obviously the losses of the inshore fishermen are by many causes. There are times when storm damage is claimed when in

effect nets are lost for other reasons. Trawlers, the gear is being hauled out of the water by boats going by. This is a continuous problem with them. But, as far as our allocation of funds this year what I said was, that the previous administration put in a dollar token vote and paid a per proportion, not in total but a per proportion of storm damage lost. We have put in \$200,000 and will pay on the same basis.

Now, hopefully that is the maximum. But as far as I am concerned I think we must still, in the interest of our fishermen, pursue this with Ottawa and get some form of a programme built into this \$200,000 which we have, to bring the contribution by fishermen to an absolute minimum requirement.

MR. WINSOR: I think the difficulty there, Mr. Chairman, is participation of the fishermen themselves. That is why the programme failed a few years ago. That is why Ottawa decided not to participate because they could not get the participation of the fishermen and they saw a great lack of interest in such an insurance by the fishermen. I am very happy to know that the minister is contemplating that, but if the need arises that there is an amount there which can take care of storms, it is very gratifying. I am sure it will be gratifying to the fishermen.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, that is well said by both the minister and the gentleman from Fogo, that, you know, if we do have a storm or losses are sustained, there is a fund or a vote or a subhead or whatever it is called, out of which the damage can be paid and it will be paid on the same basis as in previous years. I think all of the fishermen who may be affected by that will be very glad. A good thing, a very good thing indeed. But the minister neatly slid away from the question. So we will go back at it again. He really will have to answer it because we are quite prepared to keep asking him. We want an answer. Let us once again review the situation so that the minister, if I did not make myself

clear perhaps I can this time. As my friend and colleague the member for Fogo, the dean of the House, he has been here longer than any of us, probably will be here long after most of us are gone, as he said this matter is not new, Indeed while he was acting minister of Fisheries, as recently as December last, seven months past, he was in Ottawa asking Ottawa for a fisheries gear insurance programme. The new minister made it a priority, Well, so did the old ministry. It is not new, it is not a new idea. As long ago as, to my certain knowledge it was 1963 when Richard Cashin was parliamentary secretary at Ottawa. He said it was under discussion then.

It was under study It is still under study. Ottawa would never say no to anything. The honourable gentleman opposite who went off to Ottawa with their long-range planning and such got a good reception. The Minister of Fisheries got a good reception. They probably took him out to lunch, If they did not take him, he took them out to lunch then. He got a good reception. They are studying all sorts of things. After we are all dead and gone they will still be studying them. Ottawa will never say no. Just keeps rolling on, like old man river. When they do not say "yes" the honourable gentleman can deduce they have said "no." There are very few times in history when Ottawa has ever by word or by deed said we will not agree with that or we will discontinue this programme. Some will get lost in the mire, which is just between the Confederation Building up there that houses the finance department and the treasury board, somewhere between that things tend to disappear. It is just like out by George's Brook on the Trans-Canada where a bulldozer was lost once. To this day it is still on the Trans-Canada by the steps from Lethbridge running up towards George's Brook, Bonavista South. The gentleman from Bonavista South is doubtless familiar with it. That road used to go out through there.

At one stage, the contractor simply lost an ordinary bulldozer which just sank down in the bog, I suppose it is still there. At least it is solid ballast, pretty expensive ballast. Well, the former minister tells us that in this matter he had no hope, no chance, no indication - that was in December. In March, the first day of March, the flip-flop session after the new ministry had been in office for six weeks, we hear His Honour the Governor reading the words prepared for him by his ministers, by the honourable gentlemen opposite, saying categorically, not that it is a priority with the administration (that would be a fair statement) not that they hope to work out something with Ottawa (that would be a fair statement too) but rather that legislation will be introduced at the earliest possible date to establish, in conjunction with the Federal Government, an inexpensive shared-cost insurance programme covering loss of fishing gear.'

We heard those words and I am sure everybody in Newfoundland who heard them that afternoon or read them in the newspapers or heard them reported in the news reports, on the radio and on the television, said, "Ah! Ah! they have an agreement, they have a programme." Not a hope, not a priority, not an ambition, not a name, they have a programme. They have worked it out. As the member for Fogo said, we were somewhat taken aback. We made some quick checks with unofficial but accurate sources which indicated that there was no such agreement and little possibility in the foreseeable future. The matter was being studied but little possibility of any conclusion. There was not much of an opportunity at that stage to develop it, other matters intervened. Priorities change drastically, and off we went. Well we are back at it now. That was the situation on the first of March.

A clear undertaking there would be such a programme. A clear inference that Ottawa had agreed. Well, what I want the minister to tell me is on what basis that statement was made? Because Ottawa has not agreed. He stands here himself now and says Ottawa has not agreed

June 29, 1972. Tape 1116 Page 5.

to this day. That is four months gone by. They have not agreed.
I want to know on what basis that statement was made. There may be
a basis, there doubtless is a basis.

MR. ROBERTS: He says it may even be a reasonable one. But I would like for him to tell us, because if they do not tell then a clear implication follows and not a very pleasant implication. If they do tell us and it is a reasonable one then, obviously, fine. We will accept that. I have asked the minister before and my colleague from White Bay South asked him. The minister has always been pleasant and he answers reasonably and rationally and properly, but he has not answered the question. So would he tell us. All he has told us is that it was communicated to Ottawa and it was one of the new administration's priorities, Fine! Ottawa has wire baskets up there, filing cabinets filled with communications from new administrations of what their priorities are to be. Useful information. It should be communicated to Ottawa. Very well, well put together but not an implication of an agreement. Now, now the minister tell us that, Mr. Chairman? Would he tell us on what basis that statement was made? That is all we are asking.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Any more than I have already said, Mr. Chairman, I could only add to that that as far as it would be considered and assume that the need is obvious. I was not aware nor am I now aware of what the honourable member for Fogo said that the same thing had been approached in December, I have no knowledge of it. The need is there. The good faith, as far as Ottawa was concerned, if anyone asked me if it were presented to them, would they accept it. I would have said, "yes." But specifically more than that, to say that the department has been approached, we have endeavoured to sell them. They are not favourably disposed towards it. They are looking at the thing. They have not, I think it would be unfair for me to say that they have rejected totally and out of hand but that they have not accepted that, quite right. I cannot add any more to that.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Mr. Chairman, politicians are known everywhere in Newfoundland, Canada, Great Britain, the United States, to use so-called weasel words sometimes when they are making statements, so that if

MR. ROWE, W.N. something does not go quite right in the future, they can squirm out from under. It is not unknown here or anywhere else in the democratic world or in an undemocratic world for that matter.

Mr. Chairman, has the minister seriously risen in the House today and stated that on the basis of a letter, a one-sided communication sent from the Government of Newfoundland to the Government of Canada, sometime in February I would imagine or early March or sometime in February it would have to be or late January, on the basis of a communication to which he has already admitted that there was no answer from Ottawa, until he went up six weeks or so ago to meet with the officials of fisheries at Ottawa. Is he stating that on the basis of a letter sent to the Government of Canada expressing the pious hope and aspiration and aim that some such insurance scheme be entered into with the co-operation and with funds from Ottawa, is he stating that on the basis of sending that letter that the government drafted together with a Speech from the Throne and got His Honour the Lieutenant Governor to come into this House and to read the following statement which has already been mentioned in this House, which has to be stated again, "legislation will be introduced" His Honour the Lieutenant Governor says that legislation will be introduced by his ministers at the earliest possible date to establish, in conjunction with the Federal Government, an inexpensive shared-cost insurance programme covering loss of fishing gear.

A positive unqualified statement with the except of the words "at the earliest possible date," which referred directly to the fact that legislation will be introduced. All of which implies that everything was in a state of readiness at that point. Everything had reached the point in time and preparedness where legislation was perhaps in the process of being drafted by the Department of Justice to be introduced to this House of Assembly when the House finally sat to pass upon legislation.

Will the minister state whether, in answer to the question asked

MR. ROWE, W.N. by my friend, the honourable Leader of the Opposition, will the minister state whether this statement was in fact placed in the Speech from the Throne and read by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor on no more basis than a letter send to Ottawa to which there had been no reply at the time that the Speech from the Throne was drafted up and presented to his Honour for reading?

Would he also say or the Premier, who was the Acting Minister of Fisheries, why in the same circumstances there is apparently no reference in the Speech from the Throne delivered, on April 19, by the Administrator,

MR. ROWE, W.N. on Wednesday, April 19, following the general election when the government got a mandate from the people, why there is no reference at all to this insurance programme, which was stated in the earlier Speech from the Throne which was read by His Honour prior to the general election.

Will the minister stand up and give us some reasonable explanation of this, Mr. Chairman? The circumstances had not changed, when this second Speech from the Throne was prepared. The same circumstances completely were in effect. A letter had been sent, presumably no answer had been received. No answer had been received when this Speech from the Throne was drafted up. No answer had been received when the second Speech from the Throne was drafted up and presented to be read.

So, Sir, we had, prior to an election, the day that an election was called, we have a categorical, unqualified statement that legislation effecting an insurance programme was going to be introduced into this House, the day that a general election in this province was called. Subsequent to the general election, we have a Speech from the Throne which makes no reference whatsoever to such an insurance programme - I am so informed by my own colleagues, I have not pursued it recently. I am so informed that no reference has been made to this programme in the Thirty-Sixth Assembly Throne Speech.

Will the minister tell us why that is? Because, unless he can give us a convincing and plausible explanation, one inference and one inference only can follow from this information which we have laid before the House of Assembly today.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Chairman, it seems to take a great many words in order to make a very simple point. I might say that regarding as to why this was put in the first speech and why it was not in the second and why it is not in fact legislation now is, as I have said before, that Ottawa basically turned down the proposal.

MR. MOORES: Now if the honourable gentleman wants to name names, we will gladly do that. The honourable Jack Davis came down here to make a call, to draw up a fisheries programme for this province. We went through a great many headings at that time, including insurance, and at that time that was well before the March election. It was probably January or February. At that time we were given to understand that these programmes would be given sympathy, that these programmes were the type of thing that they wanted to develop and here we went ahead in good faith - most of those programmes did come through, by the way. The insurance one, upon reconsideration, on checking with his officials was turned down subsequent to that Throne Speech.

We dealt in good faith with Mr. Davis, most of our good faith was well placed. I hope we will deal in good faith with him in the future, but if we had made a mistake, the only thing we have managed to do is replace legislation with money that has the same affect.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder would the members of the Opposition mind if I made a statement now that is not in any context. I want to explain some news I have for the House about the oil refinery at Come by Chance. If it is all right, Mr. Chairman?

We have received a telex from Procon who the members know are contractors in the oil refinery at Come by Chance. I will read the telex. "This is to advise that all operating engineers on the Come by Chance site left the job yesterday in violation of a site labour agreement. We have attempted for two days to get them to return to normal work pending discussions of any points which they may have. Our efforts have been unsuccessful and without operating engineers it is impossible for any phase of the project to proceed anywhere near normal and the costs consequences of this are staggering.

In view of this it is necessary that the entire project be shut down effective 4:30 P.M. today Newfoundland time. We wish to advise you of this occurrence under the force majeure provision of our contract

MR. CROSBIE: and we will advise you later of the total consequences of this problem. Procon views this unilateral action by the operating engineers very gravely and we assume that the Government of Newfoundland will also.

We request any assistance that the government

Mr. Crosbie.

can offer to Procon and our Resident Manager in Newfoundland, Mr. Robin Lillibridge, in affecting the return to normal work by the operating engineers." As members know, Mr. Chairman, there is a project of a Collective Bargaining Agreement entered into at Come by Chance. This cessation of work by the operating engineers is contrary to the Collective Bargaining Agreement and illegal. We have the Department of Labour doing what they can to see if they can assist Procon and the union in having them return to work. Now this apparently has been proceeding for two days and Procon are now shutting down the entire job which, of course, is a very serious matter indeed. It is going to involve considerable costs. All I can tell the House at the moment is that this has happened. The officials of the hon. Minister of Labour are meeting today with the various parties to try to get them to return to work. I believe there are around one hundred operating engineers on the project but the work cannot proceed without them. They are the crane operators, I believe, heavy equipment operators and so on. There is one other matter I would like to state now. It is important. This is a question the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked me this afternoon. This is about the shipping to Stephenville. Again, the "Vancouver Forest" sailed from Goose Bay at 8:30 this morning with 6,000 cords of pulp wood in her holds.

She is due to arrive in Stephenville Saturday morning. The District Manager for the Department of Transport from St. John's was in Stephenville recently and met with our Marine Superintendent. He has indicated (this is a Mr. George, District Manager for the D.O.T.) that the dredge was on route to Stephenville. He could not give the exact time of arrival. He did mention that the dredge as usual was perennially late. Apart from the dredge a buoy which seems to have been ill placed in the entrance to the harbour has to be relocated and the coast guard vessel, which is presently in use, elsewhere servicing installations, is due to get into Stephenville by this weekend or hopefully before, either to relocate the buoy or perhaps to tie

Mr. Crosbie.

it to one side of the channel as may be necessary. It is our belief (this is from the consultants) that we will be able to bring the "Vancouver Forest" into Stephenville Harbour provided that we do not have any major wind at that time. The dredge that is now going to Stephenville, the work that it will perform is to take the dog leg out of the channel. It is our understanding that D.O.T. will present further estimates for approval in July, to widen the channel and secondly to dredge out the basin adjacent to the dock. What needs to be done now - once the dog leg is removed, there is no question of getting in or out. They can get in, without a major wind now, once they move this buoy. We have been repeatedly in contact with Mr. Chatwood, in Ottawa and elsewhere, pressing to have this work done. We believe that the "Vancouver Forest" will be able to get in on Saturday when she arrives, unless there is a major wind. Nobody here should go to the West Coast this weekend.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Chairman, on the first statement made by the honourable minister; He says that the Department of Labour are looking into it. Have the government taken any other steps as owners of the plant? Are the owners taking any further steps, i.e., (I am not recommending this.) injunctions? Secondly, is there any notion at all, if the plant does shut down or has shut down, is there any notion at all how much it would cost to get the momentum built up again, just that particular cost, just to get the momentum built up to the point where it was when she shut down?

MR. CROSBIE: I have no estimate of the cost on the second part of the honourable gentleman's question. On the first part: Officials of the Department of Labour are meeting with the union and the representatives of Procon and so on now or this afternoon to see if they can get the men to go back to work as they should. Procon, of course, should take it, if they feel that legal action is a solution. Procon should take it, the contract is with them.

MR. ROBERTS: Procon have obviously taken the legal action.

MR. CROSBIE: They stopped the job because they wanted to envoke the force majeure clause. If this is not settled in the next day or so, we will have to decide with Procon what legal action should be taken.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could inform the House what officials of the Department of Labour are involved in this confrontation. Is it the conciliation branch? Is it the assistant deputy minister? Is it the deputy minister or is it the minister himself who is actively involved in this dispute?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the minister himself is not. He is at other meetings. There is an official of this department. I think it is Mr. Cyril Churchill. That is the name he gave me, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Very well, we will all have lots of time to speak. It is only Thursday.

Mr. Chairman, the Premier's remarks, I am afraid, do not really throw very much light on the point that we are raising. I appreciate what he said, and as I understood what he said, it was essentially that the administration went to the Government of Canada and said; "we have a number of things we would like to see done in the fisheries field and here they are" and everybody in Ottawa said, "well they sound like very good ideas, very sensible, very reasonable, we will study them." Of course they would have said that even if you had gone with a programme, Mr. Chairman, to start a salt fish industry in the middle of Labrador. Of course they will study it, of course they will.

I have no doubt that the ministry here acted in good faith in making that approach to Ottawa. Equally I have no doubt that the Government of Canada acted in good faith in saying that they would study it sympathetically. The fact that the matter had been on the go for years and gentleman opposite, Mr. Chairman, should not assume that an idea with which they suddenly find themselves burdened is necessarily a new one. Most of the things the Minister of Fisheries said, in his quite good opening speech yesterday, were not new. They have been on the go for years. Indeed his late father would have been familiar with most of the ideas and so on back through the years. Honourable gentleman opposite, Mr. Chairman, should not assume that just because these ideas have not come to fruition, it does not mean that the men who could not bring them to fruition were either incompetent or unwilling to act.

The Community and Social Development Minister should not assume that all the things that have not been done in that department's responsibilities, that he will get them done. Maybe he will, maybe he will not but we will see. But if the minister had made a real effort at all, I suggest

MR. ROBERTS: he would have found out that the replacement programme had been on the carpet for years and had been looked at, so has the catch failure programme.

I know personally of at least four or five studies in depth by officials of catch-failure programmes, all of which have come to grief, nobody has ever been able to find a rational programme that meets all the needs and that does not have impossibly large loop holes in it. The same with this insurance programme. The Government of Canada had an insurance programme, Mr. Chairman, and they withdrew it. As I understand it, the real reason they withdrew it, they said so, was that fishermen would not take advantage of it. I think that is largely the reason. Men would not, if I am wrong the minister could correct me but men, rightly or wrongly, would not take advantage, they would not insure under it. Even now I believe few fishermen carry insurance except in cases where they are required to by mortgages with the Fisheries Loan Board, and that is a condition of the mortgage, of course, a usual standard condition in all mortgages.

So the situation is that the minister could have found out, very easily with a phone call or two, that this was not a new idea. His officials down there, Mr. Prince, or Mr. Russell, could have told him, Mr. Gosse, his Deputy Minister. All these gentlemen are familiar with the negotiations that have been going on over the years. Indeed I think if he looks through the memoranda submitted by Mr. Ross Young, who had the admirable habit of every time he made a visit to Ottawa he would dictate a memorandum for file, a very complete and detailed accounting and Mr. Young was very active in this sort of thing. I am willing to bet you will find in there references to that sort of thing, a bible of information on federal-provincial fisheries relations, a veritable treasure trove, well worth an evening or an afternoon in the summer to read them.

MR. ROBERTS: So anyway, the minister says he does not know why this statement was put in and the Premier tells us in effect it was put in as a statement of good intentions, as a statement of hopes, as a statement of what the government were asking for.

I do not disagree with that. That is fine, that is fair enough. I do not blame the government for asking for things. That is one of the things government should do. But, Sir, government should also be frank. I do not use that as a pun. Government should also fully disclose things. I submit, and if I am wrong correct me, Sir, if

I am wrong, let the gentlemen opposite correct me, We have asked now three or four times for some explanation on this. The minister says; beyond him, he does not know. The Premier speaks but does not give us the explanations, he does not give us a full and satisfactory one. He gives us an accounting of what happened. But, Sir, that does not square with the words in the Throne Speech. Because the Throne Speech is a categorical statement. There is no statement; we have or we intend to approach Ottawa and have them hear us sympathetically. It is a commitment, it is a promise. I submit that down in Twillingate, the honourable member for Twillingate was not a member in the House then, but, if he watched the Throne Speech on the television that day or any of his constituents, there are a lot of fishermen in Twillingate, They said; "boys that is it, they have one, they are going to do it, they have the programme that is what the Governor said, that is what the government are talking about."

Well, Sir, we have not had any evidence of that at all. I submit that and unless I am so wrong, this must stand, the honourable gentleman opposite had an opportunity to set the record straight, to give us an explanation, they have not. I must assume they have not because they cannot. I must assume that they cannot because there is no explanation. That leads straight as an arrow to the deduction that that statement in the Throne Speech was, now I must be correct, careful, was a terminological inexactitude, a terminological inexactitude -- a phrase hallowed in parliamentary history. Walter Carter would not know it, but it was first used by Winston Churchill.

The statement is misleading as it stands. It is not frank, it is not full, it does not state the true state of affairs. It simply

makes a commitment and it is obvious there was no reason for that commitment. It is obvious that this statement does not reflect the actual state of affairs. The minister says it is beyond him to explain it. The Premier makes an explanation that is no explanation, because if we take the Premier's explanation, I for one do, it sounds logical to me what he said, that is not the words in here. We cannot have it both ways, Mr. Chairman. This government talks so much about honesty of disclosure, let them be honest. Let them not bring in a speech that has in it not a lot of other statements, we have three years ahead of us yet looking forward to each and every one of them. Maybe it will be the same session of the House with maybe no recess of the House at all, with Labour Day off. We have that straightened out. There will be a lot of statements here but this happens to be the one we are discussing now under this Head, Sir. I think the minister should get up and say that. He should say the statement was made in an excess of enthusiasm. Maybe he should say, we were not that experienced in writing Throne Speeches. Let him not attempt to deny the fact that statement was made and it is not a correct statement and if the ministry at the time had every reason to know it was not correct.

No legislation had been done, no agreement had been done. All that had happened was an appeal had been made to Ottawa and no one had agreed to study it. Well, Ottawa will agree to study anything. The hairbrained schemes they have from provincial governments, including the one of which I was a part, over the years from all governments across Canada. They will get them from this administration too, hairbrained in Ottawa's eyes, not in the eyes of the province that is putting them forward. It is a very serious matter, Sir. The minister comes in now and he has not dealt with it, he slid around it. I know why he is sliding around it. I have seen minister's before

caught on a sticky wicket. I suppose it would be a kindness to let them squirm off, I have nothing against the minister personally. He was not even a minister at that point. He was special assistant to the minister of Fisheries. He was on the hook, on the hitch at the time this speech was made. It is the first one. There is no reference in the second one, Like so much else, once the election is over that is the last we have heard of it. Let the minister try to give us - you know all I want is an explanation. I do not like standing up and saying that the speech from the Throne written by the minister has terminological inexactitude in it. But that appears to be the conclusion. That appears to be what happened. They have not given us any reason. The minister cannot. The Premier cannot.

MR. ROBERTS.

Must we accept the conclusion? Must we accept that a statement was made falsely? Could the minister set me straight? It is a serious matter when the Speech from the Throne, Your Honour, -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: That is right! Right! That is right! I agree that that did not come before the House, I can tell the honourable gentleman why.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, it was. It was made improperly. What it should have said is that we hope to lay before this House, if we get agreement from all concerned - agreed! agreed! That was then. I am talking about now. I am talking about now. There are many acts to be laid before the House that have not been brought in. It was drafted, It is still drafted. The honourable gentleman knows what happened. It was not any change of heart on the part of the government. It was not. He will have to admit that. Will he admit that? The honourable gentleman knows full well why that act did not come in, why it was not brought before the House and that is because one or more of the denominations objected to it. That was why. There is nothing wrong with that. There is nothing wrong with it. I agree with the statement that it should have been, "we hope to lay before" and so should this one. If the hon.Minister of Fisheries wants to get up and say that is fine, we will let him, We cannot press him beyond that. We would not. If any minister wants to stand and admit that this is incorrect and that when the statement was written it was wrong, that is was misleading, then fine that will settle it. That will settle it beautifully. That is the point we are trying to hammer. We have been an hour at it. If they got up at the start, Mr. Chairman, and said that, instead of the minister trying to slippity-slidy away and the Premier tip-toeing through the tulips around the point. Well the point is still there. It is going to still be there. Maybe some of my colleagues want to say something. Let us give the minister a chance.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): What does the minister have to say?

MR. ROBERTS: I mean, if he will admit it, then we will let it pass. That is the end of it. The House Leader shakes his head in that sad way of his. He finds it hard to believe that the administration of which he is a part wrote a throne speech that has in it what amounts to a terminological inexactitude. He finds that hard to believe. Well so do I. Apparently that is the case. It is not a smirk. I see the minister over there smirking. It is not a smirk. It is not a matter for laughing. It is a very tragic situation. There are fishermen in Newfoundland today who believe that Throne Speech. They believed it. On top of page four for the Minister of Justice.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, the old ones. There are lots of them. You can go back twenty-three years.

MR. MARSHALL: The other throne speeches sank with the boats with the steel bottoms that the honourable gentleman is -

MR. ROBERTS: I have no idea what the reference is.

MR. MARSHALL: Do you remember the sixty-six men, the Liberal Party.

MR. ROBERTS: I can remember the seventy-one men of the Tory Party? What about the price of the subsidized inshore - the promise to subsidize the price of inshore fish? What about all the trawlers we were going to hear about. Where are all the fleets sailing in the "Narrows."

MR. MARSHALL: They are coming when we get the -

MR. ROBERTS: I know they are going to come. They are going to come like the "Flying Dutchman." Now, Mr. Chairman, to come back to the point, without crackies corner, to come back to the point, I agree there are things in that election manifesto in 1966 that were not done. Of course there were. That was the political party. But now we are talking about the Speech from the Throne. We are talking about a matter by the minister's own admission that it is one of the priorities, not something peripheral like a solemnization of Marriage Act that is important but it is not a priority.

Mr. Roberts.

It is not a cutting to the heart of an industry as the minister said yesterday by his figures, which are wrong, affects 60,000 people. It is an important industry. This goes to the heart of it. In fact it affects every inshore fisherman in this province. They have been misled by this. They believed it. The people were willing to believe it, to take the administration on trust. Now they have their first lesson. A statement was made without anything to back it up. Do you want to call it 6:00 P.M., then let us call it 6:00 P.M. We will go and have a cup of tea and come back at 8:00 P.M. There is more to come, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: It is 6:00 P.M. I have not yielded the floor yet.

I have not

yielded the floor to the honourable gentleman.

MR. WILSON: You sat down. You took your seat and I rose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable the Leader of the Opposition yielded because of the fact that it was called six o'clock and the committee has to rise.

On motion that the committee rise report having passed certain estimates of expenditure, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have passed certain estimates of expenditure under the following heading: Heading XIV - Fisheries, Items 1401 to 1413 (03)(01) and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted, **committee ordered sit again presently, by leave.**

MR. SPEAKER: It being now six o'clock I do now leave the Chair until eight o'clock this evening.



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND



THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume 1

1st Session

Number 43

VERBATIM REPORT

Thursday, June 29, 1972

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

On motion, that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Supply,

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Heading XIV - Fisheries. Shall 1413-03-02 carry?

MR. W. N. ROWE: On this particular vote, Mr. Chairman, I would like to summarize very briefly for the benefit of the minister before he presumably speaks again on this particular subhead - summarize very briefly the position which we see has developed on the whole question of an insurance scheme, an inexpensive insurance scheme for the inshore fisheries, for the gear of inshore fishermen.

During the Speech from the Throne, delivered on March 1, 1972, by His Honour the Lieutenant Government, where he read out the intentions and policy of the government of the day at that time - the day incidentally on which or the day before which or the day on which the last general election was called. There are words to this effect, well words which I will quote exactly: "Legislation will be introduced at the earliest possible date to establish, in conjunction with the Federal Government, an inexpensive shared-cost insurance programme covering loss of fishing gear."

As we stated this afternoon, this is an unqualified commitment by the government to introduce at the earliest possible date and those words imply as soon as the House of Assembly could be conveniently be called together and they also imply that there is an agreement with the Government of Canada. They also imply that the drafting of legislation is or at least the agreement or the policy or the programme is in the draft stage of development and that legislation would be definitely, unequivocally, categorically introduced into the House of Assembly at the earliest possible opportunity.

We learned this afternoon, when the Premier and the minister

MR. ROWE, W.N. attempted to explain the anomalous situation which has now grown up, we learn that the federal government have apparently turned thumbs down on any such insurance programme, as far as they are concerned. In other words, they will not apparently share in the cost of any such insurance programme for the loss of fishing gear.

Further questioning of the minister elicited some further information namely that back in February sometime, I would imagine, a letter was sent to the officials or the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa stating -

MR. CHEESEMAN: On a point of privilege. There was no letter on my part, that I know of no such letter.

MR. ROWE, (W.N.) Well I understood from the debate that a letter had been sent, but we will see this in Hansard.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Mr. Chairman, I meant to mention this earlier, actually. But I meant to do nothing more than merely correct the record.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Fine, okay, Mr. Chairman. Well then I was going to lead on to another point, namely that the Premier stated this afternoon that they have had a meeting with Mr. Davis and certain matters were discussed and apparently a proposal was put to Mr. Davis concerning a shared-cost programme for fishing gear. That was presumably done here in St. John's and Mr. Davis was down at one point. Is that the inference on the draw? That this was done in St. John's back in February sometime? The minister may not know.

MR. CHEESEMAN: I am not sure -

MR. ROWE, W.N. Well anyway the Premier says that before this document was read by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, apparently certain proposals had been made to the federal government either in written form or orally. If that is not the understanding then we can -

MR. CHEESEMAN: I am not sure and I say this subject to correction - I would say that was in reference to the second Speech from the Throne. Was that not so? Anyway, I believe that was so.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Anyway I am putting the best possible light on the situation from the government standpoint. I am assuming that in fact the Premier or the minister, before this first Throne Speech was delivered, made proposals to the federal government concerning a shared-cost insurance programme. That is not so. Then the situation the government finds itself in is even worse because apparently that is not so. Then this categorically statement here was apparently based on not even a proposal made to the federal government. So I will assume that a proposal was made. But certainly no commitment was received from the federal government either orally or otherwise, in writing. Subsequently, following the election, the honourable

Minister of Fisheries, in company with a number of his colleagues, went to Ottawa and was then informed, some six weeks ago informed that the Federal Government would not be participating or that they were going to study it. They did not give any kind of encouragement to the minister, if I have interpreted his remarks rightly this afternoon.

So the point we have reached, Sir, is this, that the government, the day before an election was called or the same day that an election was called, put words in the mouth of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, words which they had written, the Throne Speech, the advice of the ministers to the Governor, in which they made a categorical commitment to the Newfoundland people, unqualified commitment that legislation will be introduced etc. respecting an inexpensive cost-shared insurance programme. This unequivocal commitment was made to the Newfoundland people through the representatives in the House and through television on the eve of an election, at such time when the government had no firm basis whatsoever, no commitment from Ottawa, no indication even of a commitment from Ottawa that they would be sharing in the cost of such a programme and that now the minister has to come out and say that there is no insurance programme, there apparently will not be, at least shortly or at the earliest possible opportunity or shortly or in the near future, such an insurance programme but that there is an amount in the estimates to cover certain damage to gear.

Now the position which we put this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, is that this at best is the grossest kind of negligence on the part of the government, to put into a considered document, a considered, a thought out document, a commitment on the part of the government, at such time when they had no reasonable hope or no reasonable basis to assume that the Federal Government would be sharing in the cost of this or that in fact the programme at all would be going ahead. That is the best possible light. The worst possible light is, as my honourable

friend this afternoon said, the government is guilty of a terminological inexactitude. words used first by Sir Winston Churchill to cover words which are not parliamentary, which cannot be used here. Put the worst possible light I would say that we can place on it, Sir, is that the government, at a time when it knew a certain set of facts were not so, conveyed to the public the impression that those facts were in fact so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Again it is an area where it is difficult to know where to draw the line. However, I believe it is established that it is unparliamentary, not to say that a statement is untrue but to say that it was untrue to the knowledge of the member presenting it to the House or to members presenting it to this House. I think in Beauchesne, on page 130, "It is not parliamentary to say, 'this is not directly on the point but, 'it is not unparliamentary to say that a statement is untrue but it is unparliamentary to say that it was untrue to the knowledge of the member addressing the House."

MR. ROWE (W.N.): I do not have much to add, Mr. Chairman. I will simply say that I do not know whether the minister or the Premier or the government knew or did not know that certain facts were not true. I will say that I do not know that. I do not know. Maybe it was just gross negligence on the part of the ministry. That is the best possible light that this whole situation can be placed in, **gross negligence on the part of the ministry, on the part of the government, in this matter.** I will

MR. ROWE: say, since it is not unparliamentary, that at the time that this statement was made; "legislation will be introduced at the earliest possible date to establish a shared-cost programme in conjunction with the federal government," that that statement was untrue, it was an incorrect statement, an inaccurate statement. I will assume, I have to assume that it was made without malice aforethought. I have to assume that it was not made at all with any deceitful intent. I am sure it was not. Perhaps there was an excess of exuberance at a time when the government knew they were going into a general election. Maybe they wanted to build up hopes in the people of Newfoundland, the electorate of Newfoundland, which they may have reasonably thought they could fulfill, the government could have fulfilled, I do not know. All I am saying is that this statement in the Throne Speech in which the Lieutenant-Governor read the words of his ministers, is not true, was not true at the time that it was made, conveyed the wrong impression to the people of Newfoundland, I am not saying deliberately or deceitfully, did convey the wrong impression to the people of Newfoundland and that this statement was made when there were no facts whatsoever to back up the statement. It was made on a basis which does not exist. It was made on the basis of facts which are implied or inferred in this statement, that in fact the federal government was going to share in the cost of the programme, that legislation was probably ready to be presented to this honourable House. There was going to be an insurance programme, without any shadow of a doubt. Now we learn that the statement that there was going to be an insurance programme was founded on no sound basis whatsoever. There was no involvement by the federal government, every indication now that they were never intended to get involved.

There has been no explanation given by the minister that the federal government indicated a readiness or a willingness to get involved and that this statement is not true, It is false and whether to the knowledge

MR. ROWE: of the government or not, I do not know.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, my colleague from White Bay South has given a left jab and a right hook to the jaw and now I intend to give it broad sides.

Sir, administrations, governments all over this world have resigned on smaller issues than this, Mr. Chairman, a commitment made in the Throne Speech, Mr. Chairman, a commitment made by the Tory Administration. Mr. Chairman, how in the name of heaven can members on the government benches representing fishing districts in this province, how can these members go back to their districts again and look the fishermen straight in the eye?

The honourable member for Port de Grave, Sir, represents one of the greatest fishing districts in this province, Sir, Port de Grave fishermen have a reputation to be among the best fishermen in the province. Sir, how can the member go back to Port de Grave and face these fishermen? How can the member for Bonavista South go back and face the fishermen in his district? How can the member for Harbour Grace? No, there will be no point in the honourable member going back, Sir. How can the member for Green Bay go back? One time, Mr. Chairman, they used to call that Kiddy's Corner down there, now we call it Crackey's Corner. How can the member for Burgeo go back and face the....

MR. EVANS: ... Four years is a long time.

MR. NEARY: The honourable member for St. George's, maybe not so much the honourable member for St. John's South because that is largely a farming area?

MR. EVANS: What about the member for Gander?

MR. NEARY: The member for Gander?

The member for Gander, no, I will go down the line if honourable members want me to mention their names because that is the only time it will be mentioned in this House, they will not get up and speak. They will not speak for the fishermen of this province. I do not think they were sent here for that, Mr. Chairman. They will not get up and debate the issues. Here we have a commitment, a promise being broken, members who went out and campaigned on this issue as well as other promises. Got elected to this House, Sir, come in and hear the minister of Fisheries and the Premier admit this afternoon, admit in this honourable House that this particular commitment could not have been carried out and yet, Sir, it appeared in the Throne Speech.

Mr. Chairman, the fishermen of this province have been double-crossed. It is a double-cross, Sir. They were misled. A barefaced example, Sir, of a broken promise. Mr. Chairman, the government got caught with their pants down around their fishing gear policy. They had no intention of keeping this commitment, Sir. I do not blame it on the minister of Fisheries. The minister of Fisheries was not in the House at the time. He was not a member of the government.

But, Mr. Chairman, I contend that the honourable the Premier and his administration misled the fishermen of this province. The honourable the Premier should be in his seat in this honourable House tonight when his government has been charged with negligence. He should be here to defend the administration, Sir, more than negligence, he should be here to defend the administration. Completely disinterested, could not care less, Sir. I would say Mr. Chairman, the Premier should be here tonight to defend the administration and to protect his ministers. If he is unable, Sir,

to justify the action of the Tory Administration, then they should resign or the Premier should apologize to the fishermen of this province, Sir, for misleading them. A terrible thing, Sir, a terrible thing! I have been in this House eleven years, Sir, it is the first time I have seen it happen. The honourable member for Port de Grave almost got up on his feet this afternoon to speak on this matter, Sir, almost.

MR.ROSSEAU: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, it is obvious that the honourable member for Bell Island is trying to bait the honourable member for Port de Grave. I do not think that is in keeping with the rules of this House.

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order. You cannot bait something that is not worth catching. All that the honourable colleague is doing is exposing himself to the fire of the gentleman opposite. I think he is doing very well indeed at it, they are playing his game admirably, Sir, what is the point of order? Try to bait the member for Port de Grave, How can you bait something that will not bite?

MR.CHAIRMAN: With respect to the term used by the honourable member for Bell Island and also been used by the honourable member for White Bay South I believe and the honourable Leader of the Opposition; again, words spoken either in the heat of debate or in friendly jest back and forth the House are of course normal. However, the Standing Orders and the practices of the House say that it is unparliamentary to use contemptuous or insulting language and it is often again a question where you draw the line. Continued use of a term such as

MR. CHAIRMAN.

"Crackies' Corner", I believe is the term that has been used, could be considered contemptuous and I would ask the honourable members to take this under consideration and to refer to the honourable members of the House as the honourable member is supposed to do.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, thank you for your ruling. I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for Port de Grave started to rise in his place in this honourable House this afternoon. I assume he meant to participate in the debate. I hope, Sir, that he will get up tonight and say his piece, get his two cents worth in, Sir, in support of the fishermen of this province. I hope the hon. member for Bonavista South will get up and do likewise and all the other members on the opposite side of the House who represent fishing districts. I hope the hon. member for Port de Grave, Sir, will not lose his temper. I hope he will not say the things that he said this afternoon. He got a little bit excited, Sir. He got carried away.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Again the honourable member is discussing now 1413-03-02, Inshore Gear, Replacement Insurance, and I would ask the honourable member to consider the rule of relevance.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I hope the honourable members will not behave like school children like they did this afternoon. They said, "wait until I get you outside." This is what happened this afternoon, Mr. Chairman. "We have the trophy, now, take it away from us." It is this attitude.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is irrelevance again.

MR. NEARY: But, Sir, getting back to the -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, do we have to put up with this? Do we have to put up with it, Mr. Chairman?

MR. ROBERTS: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. Your Honour keeps saying and rightly so that the members of the committee should not use contemptuous

Mr. Roberts

language. The hon. gentleman from Burgeo-LaPoile has been guilty of this time and time again and would Your Honour be good enough please to call him to order, if in fact he is out of order, as I submit. There are some of the other gentleman down in the back, the same way. The hon. member for Bonavista South has just interjected himself again, Sir. Would Your Honour please call all members to order, if any of them should be out of order? May I finish without an interjection, Sir? Thank you. Would Your Honour please? I know Your Honour is enforcing the rules and doing a very good job at it. May I draw Your Honour's attention to the interjections which are now coming from Your Honour's left and which I submit are out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Again the Chair should bring to the attention of the honourable members that when it is felt that the normal debate in the House or normal interjections have gone beyond the bounds of the Standing Orders or the practices of the House, the honourable member should rise at that time on the point of order. Now a remark was made by the hon. member for Burgeo-LaPoile, I believe. I did not catch it. The Chair did not catch it. Is the honourable member stating that this last remark that was made by the hon. member for Burgeo-LaPoile is out of order or is the hon. Leader of the Opposition merely pointing out that all members are entitled to be heard in silence which, of course, is the case.

MR. ROBERTS: Sir, it is not so much the honourable gentleman's words that I take objection to. They may or may not be out of order. But that was not the point of my point. The submission is that my honourable colleague has the same right to be heard in silence as anybody else and the other members speaking to the House. Other members opposite I submit are - I will not say they are deliberately trying to interrupt him but should I say that a fair-minded person might come to that conclusion. All I am

Mr. Roberts.

merely asking is that Your Honour give my colleague the same protection that any other member would receive and which I know Your Honour is always careful to ensure that each member does receive. I submit that gentlemen opposite are interrupting my colleague more than is normal in the give and take of debate. Each of them will have an opportunity to speak if he wishes.

Certainly we will gladly hear them. Indeed we would welcome hearing from some of them, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Bell Island is entitled to be heard in silence as are all members of this honourable House when speaking.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sir, I do not blame the honourable Minister of Fisheries. I sincerely feel that if the honourable minister were minister of that department at the time I do not think that this would have happened. I do not think it would have happened, Sir. I do not think we would have seen this in the Throne Speech. But, Sir, the honourable Premier who leads this administration was Minister of Fisheries at the time and I think he should be in his seat tonight, Sir, to defend his administration. In my opinion, Sir, it was a very dishonest thing. The fishermen of this province had been led on the garden path, they had been double-crossed and the least that the Premier and the administration could do is apologize to the fishermen, Sir, for misleading.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Again the honourable member's attention is drawn to the point of order that I referred to when the member for White Bay South was speaking and that is that the implication of improper motives such as by the use of the term "dishonest" - well the term "misleading" I do not think quite goes to that stage. It could probably in other circumstances but the use of the term "dishonest" I believe again is covered by this rule that it is unparliamentary to say that a statement was untrue to the knowledge of the member addressing the House.

MR. NEARY: Maybe it would be proper to say it was political dishonesty. I do not know if that would be in order or not. Political dishonesty, Sir, and I think that the least that the honourable Premier and his ministers should do, if they do not resign, and they should, Sir, I think they should for misleading the fishermen of this province, if they do not

resign the least the Premier could do is apologize to the fishermen of this province for the misleading statement that was made in the Throne Speech in the last session of this House.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, before my colleagues and I hasten to Government House to implement the advice of the honourable member for Bell Island I thought it might be worth-while to say a few words. It was not my intention to do so but I think -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Exactly, exactly. I listened with interest to the remarks of honourable gentlemen on all sides of the House and certainly the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member from White Bay South. I think that these two honourable members made and indeed the honourable member from Fogo as well made, in a forceful, telling fashion, with as great a political advantage perhaps to be accrued to the Opposition possibly in comments on this particular item, and that is fair game. Obviously that is fair game, that is fair comment. The Opposition did, certainly in the speeches of these three gentlemen, make forcefully, effectively, in an oratorical manner, if not in a factual manner at least in a rhetorical manner, their point in the way to best accrue advantage and sympathy for the Opposition and for their viewpoint. This is fair game and nobody really can argue with that.

There are just two points I wish to make and the reason I mention these gentlemen is to distinguish between the points they made and the points, well I would not call them points but the things made by the last honourable speaker, because I think the others were points. They were debating points. They were put forcefully. No doubt they give encouragement and stamina and esprit to the supporters of the Opposition, and that is fair game. That is part of their job too. However there are two points, one

MR. OTTENHEIMER: there is only a sentence to the paragraph, but it is very brief. But even in the explanations which have gone with Holy Writ, and Lord knows they have been many and numerous - they say, "beware of the devil when quoting scripture"- well beware of members of the Opposition when quoting the Speech from the Throne, as well. But even in the explanations which have gone with scripture, from which people have attempted to prove so many conflicting theories, so many conflicting theories. Even from that kind of explanation, never have words, I think, or a sentence been interpreted in such a manner, which does not seem to result from the words in the text. We will just read it over again.

AN HON. MEMBER: Very liberal.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, liberal - now I must thank my friend. He suggests that it has been in fact a liberal interpretation of the words, and that indeed it has been. "Legislation will be introduced at the earliest possible date to establish, in conjunction with the federal government, programme." There is no need to put all the adjectives in there." A programme, legislation at the earliest possible date, in conjunction with Ottawa, to establish the programme." If Ottawa refuses, and until Ottawa agrees, "the earliest possible moment" cannot come. If Ottawa agrees next week, that is the earliest possible moment. If they agree next month, that is the earliest possible moment. But that is quite obvious. That is quite obvious. "Legislation will be introduced, at the earliest possible date, in conjunction with Ottawa, to establish the programme, when? If and when Ottawa agrees, the earliest possible moment has come and until Ottawa has agreed the earliest possible moment has not arrived. That is made very explicit, very clear. I really do not see that the honourable gentlemen from White Bay North and South and Fogo can expect to extract too much political advantage from their particular exegesis of that secular scripture. I do not want to be blasphemous - this secular scripture.

However, having said that, I do believe that anybody who wishes to bring into words the logical meaning - and the honourable gentlemen, obviously learned men in all sense, they know the meaning of those words "...will be introduced at the earliest possible moment, in co-operation with Ottawa..." When Ottawa co-operates, the earliest possible moment has come but until it cooperates it has not come.

MR WINSOR: Inaudible.

MR OTTENHEIMER: Oh! Thank you! I am certainly glad that the honourable gentleman reminded me because if not, I was very likely to have forgotten. Now, Mr. Chairman, as I say, while you know it is with a certain interest and admiration of the dexterity of explanation of script or miss-explanation of script that one listened to certain of the honourable gentlemen, if we are mentioned, it was with something well nigh close to amazement that one listened to the honourable member from Bell Island. "The double-cross of the fishermen." "Never in eleven years in this House had he heard such a thing." Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt but that in the heat of debate people speak with exaggeration. That has been known to happen. It happened, it will continue to happen. But really, for the honourable gentleman to say that when he was part and parcel of, "the contract was on my desk ready to be signed two days before the election, two days after they changed their minds - it is not my fault." Now really, Mr. Chairman, that is pushing the credulity of this committee and of Your Honour and of all of us just a bit too far.

The other points made were political. They were partisan, they were points which one expects and add to a certain sharpness of the debate; but certainly the remarks of the honourable member from Bell Island, suggesting that we were all going to take his advice and rush out and break the speed limit down to the Lieutenant-Governor's and hand in our resignations and perhaps recommend that either the honourable member from Bell Island himself or, more normally, the honourable member from White Bay North would be asked to form an administration, is going a bit too far. But when he suggests

that never had he heard such a thing, when the honourable gentleman himself was part and parcel of this contract business - and there are no two words, there are no scriptural-interpretation approaches to those words, that is really going a bit too far.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest this sentence, I suppose, can mean a few things. It could mean what it says, and what it says is quite clear. It can mean, if one wishes to interpret it that way, what members of the opposition have stated that it means. I think that the people of Newfoundland will have to judge themselves, and I hope that the words are printed exactly as they are and reported exactly as they are. If honourable members of the press do not have a copy, they should be able to get one of the Speech from the Throne. That was the first Speech from the Throne of this administration. The words are very clear. It is one paragraph. It is not like something - you cannot really quote it out of context. But I suppose anything can be quoted out of context. But it is a sentence and a self-contained paragraph. So really, one cannot in that sense quote it out of context. The sentence is, the paragraph is, the point of contention is that differing interpretations are upon this sentence-paragraph: "Legislation will be introduced at the earliest possible date to establish, in conjunction with the Federal Government, an inexpensive shared-cost insurance programme covering loss of fishing gear."

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if you took out what was between those commas, "in conjunction with the Federal Government," if the paragraph read: "Legislation will be introduced at the earliest possible date to establish an inexpensive shared-cost insurance programme covering loss of fishing gear," and if then this administration sought approval of estimates of expenditure for the Department of Fisheries, without having such a programme, then this administration would be guilty of a very serious abuse of the confidence of the people. That, however, is not reading the entire sentence because

there are those words in conjunction with the federal government. So I suggest, Mr. Chairman, and I trust that the gentlemen of the press will certainly report the debate on it, what any and all members had to say, but they will not forget as well to quote the paragraph which is under discussion. I suggest that only by leaving out the words between the commas will the interpretation suggested by the honourable gentleman opposite be valid, but by reading the entire sentence and the entire paragraph, by not eliminating those words, then their interpretation is not valid.

MR. WILSON: I rise to speak to this this evening. I have risen before this evening and I had to sit back, but now I have been attached tonight as the member for Port de Grave District. I had been called this evening "crackies." Yesterday we were called "pups." As far as I know with the honourable members that I am sitting amongst on both side, I do not consider there are any pups among them. I do not consider there are any crackies among them. I come from a district to represent, I do not claim there are any crackies there. I do not claim there are any pups there. I claim they are honourable gentlemen and honourable fishermen.

If the Leader of the Opposition wishes to point out to me that I am a cracky or a pup, well I am willing to take -

MR. ROBERTS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

I am quite willing and indeed anxious to hear the honourable gentleman speak, but I am not aware that I called him a cracky or a pup. Indeed I am not aware that I made any reference at all to the honourable gentleman. But if I did say that of

the honourable gentleman it would be quite improper. Those words used of an honourable gentleman are, I would submit, unparliamentary. But if the honourable gentleman wishes to accuse me of having called him that. He began his sentence, the words, if Your Honour wishes to write them down or have the clerk's write them down, were, "if the Leader of the Opposition," the time being at least that is I, "wishes to call the honourable gentleman 'cracky' or 'pup.'" I have used no such words in respect of the gentleman from Port de Grave. If I have used the words in the House at all, they have not been in respect to him. They have, I submit, not been in respect to any honourable member. Some of the honourable members may in my opinion acted like crackies, I would not -

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, that point of order, the debate tonight; the Opposition are only able to resort to name calling and to provocation of the basest kind in order to sustain their very shallow arguments. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the larger point of order that the Leader of the Opposition raised should be considered when Your Honour gives judgement of this particular point. The Opposition have been extremely guilty of most provocative statements all through this debate and it is a small wonder that these have caused some fairly sharp replies. I would suggest that the honourable Leader of the Opposition keep to the point of the debate in future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair has already brought to the attention of the honourable member from Bell Island the use of the term "cracky" with respect to the comments of the honourable member for Port de Grave. The Chair feels that the honourable member could have interpreted the honourable the Leader of the Opposition's statement in this manner in that the honourable leader at the time the statement was made was in fact looking at this area of the House in which the honourable member

for Port de Grave is sitting. However, the Chair has already brought this matter to the attention of the honourable members and if it is used again, the term is used again, it has been pointed out as unparliamentary and the House will have to, the committee will have to act at that time.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, may I be permitted to speak again? That was mentioned in this House this evening. The honourable Leader of the Opposition is willing to apologize as he has said. I hold no malice. I accept the apology. That was said here this evening. I was the man that spoke. I do not know what gentleman it was, I was the man who spoke and you had referred right back to me.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, could the honourable gentleman be a little more specific? If he feels I made some contemptuous remarks to him, I see no contemptuous remarks to the honourable gentleman at all. I may have been looking at that part of the House, at the handsome gentleman down there, a bit of a change from looking across at my friend the member for St. John's East, the Minister without Portfolio. But I make no apology because I have done nothing for which I should apologize.

If Your Honour feels I was out of order at some point, then on Your Honour's rulings at numerous points throughout this committee, the offending words should have been noted immediately and written down and so forth and so on. Your Honour has given the ruling a number of times.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair has already pointed out that this matter has been brought to the attention of the members of this honourable House

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak again. Then the honourable member for Bell Island gets up and attacks the member for Port de Grave District.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I did not attack the honourable member for Port de Grave. If the honourable member wants to make a charge let him make it, let him show me where I attacked him.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, it is a funny thing that someone on the other

side can get up and fire off at a member over on this side and he cannot even be mentioned. He gets up and tries to cool it off. He has mentioned the member for Port de Grave on this floor, three times tonight, and referred right over to him. Now, I do not want anything from the honourable member from Bell Island. He cannot do anything for the district. He never did. He cannot do anything for it. If he would be served the same fate in the next elections when it comes -

MR.W.ROWE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The honourable members obviously feels chagrined or annoyed at something, but we are in fact discussing inshore gear replacement insurance. I would ask Your Honour to rule that the rule of relevancy has so far been enforced with respect to this.

MR.WILSON: Mr. Chairman, I will get to that in a minute. My district is a fishing district, as well. The honourable member for Port de Grave made that known to the House.

MR.CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member would remember the rule of relevancy and speak to the item inshore gear replacement which is -

MR.WILSON: Inshore gear replacement, it is not the thing, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable members on the other side of the House were referring to when they were referring to me. This goes on with it. If the leeway is made for the honourable members to criticize the member for Port de Grave district on this side of the House, the member on this side of the House has to sit down and take it, I do not know what we are here for, who represent the district.

MR.CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is entitled to rise on a point of order at any time when an honourable member addresses him, addresses the honourable member for Port de Grave, in a term which might be considered derogatory. However, as has been brought to the attention of all members of the House, the point of order should be raised at the time the offensive words are spoken. The honourable member now should restrict his debate

to item 1413-03-02 which is inshore gear replacement insurance.

MR. WILSON: No more to the debate Mr. Chairman, if that is the tactic that the member for Port de Grave is going to receive in this House when he is referred to and is not able to get up and defend himself, I do not think myself that in this House there are any democratic rights.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask whether the honourable member were raising a point of privilege or something but I will forget about it. I am wondering is the minister going to say something about this head.

MR. GILLET: Mr. Chairman, very briefly, I would like to add my two cents worth, to use the expression of the honourable member for St. Mary's, I think that after such a lengthy discussion on this item, I think deep down in our hearts we do feel, on both sides, that the fishermen have been, I use the word "misled," perhaps. I do not think for one moment that the fishermen at least the majority of them are going to scrutinize that sentence in the same way as the honourable member from St. Mary's did. That will not pay them for their gear when they lose it.

However, it has been said by the former administration and I would presume and assume that these records were in the files of the department of Fisheries. Whether or not they lived in great hopes, as the honourable the Premier led us to believe they did, is one thing and whether they got a lesson from the former administration is another thing. But, I think we all realize, and I do represent a fishing district. Just last week one of our longliner fishermen lost four nets by ice. We all realize that some sort of protection should be and must be given to our inshore fishermen. They are not even in the same class or category as the longliner fishermen. They do not have that wherewithal to earn the higher income. They are

June 29, 1972.

Tape 1131

Page 5.

definitely in essence inshore fishermen. The loss of just a small amount of gear is perhaps greater to them than the loss of three or four gill nets to a longliner fisherman.

I am wondering whether or not there is any insurance companies, such as Lloyd's of London, come in force in Canada or any company which would be interested in taking a blanket or any overall insurance of say up to \$1 million for a premium.

Now perhaps \$50,000 would not buy much insurance for this type of a coverage. It is subject to losses of course and so everything is, whether willfully lost, the same thing could apply to fire insurance on a home and what not. But I am wondering and perhaps somebody in the former administration can set me right on this, somehow or other I have my doubts, but I am just wondering whether or not the Government of Newfoundland could induce or influence an insurance company or say Lloyd's of London, through its brokers, to give an overall coverage, based on the loss record of three, four, five years, give the Government of Newfoundland an overall coverage of say up to \$1 million, \$2 million, whatever they think is sufficient and the Government of Newfoundland pay out of this \$200,000 which they have set aside for this same purpose. If they could get a coverage of up to say \$1 million, \$400,000 premium, if this could be worked out, I think the fishermen of Newfoundland would be more than happy because, as I said in the beginning, we all feel and realize that some protection must be given to these fishermen. Now whether they pay the premium themselves or contribute towards that premium is another thing, but I think that they look to the government to do something for them, in their behalf.

I would like the minister, if he would, Mr. Chairman, to tell the honourable House whether or not this has been tried by this administration or any time in the past or whether any honourable member for that matter is able to set us aright on this. I am wondering whether

or not it is feasible or whether or not the administration even considers approaching some insurance company along these lines.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Chairman, probably I can set my colleague straight on this suggestion he has. Yes it has been tried. No insurance company would take that kind of a policy. I think, number one - the premiums would be much too high for the fishermen to afford. As I said this afternoon, that was the down-fall of the previous insurance schemes that the provincial and federal government had a few years ago. The fishermen were just not that interested at that particular time. Now that does not say that the reference to the legislation in the Speech from the Throne was not taken by the fishermen. Every fishermen in the District of Fogo, when I campaigned in March, referred to the new insurance scheme which the government was going to bring in. I told them what I had found out during my recent trip to Ottawa, in December of 1971, and I made it abundantly clear that the federal government advised me then, as Minister of Fisheries, that they would not and I repeat, that they would not be participating in any fishermen's gear insurance scheme with the Province of Newfoundland.

I told them as it was, and again I stated this afternoon, I was flabbergasted when I sat in this honourable House and heard His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor read that part of the Speech from the Throne. I said then and I said this afternoon, it was very misleading. I say it now that fishermen are very disappointed tonight to hear that there is no such scheme. However, I said it again this afternoon, I am very pleased there is some protection there for the fisherman if he should have the misfortune to lose his gear, and that is in that \$200,000. I am sure the minister, if such a misfortune happens, will give serious and sympathetic consideration to increasing that amount. I hope he takes that under very serious consideration.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Mr. Chairman, just a few comments. First of all I think the honourable member for Fogo has just mentioned it and I mentioned it also this afternoon, that last year there was \$100 in the vote and there was something in excess or close to \$300,000 paid out in total. This year there is \$200,000 in the vote. It was put in in all honesty as the contribution of the province to what, as far as I was concerned, was hoped to be a contributory scheme federally and with the fishermen, for low-cost insurance to the fishermen.

Now, I think that the problems that may arise in connection with any losses of that type this year will be dealt with again as they occur. I believe I would have to concur with the honourable member for Fogo in answer to the honourable member for Twillingate's question that everything that has been said tonight, and particularly the honourable gentleman's comments or questions concerning commercial insurance, continues to emphasize the need for such an insurance. It cannot be obtained elsewhere, to my knowledge. I believe that if it could be obtained elsewhere that as the honourable member for Fogo has said, all avenues had been tapped and could not be found, but surely that only emphasizes the need for such a programme.

Now, I would hope that perhaps one of the side benefits, if you can describe it as that, might come out of this because I am still not prepared to accept the fact that this is irrevocably closed out, done for ever and a day. As I indicated this afternoon, in my conversation in Ottawa, the government expressed or the government representatives expressed, at that time, a lack of acceptance of such a scheme. They pointed what had been done before. It did not work. I suggested at that time and I feel now that it might be noted that one of the reasons I believe is because of the lack of information that might have been available to fishermen at that time as to the availability of such an insurance and

in fact the total understanding of the programme. I would hope, as a result of this debate, that the importance that has been attached to it, the time we have spent on it, will only emphasize the extreme need for such a policy, because I can say without hesitation in this House that I consider it to be a very, very high priority item of any government dealing with the inshore fishermen of Newfoundland.

Now I have also received a couple of pieces of advice. I received some advice in dealing with Ottawa, which I take note of. I said this afternoon that I gave the reasoning or the explanation as I saw it. I really do not have anything to add to that and I feel that honourable members on both sides of the House must draw their own conclusions, inevitably. That, Mr. Chairman, is all I can say at this point.

MR. GILLETT: Pardon me for rising again but perhaps

before the debate is closed, if the honourable gentleman would be good enough to restate what I believe I understood this afternoon and that is that in the case of a, shall I say a major loss to any one fisherman or that does not have to be province wide, like a national emergency or something like that but if a fisherman, whether he be a longliner fisherman or a cod trap fisherman who might have say two or three cod traps, if through storm damage either of these fishermen lost his entire fishing gear, then the Federal Government would assist him. Did I understand that correctly, Mr. Chairman? I think perhaps you should make the statement to clarify this because the fishermen of Newfoundland are at a loss now. Let us face it, they are at a loss. They do not know which way to turn if they lose gear. I think that it should be clarified so that if the press is going to publish it the fishermen will know what to expect.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Mr. Chairman, one point at a time in connection with that. I see no reason why. It is only again interpretation of what so many things appear to be, that the fishermen should be lost. There is \$200,000 pledged this year for inshore gear loss where there was \$100.00 pledged last year. As I have already indicated, the situations beyond, the needs which arise will certainly receive the careful consideration of this government. That is one aspect of the thing.

Now with reference to my comments in referring to Ottawa, I said that this was the thing that bothered me. The fact is that Ottawa indicated that they would be prepared to look at major losses and to consider in the face of major losses some form of aid. Well we are doing that, in effect the past administration, the member for Fogo will be able to tell you they did that last year. What I expressed at that time and the reason for the need as I see it is the inequalities in that and the honourable member for Twillingate pointed out some of these things. Last year for instance losses were paid against a major storm, in a confined

area of Newfoundland, that took place on the 27th of June, I believe, if I am correct, from the 27th of June to the 2nd of July.

My point this afternoon and I still say is that that might have been of major proportion and involved a lot of gears and a lot of nets of one kind and another but surely the fellow who was, the lone man, if you will, with his longliner or his trap boat or his cod trap or anything else, the loss was just as important to him. He could not generate a major condition so that he could qualify. **This** is the real area. Sir, and this I submit is the real area for need. I would hope that every member of this House would feel the same way, that there is in fact a very real need for a low-cost insurance programme against inshore fishermen's gear in order to protect the earnings and the investment of our inshore fishery.

Mr. Chairman, regardless of which government is in power at any given time, they must face this from day to day. One of the great problems again is the fact that a man loses gear today, he loses a cod trap or he loses his gill nets, if he has to go through a long rigmarole, even if he could get it, if it takes him three weeks to get it, the fishing season is over and it is no good to him. It has to be something that happens today. An insurance of some type is the only answer. I am convinced in my own mind that there is every justification for it. I believe that Ottawa should seriously consider it. I think the amount of debate generated on this point this afternoon and tonight has only emphasized that fact. I hope that I have covered the point.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I will be relatively brief. I think there are one or two points that I would like to try to make, Sir. First of all to deal with what the minister just said, I do not think anybody over here could agree more than completely and we do agree completely with what he has had to say. I think anybody who has had any connection with the fishing industry in this province and I certainly cannot claim

to be at all expert in it but I do have a great number of my constituents who what living they make comes from the fishery and often it is not a very good living I fear but what living they do make comes from the waters that surround our province or the White Bay coast. The minister is right when he says that in the past there have been no adequate storm damage compensation programmes or no adequate damage compensation programmes.

In the last two or three years the Liberal administration got in to the business and I cannot say we got into it willingly, we got into it willingly but I cannot say we got into it gladly. It was going to be expensive, it was going to be unsatisfactory, it was going to be continuous and I submit that as long as there is a fishing industry in Newfoundland the government of the province will be involved in it. Apparently it was while Aiden Maloney was Minister of Fisheries that we first got into this on any sort of continuous basis. There is no real rhyme nor reason to it and I do not know, even if the minister had unlimited funds I do not know how he would work out a programme. We got involved in the instance of St. Barbe North and St. Barbe South with the destruction of gear by the trawlers coming inside the twelve mile limits and inside the three mile limits. We got involved in the storm the end of June, about a year past, and we got involved in a number of other storms but none of it was really satisfactory. It is an expensive programme with all sorts of problems. How does one determine the loss? How does one determine the value of the nets? Does one say to a fisherman; "Please repair your nets instead of buying a new net. All the problems that normally come up in an insurance type of operation are there in the fishing operation and are there with a vengeance.

We welcome it. If the honourable gentleman and his colleagues can work out a scheme, work out a plan, we would welcome it and I think we would vote quite gladly to have provincial monies put towards it. Indeed

we will vote this year for that. We voted last year for a \$1.00 token amount simply because we had no means to judge and I submit the minister has no means to judge this year. He might as well make it a dollar because it is a completely uncontrollable vote. It may require no expenditure or it may be a million. If we have a series of bad storms, it is possible one could get to a million. It got to about \$350,000 last year and I suspect there were some claims that were not dealt with in the 1971-1972 fiscal year, some claims that will still remain to be paid for out of the money which the committee will shortly approve.

All we can do is wish them well. I do not think we have any magic answers on it. As I have told him several times and as my friend from Fogo has said, the men in Ottawa, the officials in Ottawa, who are not stupid, they are not all bright but there are some extremely able fellows in the whatever they call it, the Fisheries Service, I guess, but that section of the Department of Environment and in the Treasury Board and in the Department of Insurance in Ottawa and in the various staff and functions that the Ottawa Government can call upon there are some very bright fellows. They have never managed to find an answer to this. It is significant that the commercial firms, the commercial insurance firms will not go near it. They will not touch it and they never would. It is just one of those things that is not an insurable risk. I do not know very much about insurance but that can only mean that it is completely unpredictable. The premium in effect would have to be one hundred per-cent and, of course, that is nonsensical.

But I wish the minister well. If he can do it, more power to him and I would be the first to say so. I will not be surprised if he cannot do it. Indeed I would be all the more surprised, surprise would come if they are successful, if he and his colleagues are successful in working out some means of dealing with this other than the present basis which is largely ad hoc. It is something, Sir, which one cannot plan. One

June 29, 1972

Tape 1133(Night)

JM - 5

perhaps can take historical averages over the years but even those are meaningless because I have seen some historical averages on alleged storm damage figures, I say alleged because they have never been collected properly and it is a hard thing to estimate. In any event, Sir, they go up and down like a seesaw. I do not think anybody in Newfoundland tonight can tell the minister to the nearest hundred thousand dollars how much will be spent or how much will be needed on storm damage and gear loss this year.

As he said, so well and so effectively and so rightly, one should not have to wait for a major storm. The man in Twillingate who loses his nets, even if he is the only man in Newfoundland who has lost them, Mr. Chairman, to him it is as serious as if everybody in Newfoundland has lost them, just as the person who has his house burned down it is no consolation to him to know that there has been a conflagration that has consumed half of St. John's. To him the loss of one house happens to be the loss of all his houses. So all we can say is, we wish the minister well. I think he means to do the right thing and I know he will try to do the right thing. He may not

Mr. Roberts.

be able to do the right thing but that may be through no fault of his own.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): It is the "Burp."

MR. ROBERTS: It is out of order, Mr. Chairman, but I would love nothing better, if Your Honour would allow it, I would gladly do it, debate in this House or elsewhere what the Government of Canada have done for the fisheries in Newfoundland in the last four or five years. I think the present administration at Ottawa (I think the minister would agree with this) have not done everything and they have done some things wrong. They have done some thing badly. I think the last four or five years we have seen more done for the fisheries in Newfoundland than has ever been done by any government in Canada, be it Liberal, Progressive Conservative - well that has been the only kind we have had in Canada, I think that is true both in salt fish and fresh fish and everywhere else. If the member for Burgeo-LaPoile wants to throw in his two-bit cracks for which he is becoming noted in this House, let him do so. I would love to debate it but it is out of order. I cannot even pretend that I am vaguely in order. The member said something else. I missed it. I want to say one or two other things.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): He is talking about the member being carried out.

MR. ROBERTS: Well he may well think that the member should be carried out. It is too bad that the member from Burgeo cannot see the faces of his colleagues when he makes one of his witticisms. It is too bad that the hon. member for St. John's North cannot see the faces of his colleagues as he carries on his little vendettas. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, let me just try to summarize the other point that has been raised in this debate. I think it has been a good debate. The hon. member for St. Mary's (I am glad to see that he has stepped back into the Chamber) gave us a prime example of the wisdom in the old saying, "a little learning is a dangerous thing." The honourable gentleman has been off in Cambridge the past couple of years, honing his legal wit. He has done very well. He gave us the

Mr. Roberts.

most tortured and most convoluted example of how to argue or how not to argue that I have ever heard in the number of weeks listening to tortured and convoluted arguments from both sides of this House. The hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources has not made any tortured arguments. He has not made any period. He has been off in Sweden, Sweding it. I am glad to hear that the minister is enduring. We have been enduring his absence. We are delighted to have him back. He adds something substantial to the House. He has a good tailor.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Mary's got up and made quite a witty little speech. I thought it was well worth the making. But neither he nor the Minister of Fisheries nor any other gentleman opposite has come to grips with the simple position. Let me state it briefly and I am willing to end it on this unless some other honourable gentlemen wish to make some contribution to the debate. My colleague the hon. member for Fogo who was (Acting) Minister of Fisheries for over a year has said that in December of this year past, December, 1971, the government of this province, (It happened to be a Liberal Government at the time) the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador were told by the Government of Canada that there would be no participation by that government in an insurance programme during this year. My colleague made that statement. He made it on the basis of personal knowledge because it was made to him. On the 18th. day of January the administration changed hands. On the 1st. day of March, the Speech from the Throne was read. In the Speech from the Throne (I do not have it in front of me. It was whisked off by someone. It does not matter) a confirmed commitment was made to bring in at the earliest possible moment, in conjunction with the Government of Canada, a programme of inshore insurance. Now merely taking out the words "in conjunction with the Government of Canada" as the hon. member for St. Mary's did in his feat of juggling, in his feat of verbal juggling, taking them out does not take away from the

Mr. Roberts

sense of the sentence. The sentence said, "legislation will be introduced at the earliest possible date to establish"(without the words in question)"an inexpensive cost insurance programme." The member for St. Mary's conceded that if the words had said that they would have been grossly inaccurate. He submitted that the words "in conjunction with the federal government " made them accurate.

I do not quarrel with that, Sir. I am not accusing the ministry of having misled anybody. I did say that that statement is a terminological inexactitude. I think that is parliamentary. I said it. I meant it. Nobody has told us on what basis the Government of Canada were expected to share in this. That is what we find hard to understand. As my colleague from Fogo has said, Sir, the Government of Canada had previously said that they would not share. So we have a set of facts with two points in it. In December the Government of Canada informed the minister and the Government of Newfoundland that there will be no participation by that government, the Government of Canada, in a shared-cost insurance programme. In March, March 1, a new administration, which have apparently made approaches to the Government of Canada but they have not even been in writing, said (They have been oral. The communications have been oral I gather. It gives the clear impression in words and the words could not be plainer. I am not playing the Scriptural text game at all) that the Government of Canada, in conjunction with that government, legislation will be introduced at the earliest possible date.

Now, Sir, all we have asked is on what basis was that statement made? We have stood here all afternoon and we stood here for an hour and a bit this evening and in some ways the hon. member for St. John's North is right, for once it is tedious. We have not been told. The Premier spoke, as head of the administration, and he did not say. The Minister of

Mr. Roberts

Fisheries was not in the cabinet at the time but was actively involved. He was a special assistant to the Minister of Fisheries. He was, I submit, in many ways the de facto Minister of Fisheries. The Minister of Fisheries has not given us any explanation. All he said is that in all honesty the statement was put in. I do not doubt the honourable gentleman's word. I cannot doubt it, in any event. Even if I were allowed to, under parliamentary rules, I know the honourable gentleman too well and I respect him too greatly. He would not say anything which he did not believe to be true. He did not give any reason, Sir. I think that is the only point we make. The statement stands. It stands in direct conflict with the information given by the Government of Canada to my colleague when

MR. ROBERTS: he was the Acting Minister of Fisheries It is in direct conflict and the government have given us no reason at all and that is all we are trying to say. We have asked them and they have given us no reason. They have not said why it was put in.

The Minister of Fisheries said, in closing his remarks a few minutes ago, that honourable members must draw their own conclusions. I think that is a fair statement. On our side we will draw our conclusions and the other honourable gentlemen will draw their own conclusions. I am afraid, Sir, the conclusion is obvious. I am afraid that that statement is completely inaccurate. I cannot say, I cannot say under parliamentary rules, I am not allowed to say and I am not saying that the statement was put in by men who know it was inaccurate. I am not saying that, let me be quite clear. But I will say that they have not given us any evidence, any evidence at all to support the statement they put in. They have not given us that in the face of a clear statement from my colleague for Fogo, that in December the Government of Canada said they would not participate. They have not shown us what changed in the three months between December and the first day of March. Actually it is less than three months, it is two months and a bit. That is all we have said. That is all we have said.

We will draw our own conclusions. The people of Newfoundland will draw their own conclusions. As the Minister of Fisheries says, "everybody will draw his own conclusions." Well that is our conclusion, Sir. In the absent of any statement all we can say is that there has been no justification from the government side at all. I am not calling him a liar. What I am saying is that we have two statements in direct conflict and they have not made any effort to contradict or deal with the statement made by the gentleman from Fogo. They have not given us any evidence.

Now let us let it stand at that. There will be other times and other places to argue the point. If any honourable member can add to it or can illuminate the debate, illuminate the point, I would welcome

it because it is a serious conclusion that I have drawn, Sir. It is a very serious conclusion indeed. The statements were made, they were made to our surprise and our surprise is all the greater because now that we have given the government the opportunity, they have made absolutely no defence. They have said they were made in good faith by them, I cannot question that but I can say they have given us no evidence in support of it.

Having said that, Sir, I am quite willing to let the matter stand unless as I say some other honourable gentleman wishes to get into it. I will listen patiently and with eagerness and interest and then if there is something that needs replying to, I for one would ask for the opportunity to reply again. Thank you, Sir.

On motion 1413-03-02 carried.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, 1413-04-01, why is it up from \$22,500 to \$60,000. Maybe if Your Honour will permit, at the same time the minister could tell us why the next item is down by one-half?

MR. CHEESEMAN: The item 1413-04-01 - Preliminary Expenses included the cost of providing initial equipment such as wheelbarrows, water pumps, water distribution lines etc. in approximately forty community stages, presently under construction and which will become operative this fishing season. The estimated cost is \$1500 for each community stage for a total of \$60,000.

MR. ROBERTS: So there are more stages than last year obviously.

MR. CHEESEMAN: It would be dictated by the number of stages. Item 02-Maintenance, \$20,000 for minor repairs, providing for maintenance of community stages already in existence and not covered under other programmes, but there have been other programmes.

MR. ROBERTS: Do these community stages, Sir, include all the community stages in the province? They were built by Ottawa, but were they turned over to the province to be operated by us, by the province?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Actually what has now transpired and only in very recent times, in looking at this and realizing that there was somewhat of a grey area here, because some of the stages were built by the federal government on provincial land, if the operation of the thing was not that clear somebody would raise a point about something needing to be done and we would have to trace back and find, try and find out what the actual situation was. So we approached Ottawa, some three weeks ago, suggesting that a joint committee be set up to tabulate all the stages and try and clear the whole thing. So they all will be brought into the one heading on this point, I hope.

MR. ROBERTS: Good! Good!

On motion 1413-04-01 and 04-02 carried.

MR. ROBERTS: MR. Chairman, 1413-05, I am just going to ask a word of explanation. There is just about a threefold increase. Maybe the minister could tell us what it is about. I do not know what my colleagues want to say on that point as well.

MR. WOODWARD: What I would like to ask; is this the regional office that is going to be set up in the province, Mr. Chairman? And this education - it cannot be.

MR. CHEESEMAN: ... current account.

MR. WOODWARD: It is current account and the information services. Maybe the minister can explain what the information services is and if it is dealing with the regional office.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Well the two are irrevocably linked and the personnel, which the honourable the Leader of the Opposition, which I think he just mentioned a moment ago, does tie into this under 1431-04.

MR. ROBERTS: No, 1431 is a blank vote. I am sorry -

MR. CHEESEMAN: Block Provision which is below this.

MR. ROBERTS: We will debate it there then.

MR. CHEESEMAN: The Block Provision for the department reorganization: But just in answer to the question this is really the support programme

MR. CHEESEMAN: of the department and of the regional offices, the comments that I have made yesterday afternoon, the time has gone on so long I am not sure whether it was this afternoon or yesterday afternoon, but when I made reference to our total lack of material, backup material passed out, handout stuff, updating of all the information programmes for the fishermen, at the moment we have six field representatives which personally I do not feel can in any way shape or form do their job properly because they just do not have the backup information or the knowledge and the tie with the department that they need. Even our programmes in boat building, insurance programmes of any type, boat and this sort of thing, and we saw it a little while ago, when there was a change in the rates for insurance on longliners, virtually everyone was sort of scrambling trying to find out. They put their boat in the water one day and suddenly they found their insurance rates had changed. There is just not the flow of information that is needed. The public awareness as well needs to be stepped up, participation in fairs and this type of thing, travelling vehicle that I anticipate are necessary in this sort of operation. These are the things the general support and publicity programme under these estimates.

MR. ROBERTS: MR. Chairman, it is a very good general answer, but I am afraid we have to ask for a little more specific information. There are no salaries to be paid out of this vote. There can be no salaries paid out. No, not out of that \$215,000, on the format of the estimates. I am sure the Auditor General would not allow a penny of that to go for salaries. That may come out of the \$100,000 of department reorganization. But this is a vast increase. I am wondering if the minister could be specific. Let me put it to him, I am after something, let me ask him point blank how much of this is going to go to George McLean? In dollars?

MR. CHEESEMAN: There is no money of this vote committed to anyone. The programme that is required will develop, the expenses will be

MR. CHEESEMAN: met as they are developed and they will be accounted for and only when we are satisfied that we are getting value for what we are doing will anyone earn anything out of this vote or be provided with anything out of this vote.

MR. ROBERTS: Let us try again.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Well that is the answer to your question. I have to say that there are no final commitment of this amount.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I do not argue about what the minister says. but we have finished three months of a fiscal year. Would he tell us please what the \$75,000 was spent on last year and would he give us please a detailed breakdown of what purpose is envisaged for \$215,000? It is an increase of \$140,000. It is quite an increase. Well it is about 200 percent increase. The vote is nearly three times as large as it was last year. What precisely has he in mind in asking the committee to approve this sort of money? What sort of thing - what has been spent to date this year? We are now one-fourth of the way through the financial year, so we should assume that about \$55,000 has been spent, assuming that it is a straight expense. The minister I think should give us a little more information. In particular has any money out of the \$75,000 gone to George McLean or his firm?

MR. CHEESEMAN: There has been no money, in fact this has been one of the things that worries me, the fact that time is going on and we are ill-equipped, within the department, to cope with even the start up of this. In the Block Provision there is a salary item in there for a public relations or -

or public office type thing, whatever you want to call it, to be able to get the information out of the department for the proper processing.

Now more specifically on the items themselves, the programme will provide fishermen and other factions of the industry with up-to-date, written, technical data resulting from experiments carried out under the many-faceted fishery development programmes, which will enable all concerned to take full advantage of the latest innovations which are found to have important commercial value. A further break down of that in the form of charts, scales, as well as written material outlining commercial resources, areas where a particular fishery or other marine resource such as irish moss might be harvested, repairing, publishing, distributing specialized information, booklets and brochures, pamphlets and other reference material pertaining to new fish products potential and their development and manufacture. This again is something I think I touched on yesterday.

By supplying detailed fact sheets and report on latest scientific and technical innovations deemed of value, so as to assist all sections of the industry to keep abreast and take advantage of commercial developments. By way of research and preparing detailed written information, such as fact sheets and documents on fishery potential of the province in general or for specific areas. This information will be supplied to interested parties or companies expressing an interest in locating, in this province, to carry out fish processing or other operations. Again this was something that I referred to yesterday, the lack of this type of thing at the moment.

By providing detailed, interim, final written reports outlining the results of all fishery development programmes which have been carried out or are currently underway. This refers specifically to the joint shared cost programme in the fishery developments that are carried out. By supplying written information to the general public

on all aspects of commercial fisheries of the province, by supplying written and other information on existing and ongoing fishery programmes to industry at large and to the general public, by supplying written and other information to industry on the fishery policies of government:

In addition to providing this in the written form, it is the intention to develop technical and documentary filming for radio and television as well as other media to be extensively used by the headquarters staff, by the fisheries field workers to show fishermen and the general public in some more remote areas of the province, fairs and exhibitions, fishery and other public meetings as required. We intend also to purchase an outfit, a special van for demonstration and information purposes, which will be used to bring the services to more remote areas.

Now that in general is the envisaged programme. Two things might be borne in mind here - number one, the time factors themselves and the staff are going to dictate to a large degree the amount of this programme which we will be able to accomplish. The other thing is that there may now be and bearing in mind that this sort of thing was compiled prior to the setting up of other services, there may be a channel-through information service for some of this material, some would be of a different type.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the minister has not satisfied me for one. First of all he did not say what \$75,000 was spent for last year. There was no vote in last year's estimates approved and my colleague who was Acting Minister of Fisheries says he does not recall that up until the time when we left office there was any expenditure under this heading. There may have been. I mean I certainly do not know. But the estimates, as passed by the House last year, Sir, had no expenditure at all for this purpose. \$75,000 was spent, according to the revised figures. The

actual may or may not have been a little different. I would like for the minister to tell me who got it, every cent of it, and what it was for, every cent, what it was for. I want to know how much went to George McLean or his firm and on what basis. The minister has been less than forthcoming with his information about this.

We asked this afternoon and we were told we would have it by this evening, Well, it is this evening, We are nearly at the end and we have not got it. I want to know if Mr. McLean was hired by this administration and when and for what and for how much? Will the minister tell me that? Then will the minister, Mr. Chairman, please give us some figures on what he is going to do with \$215,000. He read a long, meaningful or meaningless statement. It could be or it could not. But what has he in mind? What has he in mind? Also who is going to do it? \$100,000 does not hire enough staff to do everything he wants to do, he is going to spend money on capital account to buy vans and everything or mobile vans whatever it is. There is no capital here. Would the minister please give the committee a little more information and let us start with \$75,000 which, according to the revised figures, was spent last year.

You see the minister is being coached.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Mr. Chairman, the information which was given in relation to the breakdown of the programme envisaged, under this year's expenditure, is as I have detailed. Now what percentage of that we are going to be able to spend as we go through the programme, what value it is being to us, we will have to determine and we will have to decide almost, I would suggest, on a month to month basis. But if you sit down and start to detail and try and put together a public information service of some kind relating to the department, which has been part of the platform, if you will, of this party, just as much as any other items that were referred to this evening, then I suggest that this is the type of information that has to be covered.

Now the actual costing of these things, it is an estimate and I really cannot say whether this is going to break out at this figure or ten per cent more or ten per cent less, I do not know, but the programme as envisaged in the 1972-73 estimates is as I have outlined. I think some reference was made to the van and I am not really certain, you mentioned I believe capital, it is an amount of money and certainly an especially equipped van to travel around the country is envisaged under that. If it has to go somewhere else, then obviously it has to come out of that.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. CHEESEMAN: I am not familiar enough with it to be able to argue the point. I do not really know. But that is the programme that is envisaged for 1972-73. I hope personally that we will be able to accomplish most of it. I have very much doubt that we will now at this stage be able to accomplish all of it. It is very doubtful in my mind but I hope we will be able to accomplish some of it and make a good start on it because I believe it is an absolutely essential part of the service of the department to the public, from an awareness point of view of the importance of the fishery and I believe that it is an essential part of the programme as far as the fishermen are concerned to upgrade the industry and in fact to upgrade the fishermen themselves, the fishermen and the public. So there is no doubt about that.

In reference to the other part of the question - what was spent last year, the question was, you are quite right, raised this afternoon. I said at that time that the question was on the Order Paper, The Premier answered at that time and said that the information was being prepared and that he would present it to the House. It is my understanding that that is his wish. It is my understanding that he wanted to do that and therefore that is why I have not dealt with it. That is the position as I understand it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, it is not the Premier's wish that counts, it is what the committee decide. Let me again ask the minister, there was no money voted last year. The Liberal Administration may or may have spent some money. I do not know, I do not remember all the estimates, I do not remember all the heads of expenditure, all I remember is the Department of Health which I was administering at the time.

How much was spent, when and where and how much for George McLean? Because George McLean was under contract to the Department of Fisheries during the time he was working for the Tory Party, during the election; with the minister's direct approval, working with the Department of Fisheries. Now will the minister tell the committee how much George McLean and by George McLean I do not mean the gentleman, I would not know the gentleman to see him, Sir...

MR. ROWE (WM.): You cannot miss him.

MR. ROBERTS: I am told he is a large gentleman. I do not know him at all. I mean his firm. How much was paid to them? The minister is being less than frank. He is being less than frank. The minister has not told us. Will he tell us whether he - I have a whole string of questions, Mr. Chairman, How much was spent, on whose authority, to whom, when

when there was nothing in the original estimates \$75,000 in the revised estimates, what it is for? Did any of it go to George McLean? Did the minister approve anything for payments to George McLean? Let us have the information.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order: The honourable Leader of the Opposition has every right to ask a question. But he does not have the right, I submit, to shout and roar like an injured bull. I urge you, Mr. Chairman, to ask him to hold himself in check

MR. ROBERTS: Is the minister going to answer the question? If we are shouting and bawling, it is too bad the minister of Finance is not here. He is the Houses's expert in that.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, this afternoon when we were considering the Head 1412-02-03, I believe this is the one on Professional Fees:

The honourable the Premier was here in the Chamber at the time and was prepared to give the answer to the question that was made by the Opposition at the particular time, which was to the effect the relationship of McLean's Agencies or George McLean or whatever the firm name may be with the department of Fisheries.

Now apparently the honourable Leader of the Opposition brings up the point, quite correctly, and asks a similar question with respect to this heading of 1413-05 and he is interested in repeating the same question with respect to that subhead. At the present time the honourable the Premier is out, unavoidably and regrettably out of the Chamber by reason of the fact that he has to meet with certain industrial interests who are visiting the province at the present time. He may well be out of the Chamber again tomorrow afternoon, but, before he left, and he had hoped this afternoon to be able to furnish the information, some of the information came up and even then it was too late because the honourable Leader of the Opposition was developing the very interesting theme that he developed later in

the afternoon and again tonight. But the Premier had stated that obviously the government will supply the answer, the answer to the question. It is better, in all fairness, for the Premier to give that answer because he has more knowledge of it than the present minister of Fisheries, because at the time he exercised that portfolio. The present minister of fisheries has only been in that position since May 1. So, therefore, pursuant to a conversation we had this afternoon, after the session, I think we can enlarge this, I was going to bring it up when the block provision at the very end came. I think perhaps with the concurrence of the honourable members on the other side, we could let that aspect of the situation now stand. We could leave the question, we could leave the final total stand over in the estimates for the time being on the understanding that when the Premier comes back, he can deal with the questions that have been posed as it affects of course the estimate here.

Now, if by some great and unforeseen, presently unforeseen merry-go we should perchance happen to finish the estimates before the long weekend, and that looks very, very impossible, but just say that happened and we could engraft this committee into the necessary Bill of Supply to pay the government services, all of the government services, at the end of this month, then and in that event, what we could perhaps suggest at that time, if the honourable the Premier is still engaged in the important discussions with which he is engaged daily, then in that event we could enlarge this then to the question period and, by leave of the House, he will supply the answer that was asked in committee with respect to these two subheads and the relationship of Mr. George McLean to it. At that time, even though the rules of the House say there will be no debate on the estimates, we can undertake with the honourable gentlemen opposite that by leave of the House, there can be the full debate with respect to that answer. The present Minister of Fisheries

has done an admirable job. I think all can understand that he can answer the question but the person best suited is the person who occupied the position at the time.

Now, I could go even farther to say that with respect to all of these estimates there are other people on the other side of the House who could best answer a lot of the questions that have been brought up from time to time during the consideration of the estimates. But I shall not develop that theme any further in the interest of - I trust this is acceptable to the other side.

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry it is not acceptable to me. I make the statement that the present Minister of Fisheries had personal knowledge of payments to McLean Agencies. I wanted him to give that information to the committee. I say he had personal knowledge of it, of approval of McLean Public Relations. I want to know where it was charged. The minister has been less than candid, Sir. All the smiles and honeyed words of the minister without Portfolio -

MR.MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I do think the honourable Leader of the Opposition, in accordance with my memory - which is fast going after listening to the honourable leader from time to time - I do not think that he can accuse the honourable or make a statement to the effect that the honourable minister of Fisheries is less than candid. I refer to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules, page 131, where it says: "No member may be allowed to say of another that he could not expect any candour from him." I do not think the honourable Leader of the Opposition means this, and I am quite sure he would wish to withdraw a statement to the effect that he does not believe the honourable Minister of Fisheries is being candid. All the honourable Minister of Fisheries has to do, I would suggest, if the honourable Leader of the Opposition wishes to pursue this farther, the honourable

Minister of Fisheries can only obviously give the information which he has. This is all he can be expected to do in this committee. In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, the honourable Leader of the Opposition, and this is a point of order, cannot accuse any member of this honourable House of not being candid.

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I watch what I say very carefully. If I was out of order, I withdraw unreservedly and without any reservation. Now, will the Minister of Fisheries tell us whether he has any personal knowledge of any payments made to George McLean or to McLean Public Relations during the calendar year or the fiscal year which ended March 31, 1972? Does he have any personal knowledge of any approval for such payments? Would he answer that please, Sir?

MR.CHEESEMAN: I am sorry - the honourable Leader of the Opposition would he repeat the latter part of his question?

MR.ROBERTS: What I was asking was, we have a complete refusal of the minister up until now, I hope he will remedy and rectify, to tell us anything about the \$75,000 last year. We can draw the inference that it all went to George McLean. Because all he said is, in reply to my question he made reference to the fact that the Premier wishes us to deal with it at another time. Well, I will come back to that in a moment, Sir, but let me first of all deal with this thing. Will the minister tell us whether he has any personal knowledge of any approval to pay, from the Department of Fisheries, any money to George McLean or the firm, McLean Public Relations, during the year ended March 31, 1972? If so, how much and for what purpose and where is it charged, was it against this vote?

MR.CHEESEMAN: Actually the figure of \$75,000, the amount of \$75,000 the actual expenditure was not \$75,000 it was \$43,000.

MR. ROBERTS: That is good, that is a start, when they are revised they are not actual.

MR. CHEESEMAN: I was just trying to pick up the amounts. Now, of my knowledge and I believe that is the question in the way it was put and I would still like to qualify that the Premier had requested that he would furnish -

MR. ROBERTS: No need to worry about the Premier -

MR. CHEESEMAN: No, no, but I say the Premier had requested that he furnish this information. That it would be - there is correspondence obviously in connection with it which I do not have. So I just want to make that perfectly clear. Do I have knowledge of the amount? Yes. The amount is

MR. CHEESEMAN.

\$43,000 and not the \$75,000. I am not even at this point certain of the name so I will say that McLean, NACON, There are two, I believe, separate companies.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know. NACON is not registered to do business in this province.

MR. CHEESEMAN: I do not wish to make this as a firm -- there are two names.

MR. ROBERTS: We are getting close to the nitty-gritty now.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Pardon? The amount was, as I say, \$43,000, not \$75,000 paid under that. Now at this point there -

MR. ROBERTS: Some of it was paid to George McLean or a firm with which he is associated.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Well McLean Public Relations, NACON.

MR. ROBERTS: All right.

MR. CHEESEMAN: As I say, the Premier wished to -

MR. ROBERTS: I do not care about the Premier.

MR. CHEESEMAN: As I say, the Premier wished to give this information himself, I feel. He has the information. He has the correspondence because I believe it is relevant, that the correspondence also forms part of it, otherwise I am only repeating from memory. I understand that from the House Leader the Premier is in fact on the way in.

MR. ROBERTS: Good! Good! We will entertain ourselves until the Premier deigns to come along. How much of the \$43,000 went to the George McLean, NACON Firm please? Would the minister tell us on whose authority it was spent?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Of my personal knowledge the \$43,000 was, as I have already stated, paid in total. I am sorry. I think I did say that, however.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I did not understand that.

MR. CHEESEMAN: I think I did say that.

MR. ROBERTS: Maybe.

MR. CHEESEMAN: The authority was obviously the Minister of Fisheries of that day.

MR. ROBERTS: What did they do for it?

MR. CHEESEMAN: A Public Relations Programme and a stage one of a film programme.

MR. ROBERTS: Now we are getting into the nitty-gritty. Would the minister elaborate on this?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Pardon?

MR. ROBERTS: Would the minister elaborate on this?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Elaborate as to the .. ?

MR. ROBERTS: What was the P.R. Programme for, the \$43,000?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Well the P. R. Programme was not \$43,000. Well yes I suppose if you want to take -

MR. ROBERTS: That is the next question. The minister is anticipating me.

MR. CHEESEMAN: No, I do not think I was. The \$25,000 was a first payment.

MR. ROBERTS: The \$25,000?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Yes , \$25,000 of the \$43,000.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay.

MR. CHEESEMAN: The \$25,000 was the first payment of an approved three-stage film production.

MR. ROBERTS: And \$50,000 to come, is that the inference we are to draw?

MR. CHEESEMAN: If the programme were confirmed to continue, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Has it been confirmed?

MR. CHEESEMAN: No.

MR. ROBERTS: Is it to be confirmed?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Subjective consideration. This is why I say there is

MR. CHEESEMAN,

correspondence pertaining to this. The information service as such in the three months, which was to compile such items as a press release programme, a film slide programme, depicting aspects of the department, research and writings for radio programmes, etc. These were all part of the balance, the \$18,000 as opposed to the \$25,000 which is film. These are the two categories under which this was spent.

MR. ROBERTS: Now is this not a pretty little mess we are into Mr. Chairman. I am glad the Premier is back. We have discovered, Mr. Chairman, for the Premier's benefit, that last year there was no vote under this or there was a vote, it was a grant to the Salt Fish Corporation, capital grant. Sometime after January 18, the administration decides to hire a P.R. Firm in Fisheries. That is fair enough. They cast around. This is the administration from which we hear that there are going to be public bids. I do not remember any public bids but, low and behold! What does their net bring in? Their net brings in George McLean or McLean Public Relations. We had to drag that out of the minister. He tells us. What do they do? Well for \$18,000 they give us a press release programme. Well I now ask the minister if he would be good enough to table every press release issued, please, in that period? He cannot do it tonight but let us have them up in the House. It will probably work out to \$1,000 a press release. If he would be good enough to table the press releases. We do not know under what authority this was done except that the Premier who was then the Minister of Fisheries did it. We are also told that \$25,000 went to a film strip programme. Am I misreading it?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Stage one of a film programme.

MR. ROBERTS: Stage one. We are told that stage two and stage three -

MR. CHEESEMAN: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry. What about stage two?

MR. CHEESEMAN: I am sorry the question asked was whether it had gone to stage two? I said that that has not been decided yet.

MR. ROBERTS: Right, that is the point. The minister mentioned stage two and stage three. We are to infer (maybe we will be told differently and if so, so be it) that there is \$50,000 yet to come. We are getting up there now. Old George is doing pretty good out of this. NACON by the way is a firm not registered to do business in Newfoundland, as of this afternoon when I was last in the registry looking it up. If they are doing business in Newfoundland, they may be doing it unlawfully - NACON. They also rent a flat in the Elizabeth Towers, along with lots of other people, including my parents. The minister has not said to us what the \$215,000 is going for this year? It is obvious I submit that \$50,000 of it is destined for George McLean or for McLean Public Relations. There is at least \$50,000 to finish the programme. If not, are we have to have \$25,000 worth of phase one that went out the window? Now we are getting deep into the conflict of interest and all of this because at the same time as this \$43,000 was being spent (I am glad the Minister of Finance is back. Yesterday and the day before he entertained us as only he can. It was good. There were little descriptions of Martin Goldfarb . It was good. I enjoyed it. It was a little discomfoting at times. I enjoyed it.) and at the same time the press releases were going out. I will wager that they were \$1,000 a release, \$18,000 because there were eighteen releases from the 18th. January to the 31st. March. Let the minister table them. Let him table them. What other public service was Mr. George McLean performing?

MR. MOORES: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. Now that the Premier has deigned to come in, in due course he will get his say. What else was Mr. McLean, that wizzard of public relations (He is a good public relations man) doing? Why, low and behold! he was doing the Tory Party propaganda for the election.

MR. MOORES: No, it was after the election.

MR. ROBERTS: It was after the election? What was after the election?

MR. MOORES: Pardon?

MR. ROBERTS: What was after the election? His propaganda?

MR. MOORES: The effect of his campaign.

MR. ROBERTS: The effect of his campaign? What I said, Mr. Chairman, (smart cracks from the Premier will not get around it) is that at the same time that George McLean or his firm, let us say the McLean Firm, (I have nothing against the gentleman personally. I do not even know him, believe it or not) was hard at work, slaving night and day on a \$43,000 Public Relations Programme for the government of the province, the Department of Fisheries, authorized by the Premier who was then the minister and concurred by the hon. member for Hermitage, the present Minister of Fisheries (he had a hand in it. There is nothing wrong with that except politically. There is nothing wrong with it in any other sense) at the same time as they were doing that and drawing \$43,000, at the same time that all that was going on the McLean Firm was hard at work in behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party. Not bad for a government that talks about conflict of interest. It is not bad at all for a government that are spending \$56,000 on information services and are now being asked to vote another \$215,000. It is not bad at all, Sir. Now perhaps the Premier can tell us how much of the \$215,000 is destined for Mr. McLean? I am sorry, I do not mean Mr. McLean but the McLean Firm. Have any contracts been signed? What about stage two and stage three of this film business? What is it to be for? Where will you see it? What about the film strips? Oh, the gentleman from Burgeo is at it again. You can always count on a note of comedy from the gentleman from Burgeo. I do not think it is funny.

MR. EVANS: It is a tragedy.

MR. ROBERTS: We have heard a great deal from this administration about probity and a great deal from this administration about conflict of interest and a great deal of this and a great deal of that. Here we are. They were not in office a week, Sir, they were not in office a week when Mr. McLean

Mr. Roberts

was on the phone and on the letter saying, "we want some business." They were not in office three weeks when they had the business - \$43,000 worth at the same time that there was an election on. Now let that be recorded. If there is an answer, let us have it. I know I will get it right between the eyes if I am wrong. Let us have it. Let us have it.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Chairman, I would like to advise the honourable gentlemen opposite of exactly what the details of what McLean's function was as far as the Department of Fisheries is concerned, what it is at present. I cannot tell him what it is going to be in the future because that is subject to discussion right now. I did not realize that we were going to have a summer lip programme but it looks much like it after today's proceedings. Mr. Speaker, the figures on the McLean Agency were that \$25,000 was paid for the script and the shooting script for a fishery film to be paid, the following payment of \$25,000 and the final payment of \$50,000 for a twenty-seven and a half minute colour film which upon completion and final edit, the final amount would be paid. The function of this film is basically very simple. It is to do something which has never been done

for the fisheries in Newfoundland before because we had an administration that did not care for the fisheries before.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MOORES: What did you do, burn your boats? Mr. Chairman, they would not know a codfish from a sculpin over there and you could tell it by the results of their administration. On a twenty-seven and a half minute film this will be to commence in June for the filming and will run through July and to produce a film takes a lot of effort, a lot of script writing, a lot of technical know-how to go in to at first. The film will be released in the fall. It has been booked on twenty-seven television stations for showing in Canada and others in the States. It is based on the save our fisheries campaign and to tell people in Canada what the fishery in Newfoundland is about. It is a public relation film and it will cost \$50,000 complete.

Regarding the slide presentations, the radio programmes of which \$18,000 was put up until the end of March and \$12,000 since, and that has been stopped, which I will go into in the future. That was to write, produce, direct and record a weekly radio programme on the fishing industry, stressing general information, and 319 five minute spots have been booked for that, starting late this summer. Produce a slide presentation, to be used by fishermen at meetings with departmental officials, outlining new methods of catching fish, new gear, new boats. In other words taking new processes to the fishermen through the electronic process rather than by watering down the Department of Fisheries as was done in the past. Arrange for feature writers and radio and television commentators to do special feature stories on the fishing industry in the province, from across Canada, and seven of those have been arranged. Provide consulting assistance and advice to fishermen, fish processors and canners and telling of their affairs

and products. Take pictures which show the fishing industry and release them to the various news media in other parts of Canada with special emphasis telling of the importance of the industry to our country so that people are aware that Newfoundland has a fishery and that we are not ashamed of it.

Mr. Chairman, the figure of \$43,000, up until the end of the last fiscal year, was right. The amount of \$12,000 in the last two months is the additional amount that has been spent with the McLean group. Mr. Chairman, it is not just a matter of Mr. McLean getting this business because he was the P.C. advertising firm that we had during the election. He happens to be a man who is very effective in his job. He happens to be putting together a programme which is very very essential for the future of the fisheries in this province. We have a few days ago cancelled further payments to Mr. McLean until he gets his slide presentation work up-to-date and we are satisfied. This was done before these estimates. and we are satisfied that he has reached a stage whereby the value is there for money because we do not believe in paying for not getting value such as Mr. Chairman. \$603,000, last year, to Ronalds Reynolds for tourist advertising, \$200,000. What tourist advertising? Between May and October, we know. We know about the Goldfarb Report. Markets Consultants Services. McLoughlan \$156,000, Martin Goldfarb \$82,000, the media here \$18,000. the Lee Wulff \$50,000 which was probably good value, \$60,000 general and they kick up a stink because \$43,000 is being spent on the fishery.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned the fishery in the success of the last election bears out where the value is, as opposed to \$603,000 and the remnants we have left representing the other side.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Chairman, now we are getting to the nitty-gritty of it. Let me deal first with the last points raised by the Premier. He mentioned McLoughlan, does he mean T.E. McLoughlan Associates?

MR. MOORES: No.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, then I would ask the Premier to withdraw his remarks because the money for T.E. McLoughlan Associates went to a firm in Ottawa in connection with industrial promotion, a firm recommended by the DREE people and it had nothing to do with any tourist promotion or anything else. I do not know the amount that was paid to them. They were under contract and I do not know but they may still be under contract. It had nothing to do with the sort of promotion the Premier was speaking of here. We will just whack that off. The money which Goldfarb spent, I do not know the \$82,000 bit, I do not have the figures here. Martin Goldfarb's firm was hired to do a tourist study. They did the study.

MR. MOORES: What did they get out of it?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I do not know what was in the study but whether the study was good or bad they did the study. As for the advertising to Ronalds Reynolds, the government are spending advertising this year. I was not in the Committee for the debate on that part of the estimates for the Department of Economic Development but I am sure there is money in the tourist thing. The Premier is comparing apples and oranges. He is further, Mr. Chairman, trying to cloud the issue and confuse it and create smoke screens around it by saying that the fact that we questioned this. this payment, is somehow to be construed as being against the fisheries. Sir, that is a blatant canard, not worthy of comment. What we are questioning, we are not even questioning Mr. McLean's ability. It is very real, He is a very good P.R. man, no doubt at all about that. What I am saying is all I wanted to do was to get somebody in the administration to tell us how much money had been paid to Mr. McLean. They have been playing coy on that and I want to record the fact that no bids were called for it. The government that talked so much, so boldly, so proudly about bids, either the Premier or the minister,

the Premier I think, yesterday on the estimates of his own head, speaking of Information Services, Information Newfoundland, if I remember correctly, said there will be bids called, I believe it was the Minister of Economic Development, on his estimates; there would be bids called for any of this. Well, there were no bids called for Mr. McLean. The same time as the Premier of this province and he was then the Premier was going about talking about conflict of interest and all that, he had approved and so had the Minister of Fisheries, had approved payments to Mr. McLean's firm. That is all I am saying.

I do not begrudge it to the fishermen. I do not begrudge a hundred times that but I do want to point out the hypocrisy of it all, the hypocrisy of the Premier and the administration in this matter. I would also like him, he has not said what the three hundred and nineteen, indeed the Minister of Fisheries has not given us any information. In detail, the Premier has given us more in two minutes than the minister gave in fifteen. It is obvious another \$25,000 is going to Mr. McLean's firm to finish the film. That is obvious. It is obvious as well that somebody is going to have to pay for 319 five minute spots. They cost money. I am sorry.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the Premier will tell us in due course. You know let the Premier, if he is caught, and I do not say caught in any impropriety, if he is caught in a little political impropriety that is the worst it is. There is nothing worse than that in it. The Minister of Finance in his economic development capacity made a little support the other day, that is fine. I do not know where the tourist account is going this year.

MR. CROSBIE: Ronalds Reynolds.

MR. ROBERTS: Ronalds Reynolds. Well I am glad the minister has confirmed the judgement - Well then I do not know where it is going next year.

MR. CROSBIE: It will not be going to Ronalds Reynolds.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, that is fine enough, fair enough by me. I can assure the honourable gentleman that in any capacity I would not have recommended Ronalds Reynolds, be it for the government's account or for any other private account. But I have no objection to that. If the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Economic Development, because it will be that department, wants to move it, that is fine. Dalton Camp used to have a lot of accounts, well and good. Ned Belliveau and Candy Advertising used to have a lot. You know this goes on all across Canada and let us be grown men and not pretend. I would not be at all surprised if the Ronalds Reynolds thing is moved. Sure, I might suggest moving it on the grounds of competence as I do not like the tourist advertising we see now. You see it in the National Geographic and you see it in some of the publications. The \$200,000 figure that the Premier referred. I do not know how much of that was for media costs. Much of it I would assume would have been, indeed I assume almost all of it would have been and then the agency get a standard fifteen per cent. I do not know. I do not have the figures here.

The point I am making though is what we have and let us just record it. If the Premier wants to come back and any other honourable gentlemen I am happy too. I am enjoying this. It is great fun. So all we have is that Mr. George McLean and his firm are the new, they entered into the Promised Lands. They were paid \$43,000 last year and they will be paid some ..

Mr. Roberts

need some money this year. They apparently have not produced very much as of yet because the Premier tells us that the government have had to suspend payment until they get some work out of them. That is a good decision. I find it interesting that they were given \$18,000 and had not produced anything up until now or have not produced enough, have not produced sufficient. There must be some such thing or the government would not have cut them off. They have been paid \$25,000, half the price of a film. The Minister of Fisheries tells us that no decision has been made on the second half of the project; namely, to proceed with the shooting and so forth. The Premier seems to contradict that. Shooting he said would be going on in June. I doubt if it will be going on in June. Today is June 29, unless it starts tomorrow.

MR. MOORES: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Oh! under contract to the government? I mean when I say under contract that is for - he is earning the second \$25,000, is that the point?

MR. MOORES : Yes. He is working at it. He is working at providing the material where the second part can be confirmed.

MR. ROBERTS: In other words he is shooting the film and then when he gets it done he gets paid. Is that the arrangement?

MR. MOORES : That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the Minister of Fisheries told us that no arrangement had been made with Mr. McLean.

MR. MOORES: Until we get the final product.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, he is doing it on speck. Is that it?

MR. MOORES: Bringing it up to standard.

MR. ROBERTS: But he is doing it on speck. In other words he may get his film done and when it is looked at by whomever looks at it, they may say that that is not good enough, forget it. Is that the story?

MR. MOORES: Could be.

MR. ROBERTS: Is that the story? What arrangement has been made with Mr. McLean?

MR. MOORES: You have asked a lot of questions and when you sit down I will answer them.

MR. ROBERTS: All right. That is one more now. What arrangement has been made with Mr. McLean? The Minister of Fisheries told us that no arrangement had been made with Mr. McLean in respect of this year. He told us that twenty minutes ago, before the Premier was called away from a meeting which I am sure was like the 1001 Arabian Knights, maybe he should have been Ali Baba - "many strange and wonderful things." I find it interesting that no bids were called nor have any bids been called. I do not find that unusual. I do not find it unusual. I suggest that it has gone on all over Canada and will go on. It goes on at Ottawa. When the Progressive Conservative Party formed the administration of the Government at Ottawa it happened. When the Liberal Party came back into the administration at Ottawa, it happened again. It happens all the time. I would not be the least surprised if Ronalds - Reynolds lose the contract next year. It does not surprise me nor does it surprise the hon. gentleman from St. John's East, I would submit. It is quite normal. It is quite in hand. I do find it curious that it comes from an administration that has made such a fetish of no conflict of interest. The Minister of Finance and Economic Development exhibited his talents again yesterday on this. There was great fun about it. There was great fun. That is fine. We sat and took it. He is sitting and taking it now. I admire him for that. He may shortly say a few words. I would enjoy that. It is always a pleasure to hear from the honourable gentleman. Oh, he will get a chance to say them! We are going to be here until Labour Day, sure.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Some of us anyway.

MR. ROBERTS: Some of us.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Others will be carted away by that time probably.

MR. ROBERTS: We are going to be here until the committee have dealt

Mr. Roberts

thoroughly with the estimates and so it should be. We were sent here by the people of Newfoundland to deal with it. We are talking of an item of \$215,000. It is a fair amount of money. It is a fair amount of money. I am sorry.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: That is true but the \$603,000 - the hon. member for Bonavista South could not have been listening or I could not have made myself clear. It is bit of a false analogy because the Premier was including apples and oranges there. Are the McLaughin Firm still under contract? I do not know nor am I really concerned. The McLaughin Firm was retained for industrial promotion purposes through the Department of Economic Development. They were recommended to the government by the DREE people at Ottawa. I do not know if they did their money's worth or not. I was not the minister. It certainly had nothing to do with promotion of this sort. These were services of the sort which dealt with the department and will continue to provide. Indeed I believe through the agency of the McLaughin Firm a great deal of smaller type industries were established in Newfoundland, out in Stephenville. I will ask John Nolan to get a list for the hon. Premier. They did succeed. A lot of DREE money went into it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: No , it was not the magnesium plant nor magnesia even. Magnesium maybe is what the honourable gentleman needs. Milk of magnesia has a most interesting affect. The honourable gentleman would find himself considerably lighter if he took a large doze of milk of magnesia. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, let us ask the Premier again if he could clear up some of these points. If he wants to debate it, I will. I am delighted to. I am glad he has given us the information. We were having a little difficulty with the Minister of Fisheries. All I want to know is what Mr. McLean is doing. What is he doing this year? I would also like to point out again that this is as flagrant an example of conflict of interest or of something

MR. ROBERTS:

or other as anything that the Minister of Economic Development has pointed out. It is no worst. It is no better. It is an unfortunate fact of political life and I submit that it will always be so until we get to the happy days when the state pays part of the cost of elections and in return limits the expenditures on election. That is all I am saying. I am quite happy to go over it again. I think it is worth going over.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Chairman, just to reply to the questions by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. As he referred to indirectly in his usual manner, the reason I was not in the House tonight is because I was having meetings with Mr. John Shaheen, which were of a serious nature, regarding the Come by Chance situation and I apologize for not being here but that was the reason why not. Regarding the points that the honourable member mentioned, I have no intention of withdrawing any remarks about P. S. McLaughlin unless I have been shown where I was wrong. I said they were part of the \$603,000 promotional advertising group last year. The hon. Leader of the Opposition as usual said that they had nothing to do with this sort of thing. They were doing industrial promotions. Mr. Chairman, as far as this government are concerned, the fisheries are industrial promotion and a very much more important form of industrial promotion than a man sitting at a desk in Ottawa hauling down \$156,000. Regarding the film it is being photographed. As I said the first \$25,000 was paid for the script and the second \$25,000 will be paid when the film has been completed. The reason the radio presentation has been cut was not because not quite a bit of work was done but a lot of work was done. The content was not good enough for what has to be done. We have to have all the new types of fishing, all the new types of boats, all the new types of gear presented in this. A lot of this was done but not enough to make the total package, according to what the minister, the department and various experts that we could get to do a critique on this. There is no point doing slide presentations

Mr. Moores

or radio programmes unless they are done well. The only reason that it is being delayed is to give Mr. McLean who has done a lot of work a chance to upgrade it and do it well. Other than that, basically I think the information has been supplied and certainly a lot of lip service has been given.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Premier. We seem to be getting near the end of this. I just want to clear one point. Doubtless in the years ahead this discussion may be rehashed again. I have no doubt of it. It will be brought up to date from time to time. Mr. McLean or his firm is now finishing the film. If I understand the Premier correctly, the government have said to Mr. McLean's Firm that when the film is finished, we will give you another \$25,000 which will bring the total contract price up to \$50,000. I assume that money comes out of this subhead or this vote. It seems to be the only appropriate one in the department. I merely want to note that the Minister of Fisheries told us that no arrangement had been made with Mr. McLean in respect of this year. I may have misinterpreted the minister but that is certainly what I believe happened. There seems apparently to be a conflict between the Fisheries Minister and the Premier on what is going on here. One says that no arrangement has been made with Mr. McLean, the Minister of Fisheries, in respect of the second \$25,000. The other, the Premier, says that the arrangement is that when Mr. McLean finishes the film (He is now engaged at that. He is apparently at sea on the trawler or some such thing) that the \$25,000 will be paid to him. There seems to be an apparent conflict. We cannot have it both ways. The Premier has something to say?

MR. MOORES: Just very briefly, Mr. Chairman. This was contracted when I was Minister of Fisheries. I must have taken my files out of the office when the new minister came in.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I suggest that the Premier have a word with - the Premier of the Province is quite concerned about people taking files.

MR. ROBERTS: I cannot remember that particular cliché. In any event we will obviously be back at this next year, I suspect. Mr. McLean is going to become a prominent part of the debates on this item. I thank the minister for his co-operation. We did get it out of him eventually. I am glad of that because else it would be extremely difficult because for once I knew the answers to questions. I knew full well the answer to the question and I am glad the minister, as always has given us the information we sought. The House Leader looks at me, Investigatory functions are not confined to members of Her Majesty's government.

MR. MARSHALL: Would the honourable Leader of the Opposition yield for a moment?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. of course.

MR. MARSHALL: The reason I am looking at the honourable Leader of the Opposition is because there was a rumour at one time, that it was only a rumour. that the former Premier had made this statement that after three o'clock in the afternoon the honourable the Leader of the Opposition is spent, and having heard the Leader of the Opposition today for the first time in my life, I can concur with the honourable former Premier.

MR. ROBERTS: The former Premier I believe made that statement, Sir. I will not go into the ones he made about the gentleman for St. John's East. Because to say the least -

AN HON. MEMBER: There are rules.

MR. ROBERTS: There are rules, and they are unparliamentary but they were still accurate. However that is another story, another time, another place. Hold on now, the gentleman from Burgeo - I am listening, come on. The gentleman has to be coaxed to his feet. Come on! Come on! Come on!

MR. EVANS: ... the vote will be in here next year.

MR. ROBERTS: Coaxed from his seat. Come on!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the honourable Leader of the Opposition proceed.

MR. ROBERTS: I think I have come to about the end of this particular thing for this year. We will be at it again. I was just thanking the Minister of Fisheries for his candour. I am glad he gave us all the information. It took a little prying and I hope that next year he will not be as quite as reticent. Let him not hide his light under a bushel. I hope he will arrange to table within the next day or so the press releases issued by Mr. McLean or produced by Mr. McLean's firm. They say my guess of \$1,000 for press releases is not too far out. I suspect, not too far out, \$18,000, if there were eighteen press releases that is pretty good.

Could he also arrange in due course, indeed I think we should have a meeting of the members of the House at some point and have a look at the film strips. I think that would be interesting, very interesting. We wish him well with it. It is quite a good idea. It is quite a good idea. The minister at least has not been hypocritical about it, not as hypocritical as certain other gentlemen who pretended that government have no role in public information. They do have a role. This sort of thing can be quite useful.

We are just adding it up now, we are up to \$215,000 plus \$56,000 for "Information Newfoundland," that is \$271,000 so far. It is double the cost of the "Bulletin" in its heyday. We are not doing so badly. All we will do now is just take a rain check next year, at the same time, the same place. It will be somewhat a better story, I have no doubt.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, before we end - I would like to certify it. Mr. Chairman, before we end this discussion which of course is a very interesting one, I believe the honourable gentlemen opposite think that they are into the fat, as the saying goes in the seal hunt. It is really amazing, Mr. Chairman, to listen to the honourable Leader

MR. CROSBIE: of the Opposition getting up and all this indignation and wrath and upset, roaring about tenders are not called or bids were not called for this work, when last year he had a dental advertising programme in the Department of Health that cost \$43,000 and some of which featured the honourable gentleman opposite. The honourable gentleman opposite, I remember seeing him on T.V. with his old choppers going.

MR. ROBERTS: No way! No way!

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, the honourable gentleman chopped away.

MR. ROBERTS: No way! Mr. Chairman, if the honourable gentleman would yield to a point of order. The programme, which was done by Mr. Rod Parker and a gentleman from Toronto, whose name I have forgotten, who does a lot of work for the Government of Ontario, I took no part in it and I would ask the honourable gentleman, or say to the best of my recollection and I am prepared to stand by it, the honourable gentleman, would he be good enough to either withdraw this statement or substantiate it, either way. But I took no part in it, I am not even sure of the figure, I will check that. But I also might add that the programme has worked out with the Newfoundland Dental Association.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, it is possible that I have a cavity in my memory.

AN HON. MEMBER: It should be certified.

MR. CROSBIE: Or that the -

MR. ROBERTS: Would the gentleman withdraw the statement, please?

MR. CROSBIE: Or that the honourable Leader of the Opposition does. But if he says definitely that he was not, I will have to accept that. But I certainly have a fond recollection of watching T.V. and I thought it was about the new dental programme. It was a paid advertisement and the honourable Leader of the Opposition was talking about it. But if he says that is wrong, we will have to check.

MR. CROSBIE: In any event, there was a dental advertising programme last year in the Department of Health to advertise the new dental scheme for children. That cost \$43,000. Is anybody going to argue that that was a legitimate programme? There is a programme in fisheries this year for information and advertising for the fisheries. I cannot see anything wrong with that. No bids or tenders were called last year to have this dental advertising programme done. It is not the kind of work where you can ask for bids or call tenders for a programme of that nature.

The honourable gentleman knows full well that last year \$19,000 was spent to have the former Minister of Economic Development, Mr. Nolan, on T.V., as the election approached, talking about the parks. Now that was pure political propoganda and nothing else. That certainly was a misuse of public funds. That is not in the category of developing the fisheries information programme, a film and slides and the rest of it. Nothing like it. There was \$19,000 paid to CJON and VOCM last year, mostly CJON, for ads. for the provincial parks, to tell people they were provincial parks and to look after them and do not start fires, and all that news that nobody knew anything about before until the honourable minister got on with the nonsense that cost us \$19,000.

The honourable Leader of the Opposition mentioned Martin Goldfarb, the man that could merchandise tomatoes and politicians like tomatoes, \$120,000 for what? For nothing. For a couple of junky studies. one on tourist. I think it was a motivational study and something else so vague that I cannot describe it. \$120,000 altogether for that. That was not the fisheries information programme. That was not anyone's information programme. That was for purported studies, while we all know that the real reason for paying that was that he was down doing political polls for the Liberal Party. Ronalds Reynolds, \$35,000 last year, they were the advertising agency used by the Liberal Party in Newfoundland.

MR. ROBERTS: In October.

MR. CROSBIE: In the October election. They had gotten \$35,000 last year, from the Department of Economic Development, Tourist Division, because it was called a marketing studies. The real reason for it was that they did not feel that the advertising budget was large enough and that they should have some more money. So they got \$35,000 for nothing, for something that was called a market survey. Pure junk! They say in their letter that they came down and held meetings with the minister and travelled around the island and to look at Newfoundland and its people. That was because they were the advertising agents for the Liberal Party. They did not turn out a film. They did not turn out a slide. There is no objective in either one of those studies. There is \$155,000 Goldfarb and Ronalds Reynolds, who also have the contract for this year's advertising for Newfoundland Tourist Development Department, because the contracts are given a year ahead or at least they were awarded six or eight months ago. Therefore, in the budget this year there are a couple of hundred thousand dollars for Ronalds Reynolds, for their advertising. There were no bids called for that or tenders. It is not the kind of work that you can call bids or tenders for.

So why the honourable gentlemen are getting in such a state because Mr. McLean or his firm are doing an information service programme for fisheries in Newfoundland, is really a bit much. Do you not think, Mr. Chairman, it would have been a lot better if that tommyrot had been forgotten until next year when the honourable gentlemen can look at the results of what Mr. McLean had done and most likely he will be admiring them and wishing that they had done it themselves. Then that last year Ronalds Reynolds might have done something sensible and worthwhile or Goldfarb might have done something sensible or worthwhile or Mr. Nolan could have done something sensible or worthwhile. Whatever he did do for the parks, it did not

MR. CROSBIE: do him much good up in Ferryland District.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is a lot of cuff-huffle about nothing. There is no conflict of interest. What utter rot. Where is the conflict of interest in the government hiring a firm to prepare a film? Lee Wulfe, how many films did he do for the Tourist Divison of Newfoundland in the last twenty-three years? There were never tenders called. But whoever got up in the House and went berserk about that? That Lee Wulfe did a film on tuna fishing or salmon fishing or trout fishing and the rest of it? There was never a great fuss, hue and cry made about that. The only reason this is being made now is that the honourable gentlemen are angry with George McLean -

MR. CROSBIE: because he assisted the P.C. Party in the last election and thereby proved his extreme value and his extreme work as a man in this field. If he can do for the fishery what he did for the P.C. Party, he should be paid twice as much.

MR. ROBERTS: MR. Chairman, it is not often I agree with the Minister of Finance and Economic Development. I agree with most of what he has said. I may add, we have seen a little of the results of Mr. McLean's work and that is why the people of Newfoundland would object to this. The only points that I made and I will make them again, I agree completely that you cannot call bids for films or advertising agencies.

MR. ROWE, W.N. You can get proposals.

MR. ROBERTS: You can get proposals, sure, I went further and said that there is an element of patronage in this and there always will be an element of patronage. There is an element of patronage in this government. There was an element of patronage in the previous administration. There will be an element of patronage everywhere across Canada. There always has been, there always will be.

What I am speaking about is the rank hypocrisy of the administration in trying to pretend, as they did, that this does not exist, in trying to say that somehow the real reason Mr. McLean was hired, let us admit it, The real reason he was hired, Mr. Chairman, was simply that he was the Tor Party P.R. man. That is fair enough. No argument with that. When the Liberal Party comes back into office, Mr. McLean will not be hired any more.

AN HON. MEMBER: A quick death.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not wish Mr. McLean a quick death, as the honourable member for Burgeo does. I wish him a long and happy and apparently he is going to have a very prosperous life too, at these rates. But you know that is all there is.

The Premier was the one yesterday who said that there will be bids called for this sort of thing. The honourable gentleman for St. John's West, the Finance Minister, would never say that. It is a matter where the administration would make up their mind who is the best person. It

MR. ROBERTS: is amazing how many administrations across Canada how often they come to the conclusion, the best person just happens to be the firm or the person who has worked with Mr. Dalton Camp and became involved with Mr. Stanfield, when Mr. Stanfield was Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party in Nova Scotia. Mr. Stanfield's firm did very well in Nova Scotia on the tourist accounts, over the years.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Camp?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Camp, Mr. Dalton Camp, yes. Well I am sorry, Mr. Camp's firm did very well.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Stanfield sold a lot of underwear.

MR. ROBERTS: He sold a lot of underwear. he should have stuck to that.

Mr. Camp and his firm also became involved with the administration in New Brunswick. He may have done very well out of it. Mr. Camp's firm they get all of the business. So what? It used to be New Brunswick Candy Advertising, Mr. Ned Belliveau, who was close to Mr. Louis Robichaud when he was Premier. I can go right across Canada. Nothing unusual. The Minister of Finance would agree with that. He is a realistic, practical politician along with all of his other faults. He is that.

But it is the government who pretended all this sort of stuff was unusual. Pretended it was wrong. That is all we are saying we will go on saying. We will judge the quality of Mr. McLean's work in due course. We will see what it is. We will hear the 319 five minute spots. That is a longer running programme than "Conversation with the Premier" used to be on VPCM. We will see what money the government will spent on promotion. We will be watching very carefully. We will be watching the Minister of Fisheries for his information programme. A very good thing to have an information programme. We will be watching it with great care. Mr. McLean is busily hiring just about every newsman in Newfoundland, there will be nobody left if he keeps on hiring them. It is all we are saying.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman was not here a little while ago in the committee, when I said we listen with interest to his remarks yesterday. I will listen with interest to them again. Whatever I may think of the honourable gentleman, I have mixed emotions, as one may understand, he is rarely hypocritical. He rarely does not speak what is on his mind. He may be wrong. He is often wrong but he is rarely hypocritical. There was another honourable gentleman who came up and tried to pretend there was something unusual. There is nothing wrong with hiring George McLean's firm. They may even do a good job. That is all, we wanted to put that on the record, that the Tory Party's firm, the firm that did the advertising work for the Tory Party was hired to work

for the government as the same time as the election was on. I submit that they were hired because they were doing the work for the party. That is what I mean by conflict of interest. Conflict of interest is a loose term. When the government come to bring in legislation, we debate it we will find that it is a very difficult term I think, to decide or to define. But, you know, the people of Newfoundland will make their own judgement on this. They have heard song and dance about how bad it allegedly was, that the previous administration hired Ronalds-Reynolds. I do not think they are a very good firm. They are not the firm I would have recommended. We did better with MacLaren in 1966. The honourable gentleman will remember MacLaren, he was then with us or we were with him or.

AN.HON.MEMBER: George Eliot.

MR.ROBERTS: George Eliot who is now by the way working with the National Liberal Party, and can do at least as well as he did in 1966 provincially. But, nothing wrong with that, it is part of the system, part of the system here and across Canada. All I want to establish, I think it has been well established in this debate this evening, is it the present administration, if there is guilt, if there is wrong, if there is bad, they are as guilty, they are as wrong, they are as bad as anyone else. They are just the same as the rest of us. That is all. That is all, I am saying nothing unusual. But for honourable gentlemen opposite that is a real revelation. Low and behold they are not quite the little paragons little Lord Fontonroy and so forth. Low and behold! When all is said and done, the honourable gentlemen have exactly the same feelings that they have accused us of in this respect. We will deal with other aspects as the time comes.

So, I wish Mr. McLean well. I am going to be looking forward to

the screening of the trawler film or whatever it is to be called or the fisheries film. It should be very interesting. I will be looking forward to the 319 radio spots and I am going to be looking forward to all the press releases. I hope information Newfoundland will be involved in them. I hope Finance will get in on them. When the finance department casts his beady eye on something it is usually -

MR.CROSBIE: The Newfoundland Treasury Board -

MR.ROBERTS: Well, then I suppose we do not need to vote any money, Mr. Chairman, because I know what will happen to it at Treasury Board.

MR.CROSBIE: If we do not get, a few spots -

MR.ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman has lots of spots, Mr. Chairman. But it is the minister of Health who has to take care of those for him, not the Treasury Board. Anyway, I am sure my colleague from Bell Island who speaks with such feeling of what happens to proposals when they hit the Treasury Board, they lie there eviscerated, mutilated. The minister of Finance dances on the corpse of the proposal. That is the traditional role of the finance ministers. The present minister glories in it. He will apparently have full cause to glory in it. So we can expect next year, not only no supplementary supply, we can expect to show an improvement. Will the minister tell us, is he going to be able to pay the civil service tomorrow or are we going to have to put interim supply through? I doubt if all the estimates will be through tomorrow, Mr. Chairman.

MR.CROSBIE: You are showing admirable co-operation, I do not think -

MR.ROBERTS: I agree with showing admirable co-operation, We are prepared to meet tomorrow morning.

MR.CROSBIE: We are not paying them, that is all.

MR.ROBERTS: Not paying them. Fair enough!

MR.CROSBIE: Not going to ask the House for interim supply twice.

MR.ROBERTS: That is fair enough. We have said, we have said we will

put interim supply through all stages at once, if the government miscalculated, as they did. They asked for three months supply.

Now and behold! here it is at the end of the third month, they have not enough supply. So let them not talk about obstruction there. We will meet tomorrow morning. We will meet at ten -

MR. CROSBIE: We have ninety-six hours -

MR. ROBERTS: We will meet at nine - we will meet Saturday not Sunday - six days shalt thou labour - Sure, we will not get through the estimates tomorrow. We still have municipal affairs and housing, community and social development, some things in the budget we will want to deal with, That should be dealt with. We still have labour. We still have - I could not forget the honourable gentleman. We still have supply and services, but that usually does not take very long. Does that mean the civil service will not be paid tomorrow? Very interesting.

MR. CROSBIE: No, I would not want to say that, Mr. Chairman, I want to get out of the building first.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I wish the minister well. It would be quite something, Mr. Chairman. They asked for three months supply, they got it with no problem.

MR. CROSBIE: We have enough for every one but the Auditor General.

MR. ROBERTS: The Auditor General is quite capable of holding his own, as the minister of finance knows

MR. CROSBIE: He will hold his own tomorrow, he will have nothing else to hold.

MR. ROBERTS: But it is - that should be good for a couple of comments in the next report, I must say. That is quite a confession, if the government were not able to calculate how much they need to run the province for three months. If they intend to ask interim supply; for our side, we will agree to put it through all stages -

MR. CROSBIE: We saw you put through the rest of the estimates.

MR.ROBERTS: We know that but we are not going to play that game.

We are just going to carry on with the debate.

MR.CROSBIE: We do not want to stop you.

MR.ROBERTS: That is fine, the honourable gentleman is not going to stop us.

MR.CROSBIE: We love it, we love it.

MR.ROBERTS: I can believe that too.

MR.CROSBIE: Two hours a night -

tonight, I was crying downstairs, I could not be up here.

MR. ROBERTS: I can believe that too. I am delighted to see the honourable gentleman back. They would have made Mr. Shaheen's night somewhat the less if the honourable gentleman had left him and come back to us. Anyway there we are. We may get through fisheries tonight as we only have another page to go, if the minister gives a little information. One thing we are going to be asking about, we are going to have a little chat about the administration's promise to subsidize fish prices. We have not heard anything about that. We would like a little talk about that. We think that is a subject of some interest, some importance. All the fishermen in my district are waiting for the cheques to come. I would like to hear a little about the regional office as there is \$100,000 down below for staff. Have any been appointed? I remember the member for Lewisporte District announcing during the March election that the office was being opened in Lewisporte. We would like to hear a little chat about that. Yes we will probably get it done.

Are we going to sit after eleven tonight? If the House Leader wants to sit after eleven, I am game. Sure let us sit after eleven tonight. sure. How late?

AN HON. MEMBER: Until eleven tomorrow morning.

MR. ROBERTS: I am willing to go on all night. It is great fun. Sure I am willing go on all night, if the honourable gentleman admits that they are that incompetent over there that they have to go on all night.

MR. MARSHALL: Can we take the honourable leader at face value now?

MR. ROBERTS: I am quite willing to sit here all night.

MR. MARSHALL: Would we like to raise committee and make the necessary opening speech.

MR. ROBERTS: We will raise the committee in due course. I am quite willing to sit all night. If the administration have to sit all night, have to keep the House in session all night so that they can get enough

money to pay the civil servants, we will do that, but the estimates still will not be finished by tomorrow night. The Minister of Municipal Affairs. we have to have a week with him, just a week listing the delegations who want to see him and cannot see him.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, or just a point of advice maybe. The honourable Leader of the Opposition likes to take advice from me. I would suggest that we might make a bit of progress with the estimates if we speak on the sub-head 1413(05) which is fisheries, education and information services. Now we are getting a lot of education and a lot of information from the Leader of the Opposition but it does not pertain to fisheries.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh it does, Mr. Chairman, and I am inclined so much as to say I am on a fishing expedition. We are going to need more than water if we are going to be here all night. That is fine. It will be quite interesting. Obviously the item will pass but if the honourable gentleman wishes to rise the committee we will have a discussion as to whether the House should sit all night or not. I think if the honourable gentleman wishes, let us do that. Let us have a go at it. I doubt if we will finish fisheries much before eleven, unless the minister can tell us about these other things. Want to put it through by eleven?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. ROBERTS: We are interested in the fisheries.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Chairman, on this same sub-head, I do not know what suddenly happened to the House. I guess it was the presence of the honourable Minister of Finance. He came in and he mollified my colleague. pacified him completely, the Leader of the Opposition. It must be that he is so cute and cuddly as a teddy bear over there that everybody sees sweetness and light when he comes in the door. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word or two about this conflict

of interest that we have been talking about. It seems to have been dropped and everybody is cheerful and all that sort of thing. I would like to say something about this.

First of all let me preface my remarks by saying that I think that this type of an information programme and education programme is vitally necessary in the fisheries.

MR. ROBERTS: You are two short. You do not have a quorum over there.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): No quorum.

MR. ROBERTS: You have no quorum. A couple of them need to drift back in.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): I think that an information and education service such as is propounded.

MR. ROBERTS: We must have a quorum count. Thirteen, fourteen. no they are back up again. It is okay for the time being.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Some such programme as this, Mr. Chairman if I can get a word in. is necessary, vitally necessary. But for the honourable Minister of Finance to stand up in the House and to say that there is no conflict of interest with regard to the contracts with George McLean. that any suggestion that there is a conflict of interest is nonsense and foolish, for him to say that. Mr. Chairman, is stretching it somewhat. The honourable minister's government hires on a public relations firm to do some government work, at the same time the honourable minister's party hires on a public relations firm to do some political work. The obvious inference is that it is not just a question of patronage, It is not just a question of a government allowing friends or giving friends of the government a little work here, there and everywhere. it is a question of an absolute and complete conflict of interest situation where the inference necessarily arises, and I am not saying that it does apply to this case, but the inference necessarily arises where someone like Mr. McLean or some other public relations firm is being paid by

the government out of public funds for both jobs of work, for the political work and the public, governmental work.

That is the problem that arises. I am not jealous. I am merely stating the situation, the conflict of interest which the honourable Minister of Finance says does not exist. The problem is, first, that it does exist. There is a definite conflict of interest in the situation. The other point that has already been mentioned and I would like to stress is the fact that the administration which I belong to undoubtedly entered into similar conflict of interest situations as well and I am not particularly proud of them, those situations. I merely note the fact that they probably did. One I know to my own certain knowledge probably was a conflict of interest situation. What is somewhat annoying is the fact that this government have painted themselves as completely pure and white in this type of a situation and they have protested up until the moment that we managed to drag, reluctantly drag the information out of the Minister of Fisheries, they protested up to that point that they would never be involved in situations where there were no bids or no proposals, things would not be handed out to friends of the party. They protested that they would not get involved in conflict of interest situations such as the previous administration allegedly did. Suddenly we see, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, that they themselves are up to their necks in a similar type of situation.

Now I do not blame too much the ministers or the administration for this, although I would be interested to hear the Minister without Portfolio the House Leader, I would be interested in hearing him say something on it. He has been the one who has been most vocal on this whole situation of conflict of interest. He is the one who says that conflict of interest legislation is of top priority and should be brought into the House, although we see no indication of it being brought

in this session, as has the Minister of Finance. I think I agree. Sir, with the Minister of Finance, when we have had chats between ourselves on various occasions, that the system, the political system that we live in inevitably gives rise to political hypocrisy on the part of parties and on the part of governments, that the political situation is such that governments are and parties are more or less obliged, in order to look after the ongoing costs of party operations and elections, to get involved in conflict of interest situations. I agree with him as well that the time has come I think in this province, where we should try to do something about it, because it is no pleasure to me as a member of the House to see --

MR. MARSHALL: If the honourable member would permit, I would like to rise the committee to get this straightened out.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Well, I would like to finish my sentence, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MARSHALL: Certainly, finish your sentence.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Why do you want to rise the committee? It is only ten to eleven.

MR. MARSHALL: Because we are going to take advantage of the kind invitation of the opposition to meet certainly until two o'clock in the morning anyway.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): That is fine. Well, I will just finish my sentence. I would like to hear the House Leader on it, Mr. Chairman, as time goes on. But the political system that we live in is such that conflict of interest necessarily arises and the political hypocrisy necessarily arises and what we need in this province is, as elsewhere, this is my last sentence the honourable House Leader will be happy to know - what we need in this province as elsewhere is some system whereby a limit is set on the expenditure of funds, political funds during election times and at other times and some system whereby the public chest is some way brought into the financing of election campaigns so that

June 29, 1972

Tape 1144(Night)

JM - 6

political parties, political candidates do not have to get themselves involved in the distasteful situations of conflict of interest and the political hypocrisy which we have seen here tonight expressed by the P.C. Administration.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise and report progress.

On motion that the committee rise and report having passed Estimate of Expenditures under the following headings - XIV - Fisheries from 1413-03-02 to 1412-04, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion committee ordered to sit again presently.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I do move that the House do not adjourn at eleven o'clock today.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved and seconded that the House do not adjourn at eleven o'clock today.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: (DUNPHY): Shall 1413-05 carry?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Let me ask the Minister of Fisheries one question, Mr. Chairman, before it carries or if any other members wish to speak - of the \$215,000 which the minister is proposing to get passed here tonight for the purposes mentioned, the fisheries education and information services. Of that amount is there any way he can now give us a breakdown as to how much will go for various things, not necessarily various persons?

Now he has mentioned a long list of things that propose to be done under this. He has listed it in a general fashion, even in a specific fashion, certain things that are going to be done under this particular subhead. What I am wondering is; can he tell us how much is going to go of the \$215,000. how much is proposed to go for say consulting services of a firm of publicist or something like this, like for example, the McLean firm? Does he know how much is proposed to go in that direction and of course how much may go for the setting up or the leasing or what not of regional officers or information offices around? But primarily what I am interested in is a breakdown of the actual amount that is going to go to firms of consultants who will assist

MR. ROWE, W.N. the minister in preparing and disseminating information?

Does he have that figure?

MR. CHEESEMAN. I have a basic breakdown, yes, Mr. Chairman, if I can find the books and papers, the appropriate sheets, I will endeavour to deal with them. If I can make reference to the items that I did before in the scale charts and that type of thing and bear in mind that these of necessity are estimates, \$5,000, publishing distributing specialized information \$10,000, detailed fact sheets and reports on scientific technical data, \$5,000, research preparing detailed written information. \$10,000, detailed information, final written reports outlining results of the fishery development programme \$10,000, supplying written information to the general public on all aspects of commercial fishery, \$5,000, supplying written and other information to industry and the general public on fishery policies of government, \$5,000. Then we get into the areas I think, specifically, he was asking about, where professional - I have taken that on the basis of ten percent, I think somebody said, I think somebody said fifteen percent was the regular fee but I have taken it actually on ten percent of \$150,000, which is \$15,000; advertising station time, T.V., radio that type of area. \$10,000 which may or may not be low, I am not sure; \$3,000 for equipment which would be used in showing slides and films and that type of thing, especially equipped van and here, as I have already said, somebody said it cannot come out of this vote, I am not sure, I just do not know but there is a \$10,000 figure in there that I will have to check. General meetings, hiring of halls and this type of thing. payment of halls for fishermen's meetings, \$5,000; fairs exhibitions and public displays \$15,000; slide presentations \$5,000 and three films, if we should go to three and as I said before there is still no confirmation of this, an estimated \$60,000. So basically I think that adds up to about \$190,000.

MR. NEARY. Mr. Chairman, for several months past I have been asking questions in this honourable House about McLean's advertising. I have

MR. NEARY: been getting very evasive answers from the ministers that I have directed the questions to, Sir. At long last, at long last, Sir. the government tonight confessed that there was such an organization, up to now they disclaimed any knowledge of it. Now tonight they have confessed, maybe confession is good for the soul.

We have discovered, Sir, again I have to say I am not boasting, but I have to say that I was absolutely correct in some of the statements I have made in this honourable House over the past couple of months, that there was political patronage being passed out to a public relations firm from Ontario, McLean's Advertising. I was laughed at and sneered at by the ministers. It is proven tonight, Sir, that I was absolutely right.

I am also right, Mr. Chairman -

AN HON. MEMBER: No way.

MR. NEARY: in statements that I made that these fantastic amounts of money are being lashed out to this advertising firm at the expense of the mothers and the students in this province, Sir. It is the mothers who are paying the bill. I would like to know, Sir, what benefit this programme is going to be to the fishermen of this province? I would like to know, Sir. The minister has not told us. A great public relations firm, what is it meant to do, Sir? Is it meant to find markets for the fish? Is it a conservation programme, Sir? What is it? Is it going to put any more income into the pockets of the fishermen?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know before I agree to passing this fantastic amount of money to a Mainland firm and I have nothing against Mainlanders, Sir, nothing against Mainlanders. I am sure this work could have been done in Newfoundland. It could have been done for a much lower cost.

MR. CHEESEMAN: If I may, I am not sure, Mr. Chairman, I only ask it in relation to the amount of money being referred to, as I have stated earlier, this programme, the 1972-1973 programme figures and

the dollar values that I just gave are not committed to any one. I said that before and I say it again. There are no contracts with any companies to produce the money that I have quoted in the 1972/1973 estimates.

MR. NEARY: But there is a commitment, Mr. Chairman. There is a commitment. If they produce the right type of slides and films then my understanding is that the government are committed to pay another \$25,000 to this outfit from -

MR. CHEESEMAN: That was only in reference to the film that the Premier stated that there would be no further payment until stage two was done. What I am saying is and what I said before : Until such time that there is any contractual arrangement with any company, this 1972/1973 estimate figure is not committed. As I say, I am only saying it from the point of view of clarification. I am not arguing about the amount of money.

MR. NEARY: I appreciate the minister's clarification, Mr. Chairman. I want the honourable minister to inform this committee of how he thinks this great programme that we have heard so much about tonight, how it is going to put additional income into the pockets of the fishermen? Could the money not be better used for the fisheries, Sir? Could it not be better used? We were talking tonight about the insurance programme. I submit, Sir, that it could. I would also like to ask the minister another question. Apart from the service charges I presume that are being paid to Mr. McLean or McLean's Advertising, at the expense of the mothers and the students in this province (the Minister of Finance can come in and flop down in his seat all he likes and he can thumb his nose at me all he likes, Sir. That is what is happening. It is being paid to this outfit at the expense of the mothers) will there be any commissions to this outfit from the television stations, from the radio stations, from the newspapers in addition to the service charges? The honourable minister says that he does not know. Could the honourable minister find out and let us know?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Well I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that it is under

Mr. Cheeseman.

the listing which I gave. I do not think it is applicable. If there is a cost for a film or any other type of presentation that will be ours. It will be passed to us. I do not see the area where that could apply.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I made a statement in this honourable House the other day that it was reported to me that McLean's Advertising, the Bay Street Boys from Toronto, would get paid by the taxpayers of this province \$8,000 a week. The hon. Premier was in the House. I put the question to the hon. Premier and he did not deny it, Sir. I would submit that that is pretty close to the truth. The total expenditure, not only from the Department of Fisheries but from all the government departments -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, I am not debating all the government departments. Mr. Chairman, I asked the Premier to confirm or deny the fact that McLean's Advertising would receive from the taxpayers of this province, hard earned money, in the next twelve months, \$8,000 and the Premier did not deny it. He did not deny it. The hon. member for St. John's East is listening to me now and I am heading home. I was also told, Sir, that this great public relations outfit from Toronto -

MR. CARTER: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. All the points that the honourable gentleman is making have been covered before, again, again and again. I would submit that he should be ruled out of order for being needlessly and tediously repetitious.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, what kind of a point of order is that? Is it any wonder, Mr. Chairman, that nobody in this province today is taking the Minister of Education seriously.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is speaking to a point of order.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is not a serious point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point of order raised by the honourable minister is with respect to the delaying of the debate by repetition. I would ask the honourable member to keep in mind that this practice is there that at some stage repetition does become out of order. I ask the honourable member

Mr. Chairman.

to keep this in mind.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, as I have said, is it any wonder that the people of this province are not taking the Minister of Education very seriously. Sir, I do not want to delay the committee. The hon. Minister of Finance waltzed into the House again tonight, flopped down in his seat as he always does and said, "all the honourable members on the opposite side are angry over this." Of course, we are angry, Mr. Chairman. The people of Newfoundland will be angry when the news gets out tomorrow. Tens of thousands of their hard-earned money, the taxpayer's dollar lashed out to a public relations firm from Toronto, Sir, at the expense of the mothers and at the expense of the students in this province. That will not be very funny, Sir, when it comes out tomorrow. I am glad that the information came out tonight, Mr. Chairman. It indicates what I have been saying for the last six months in this province. We will hear a lot more about it in the future. I feel sorry for the Minister of Fisheries getting trapped into the kind of a situation he was into tonight. It was not his fault, Sir. I would suggest that it is the hon. the Premier who will have to pay the penalty for this when the news gets out on the radio, television and in the newspapers tomorrow, when the people of Newfoundland see what is happening to their tax dollars.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the Minister of Fisheries one question: In addition to the regional offices that are proposed to be set up by his department, does the minister now have any plans as to the location of these offices? Is there any ground work as far as the establishment?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Mr. Chairman, actually I think I mentioned earlier in the evening that the regional offices (I will answer it now, if you wish) if you look at the estimates under the Block Vote, that is the establishment of regional offices and staff. I can answer it now, if you wish.

MR. THOMS: Answer it now and I will not have to ask you again.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Okay. Under the Block Vote Provision, there is provision

Mr. Cheeseman.

made for four regional offices. These four regional offices are to be located strategically around the country. The specific answer as to whether the locations are actually decided on, the answer is no. "Is there any work going on in connection with establishing them?" Yes, I have asked a couple of people in the department to try, as part of this inventory taking, and find out where the concentration of people are in terms of the fishery so that we can more logically locate the regional offices in the correct locations. There are no decisions as to either personnel or location.

MR. THOMS: Would the minister answer this question for me? Does he intend or do any of his officials intend at the present time to put one, two or three of these offices in either Gander, Grand Falls or Corner Brook?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Well since no decision as I have said has been made there can be no terms of commitment there but my own feeling is that the offices should be located as close to the fishery and fishermen as possible, in the locations which will be taken.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister of Fisheries a question. How can he explain that the Minister of Justice, the member for Burin, has already announced that one of these offices will be located in Burin, when the minister stands here and says that no decision has been taken yet on where the offices will be located? How can the honourable minister explain that? Is there any dialogue between the two ministers?

MR. CHEESEMAN: In as much as I am the one who is doing the estimates and it is the Department of Fisheries, you would have to ask some one else about it. If that kind of a decision has already been taken, I am not aware of it.

MR. NEARY: Is the honourable minister aware that the hon. Minister of Justice, the member for Burin, announced publicly on radio and television that one of these offices would be located in Burin?

MR. CHEESEMAN: I do not know. I am not specifically aware of it. It might be logical that in that area there might be one located. I mean other than that there is no signed, sealed agreement, to my knowledge, at this time unless any such commitment was made without my information prior to my assuming responsibility for the department. I would have to qualify it to that extent.

On motion 1413-05, carried.

On motion total subhead 1413, carried.

On motion total subhead 1421 carried.

On motion total subhead 1431 -

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, if all the claims under the storm damage programme were paid last year? Or was there some turned down?

MR. CHEESEMAN: As I have stated tonight the actual situation, which was to the effect that the claims which were accepted last year originally by the previous administration then carried on with the balance of the fiscal year by this administration, there was a backlog of some I would not want to be held to this figure but I think it was approximately \$36,000 which was needed in addition to the money that had already been appropriated in order to clear up the claims that came under the criteria set up by the previous administration but which has not been paid. Sufficient monies had been voted for that and the claims that were in at that time under the time limit set on it were paid. To my knowledge all those had been paid. There were claims which for one reason or another were turned down, for reasons that I was stating tonight, because they did not meet the criteria that was set up at that time or they were well beyond the date when the deadline was cut off. So there could very well be claims that were not -

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, within my district, at the present time, I have at least five fishermen who lost equipment, fishing equipment, last fall. To this date they have not been able to get one cent rebate or one cent against their claims. May I ask the minister, is there any way that these fishermen can receive any payment whatsoever? Because I bring to the attention of the minister one thing: One man in particular who the last year had a longliner, he lost \$4,000 worth of gear. He is not fishing this year because of that. He cannot fish. He lost every cent he had, he lost all his credit last year because of this. He is not fishing this year. Is there any possibility of the minister's department helping this fisherman out and may be many others like him?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, of course the honourable member for Bonavista North is quoting the very kind of circumstances that I was describing earlier tonight on the need for insurance. If the loss left the criteria which was established last year, because bear in mind it was only a balance of payment of last year that was paid by this administration.

If it meant the criteria set up - as a matter of fact I believe in that area it was a specific storm, because from memory, say June 27, to July 2, assuming it was in that time which qualified, and assuming that the application was in, I gather from what the honourable member said that there is some suggestion that the claims had been in and had not been satisfied. I do not know when they would be in. The only thing I could say to the honourable member, if he could give me the details and when the claims were originally filed, then I would be glad to have the department look into it and see what the qualifications are.

on motion total subhead 1431 carried.

Shall the total heading XIV - Fisheries - carry.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the minister, previous to Jan. 18, the then Leader of the Conservative Party made an announcement that if his party took over the government of this province that they would pay one cent per pound as a subsidy for fish. Can I ask the minister if his department has any programme along this line as far as subsidizing fish is concerned?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Mr. Chairman, in answer to that I have to say that I have no knowledge of the announcement which was referred to. I heard reference to subsidies being paid on inshore fish or the government would consider subsidies on inshore fish should the price levels so warrant. I think there was some reference but as to even who made it I could not say. At this point, from a department point of view, no.

MR.THOMS: No, there is no programme. There is no subsidy.

MR.CHEESEMAN: Well, there is no consideration subsidy, pre-supposing that the prices would have to be at a level for which subsidy would be warranted. This does not exist or ~~has~~ not existed to my knowledge. Bearing in mind that I do not know the specific reference or any specific statement that anyone might have made prior to Jan. 18, I am not familiar with that. I think that the question would have to be directed to whoever made the statement at that time. The only thing I can assure the honourable member, it was not I that made it.

MR.THOMS: Mr. chairman, I can assure the honourable member, it was the Leader of the conservative party at that time, who is now Premier of this Province, who made the statement. I do not have the statement at hand but I can certainly get it for the honourable gentleman. The statement read that he would subsidize the price of fish. There was no condition attached to it whatsoever.

MR.CHAIRMAN: Order: I draw the attention to the honourable members to the fact that there is now before the House the total for headings. Questions of the nature that the honourable member is now asking I would think could have been asked under the minister's salary or if there was a specific item of expenditure. I permitted the question to let the minister answer it. However, I would ask the honourable member to limit debate on this matter, since there is really no motion before the floor at this time to which that discussion is relevant.

MR.CHEESEMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think in fairness, I was half-way through answering the thing. I should say that I think the particular weapons of the question should be identified and brought forward because I am not aware of it.

On motion total Heading XIV - Fisheries - carried.

Department of Municipal Affairs & Housing: XIII.

MR.COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, at this hour in the morning I do not have any

long drawn out opening statement. I think possibly I would prefer to let the honourable members opposite decide on what they want to ask on the various headings. I will try to answer them as best I can.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, there are just two or three points I would like to make or inquiries I would like to make of the honourable minister. In making them I would like to refer back to the document that was presented to this House on March 1, 1972, Wednesday, the Speech from the Throne, in the first session of the thirty-fifth general assembly. In the first paragraph of the part of the speech that refers to Municipal Affairs & Housing the following is said. "The rapid growth in the number of councils which have become incorporated under the Local Government Act is most encouraging. As a very important part of my Government's policy to improve the quality of administration my Ministers recognize the need to strengthen the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing by establishing regional offices in the larger strategic locations in the province."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I could not agree more with the need for the establishment of regional government or regional offices in this province. We only have to look back to an analogy to the department of Education or the Boards of Education. A few years ago we had over two hundred school boards in this province. Now I think we have something like I believe thirty-five or thirty-seven school boards. If we can only see the - we certainly have seen the advantages that are to be gained from centralizing or having fewer school boards. I think the same thing could quite easily apply to having fewer municipal councils, town councils, local improvement districts throughout our province.

One thing that really disturbs me when I travel around the rural parts of our province is when we see so many local improvement districts, we see so many town councils really fighting against each other for

June 29, 1972.

Tape 1147.

Page 5.

funds from government. There is all sorts of rivalry between these various communities. I think that one way around this problem is to have some form of regional government or a combination of these various town councils so that in fact regions, these councils, then would have more power or

3712

Mr. Rowe (F.B.).

have a greater strength when they come to government in order to try and meet the needs of their particular area. As well I would submit, Sir, that in the collection of taxes and this sort of a thing, if we had fewer councils, a centralization of collection agencies for town councils, a great amount of money would be saved in the collection of these taxes and the revenue would, therefore, be that much greater. We certainly need this co-ordination, correlation and this co-operation between what we now see, i.e., little spotty town councils, community councils and this sort of thing all up and down and around the coast and around the bays. So, Sir, I would like to hear what the honourable minister has to say with respect to the plans he has for the development if any of regional government in this province or certainly I would like to hear what he would have to say about the establishment of regional offices. I do not know if I entirely agree with the business of establishing regional offices. I do not know what they would do, whether they would try to co-ordinate the work of local improvement districts, town councils and what have you. I would like to hear what he has to say really about this whole idea of regional government itself, how this can be taken care of.

The second thing I would like the minister to relate to, Mr. Chairman, is this whole business of financial assistance to municipalities. Again quoting from this Speech from the Throne, the Thirty-Fifth General Assembly: (I would like to add that in the second Speech from the Throne, which could not be conceived as an election document I guess to the same extent that the first one could it suggested there) "My government today is still totally dedicated to fulfilling the commitments and the carrying out of development programmes proposed during the opening of the Thirty-Fifth General Assembly." We see that the question of providing additional financial assistance to municipalities has received very serious consideration. "In view of the fact that the Newfoundland Federation of Municipalities has

Mr. Rowe (F.B.):

recommended to government that the ceiling on revenue grants paid to municipalities be raised my ministers have decided to remove the \$75,000 ceiling and increase this figure to \$100,000."

Now, Sir, I cannot understand the compatibility of that particular statement in the Throne Speech, when we look at the total grants to Local Government Administration, 1311-03, that that has been reduced from \$10,914,000 last year down to \$7,613,000 this year. Sir, I would like first to hear the honourable minister explain what we see in the Throne Speech on the one hand and what we see in the estimates on the other before I would even dare suggest that there might be a certain amount of political hypocrisy or political dishonesty from this Throne Speech. The third point, Sir, that I would like to raise and again I have to go back to the Throne Speech: "My government will initiate forthwith a policy of cost sharing for paving of streets in the incorporated municipalities throughout the province." (That is a quote directly from the Throne Speech).

When we look to the estimates, Sir, for the honourable minister's department, we see that the paving grant has been reduced from what was \$1,229,999 last year to \$775,000 only this year. I would like the minister to try and explain the compatibility, if any exists, between the statement in the Throne Speech and what we find in the estimates. The fourth point that I would like the minister to relate to, Sir, is this whole business of water and sewerage. We see that the grant to that particular vote is down as well from \$3,812,000 last year to \$2,800,000 this year. Now, Sir, I realize the great problem that we have with providing water and sewerage to the many communities that we have in this province. I am representing the District of St. Barbe North. There are twenty-five small communities in that particular district. There are two local improvement districts and one town council. Now, Sir, I do not know whether they are

June 29, 1972

Tape no. 1148

Page 3

Mr. Rowe (F.B.)

planning to set up town councils or local improvement districts of the other communities. I understand that the people in this district are. But, Sir, they all obviously want water and sewers for each particular town. Sir, I think this administration, in view of the fact that they promised to tell the people the way it is, owe to the people of St. Barbe North and the people anywhere in this province, owe to them to tell them whether there is a chance in the world of those people ever being provided with water and sewers. In the couple of communities where we do have a water supply system in St. Barbe North now, and this was done under another department, the Department of Community and Social Development; the water lines are still frozen, Sir. They expect to be frozen until the end of July. I think this administration (It is no good referring back to the former administration saying that they did not tell it the way it was or the way it is) or the honourable minister ought to make some sort of a statement as to the possibility of his department ever being able to supply water lines or water and sewerage systems to communities like that. I realize the difficulties involved but I would like to hear him say something about it. There is just one other point, Sir. I will be as brief as I can.

I understand that the members of the local improvement district associations are appointed by government. Is that right? I have heard two sides to this story. Some people in some communities want members appointed to the local improvement districts. They do not want to have the members voted in by the community. On the other hand, Sir, I have heard the exact opposite coming from some people. They would like to have the members of those local improvement districts elected by the people in the town or in the community. This is what I am trying to find out. What is the story with respect to that? I do not know if I should say this or not or make the charge or not. I am not referring to anybody in particular.

3715

Mr. Rowe (F.B.).

But some people in the communities are of the feeling, Sir, that people set up those local improvement districts for only one purpose and that is to set themselves up in a position where they can benefit from it in the way of business and this type of thing. I would just ask the minister if he would comment on that, if he has had any complaints from any communities that have local improvement districts and what the story is with respect to this: Can these members be elected? The hon. member for Bonavista South suggests that they can. I was not aware of this. I would like for the minister to comment on that briefly if he would, please. There are five points. I do not know if you have had an opportunity to get all the information.

MR. COLLINS: There are more than five, Mr. Chairman. I will deal with them in the order that the honourable member asked them. First of all about the regional offices which we did indicate that we are setting up, (I do not know if it was during an election campaign or between the campaigns, to tell the truth. Whatever it was, it really had nothing to do with politics as such) we are of the opinion that regional offices strategically located across the province could service many town councils which we have now much better than they could be served from the central location here in St. John's. It is a source of some concern to all of us, with the great increase in the number of councils which have been incorporated during the past several years. The staff in the department have not kept up with it. Very often we find councils established and someone sends them a few brochures and possibly an inspector makes an initial visit. There is not an adequate follow up in terms of training municipal officials and so on. We felt that this could be better done by having offices possibly in Labrador, possibly on the South Coast, possibly in areas across the province whereby the inspectors, rather than spending an enormous amount of time travelling from St. John's to the West Coast or Labrador and back to St. John's again, would be located close to a number of councils, We thought they could be able to provide a better service to them.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): In other words, it is not really a sort of a form of the starting of a regional government, it is the Civil Service moving out into these regional offices?

MR. COLLINS: It has nothing to do with another level of government at all. That is another subject I will deal with shortly. The regional office concept we believe has some merit. We want to discuss it further with the Federation of Municipalities and we want to make sure that if we do go into this that it is the right thing to do. There is not much sense of doing it for the sake of trying it and having it fail. We want to be sure that it will make a contribution to the overall benefit of the local government movement. The honourable member referred to regional government. There has been some debate in recent years in Newfoundland and certainly across Canada about the merits of another layer of government, if you want to, regional government. I attended the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities Convention in Quebec City not too long ago and this was a topic which was thoroughly discussed. There were several workshops on it. I remember there was a gentleman from an area in British Columbia, there was a chap from York, in Ontario,

MR. COLLINS: and someone from Niagara Falls and someone from somewhere in New Brunswick, I believe it was St. John, where there is a system of regional government. The problems in British Columbia are different from the problems we find in New Brunswick. Certainly the problems in Ontario are different from all of them. I think that honourable members will agree that the problems in Newfoundland are different from all of those.

Whether we are ready in Newfoundland for another level of government, I am not sure but I am inclined to doubt that we are. The Local Government Movement in Newfoundland is relatively new. Certainly there is a lot of training to be done. We have a lot of good municipal officials and a lot of good mayors and councillors. What I mean by good - competent people. But I am afraid there is a lot of work to be done in the area of improving the competency of the management of government. I am inclined to think that maybe another layer at this time, which might be required, to impose another tax burden. The ultimate end might not mean an increase in the overall tax but at least it would be another tax imposed somewhere along the line. I do not think we are ready for that in Newfoundland at the present time.

That is the regional government concept. There could be areas in Newfoundland where we have several large communities or even several small communities or close together, they might be able to derive some benefit from sharing fire fighting services, from sharing water services, possibly. That is a good case to be made in Central Newfoundland for a joint water system. There are places where garbage dumps, a common dump can be provided to service a number of municipalities.

This is all good but I think that can be brought about by co-operation from among the councils now, that once you start another layer of government, a regional government would be another layer, another group of elected officials, I do not believe we are entirely ready.

However, we are going to have some experts look into this, please goodness, in the not too distant future and get all the advice that we

MR. COLLINS: can. We have already received a fair amount of it from the CFNM and after we get it altogether and tested on the municipalities, chances are we would try it but I think it a little premature at this time.

MR. ROWE, (F.B.): The feelings are, according to the honourable minister, the various councils themselves are not exactly in favour of it at this point in time. Because the reason I ask this is, the time for instance when we were considering this whole idea of consolidating school boards, the individual school boards were not particularly in favour of it, but once the act was done the benefits to be derived from it were obviously quite clear to them. You know you have your little pockets of power or responsibility at this stage of the game and to sort of suggest that you are going to wipe this out might made the people feel just a little bit uncomfortable.

So I would not expect, I do not know what the answer is, but I would not expect that you would get that much support from the various town councils or even from the federation at this point.

MR. COLLINS: Well the Federation of Municipalities in Newfoundland, I forget what council made the resolution, but they did submit a resolution in their most recent brief which was presented to us, suggesting that we might try regional government. I am inclined to think that it is a bit premature yet. If the councils insist on it and only by insisting and by agreeing to make it work, will it work. Certainly we are not going to impose it on them, because there is a great danger that it will not work then. But I believe that when the councils say that they are ready, chances are the people will be ready. When that time comes, we will certainly take a good look at it.

In the meantime we are taking a look at it now, if there is something worthwhile to be said for it, I believe then we have the responsibility to offer this information to the various councils and possibly to the people. It is something which they should see, and let them more or less decide. I think there should be a lot of debate and dialogue, as the

MR. COLLINS: honourable member says, before we get involved in it.

what was the next question?

MR. ROWE, F.B. In the Throne Speech, I noted, the Thirty-Fifth General Assembly, you were going to raise the ceilings \$75,000 to \$100,000 on the revenue grants paid to the municipalities. I noted that the total grant to local government administration has been reduced by something over \$3 million this year.

MR. COLLINS: With regard to the grant, we did make reference to that in the Throne Speech and I believe that in the next Throne Speech we did say that it was not introduced. There was a ceiling of \$75,000 on revenue grants to municipalities. In other words, we could not pay any more than \$75,000 to any municipality. The revenue grants are based on a sliding scale, it is two dollars for each dollar collected. For instance, if a municipality collects a dollar in revenue, we contribute two dollars in the form of a grant, up to a certain amount and then it drops back. But when we reach the ceiling of \$75,000 that was it. A municipality, some of the larger ones -

MR. ROBERTS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, if Your Honour will permit. The point of order is this, that we are ordering some stuff to be sent in from Barney's, does anybody on the other side want to order anything?

AN HON. MEMBER: Are the honourable gentlemen over there going to buy it?

MR. ROBERTS: No. of course, we are not buying it.

MR. COLLINS: So what I was saying is that there was a ceiling of \$75,000. Some of the larger municipalities were suffering because of that. Some of them could be collecting eighty or ninety, or ninety-five, some of them over one hundred in fact. We removed the ceiling of \$75,000 and brought in a new ceiling of \$100,000. So there are approximately twelve or fifteen, I do not know exactly but somewhere between twelve and fifteen is pretty close, municipalities who will derive

MR. COLLINS: considerable benefit from that this year. Some might receive only another \$10,000, others will qualify for an additional \$25,000 in the revenue grants.

I do not know if that is clear. Yes, but what we are talking about here is the ceiling. In other words, even though a municipality by virtue of their own tax collection would qualify for more than \$75,000 before, we were limited in what we could pay them. We could not pay them more than that, Now we have raised it to \$100,000.

Cost sharing of paving was the next question, I believe.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

MR. COLLINS: We do have a figure in here of \$775,000 for assisting the municipalities in paving local roads. That programme is not a new programme, I might say this was in use by the former administration. It is contingent upon the municipalities being able to provide fifty percent of the cost. We have had some requests, not too many because I suspect there are not too many municipalities that can find the fifty percent of the cost which they are required to provide.

However we should not be misled by the \$775,000 because, depending upon how we finance the paving ourselves, whether it is over a five year period or a ten year period or a fifteen year period, that we have not decided yet, we could do a considerable amount of paving with the \$775,000 commitment this year.

MR. ROWE, F.B. The impression that I got, Mr. Chairman, from this statement and from the Throne Speech was that "my government will initiate forthwith a policy of

cost sharing for the paving of streets in the incorporated municipalities throughout the province. Now this seems to suggest you are going to draft some sort of a new scheme or formula, you are going to initiate forthwith a policy. There was already existing a policy. Do you have a new policy to announce?

MR. COLLINS: I am not sure what the exact wording in the Throne Speech was. I just said it was not a new policy. The former administration did have a similar policy, as members opposite, the honourable Leader of the Opposition knows and so does the honourable member from White Bay South, that there was such a programme years ago. I believe it came in in 1962 and expired in 1968.

MR. THOMS: What do you mean years ago? It was in effect last year, was it not?

MR. COLLINS: No, it expired in 1968.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): In other words, Mr. Chairman, you are not initiating a policy.

MR. COLLINS: Not a new one, no.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): Well this is what the statement says in the Throne Speech, that my government will initiate, that means to start up a new, initiate a policy. This seems to indicate something far different or different from that which already existed.

MR. COLLINS: Well that was not intentional, to do that then.

Certainly all the municipalities -

MR. ROWE(F.B.): But it is a curious thing that it just happened to be three weeks before the election.

MR. COLLINS: We were not fooling the municipalities, as they knew the programme existed before.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): Basically. Mr. Chairman, the way it is with respect to water and sewerage.

MR. COLLINS: Water and sewerage. I think that the honourable member

mentioned that the water and sewerage grant was down. We all know that last year there was a considerable amount of water and sewer work started. The year before and the year before and the year before there was not as much, I would suggest. Last year there were quite a few starts made. I can go into that if I want to but it will take some time. Maybe we should.

At any rate the figure which appears here this year is no indication of the work which might be done this year. The figures which we have here reflect payments which we are required to make this year to the Municipal Finance Corporation for work which might have been done several years ago. Any work which is being done this year in council areas, on capital account, is not reflected in those figures at all. These are merely payments which we are making, they represent actually subsidies which we make to municipalities, which come due year after year after year.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): With all the maneuvering, Mr. Chairman, I am having some difficulty in trying to get the question straight. The other question relating to water and sewerage, Mr. Chairman, I was asking of the minister, was there exists in this province a real problem with respect to supplying water lines and water systems and certainly water and sewers to those great numbers of small communities that we have in our province. Now this probably requires a policy statement on the part of the Premier because it could involve resettlements as some of it comes under the Department of Community and Social Development and of course some of it comes under the minister's own department. But what I am really trying to get at is people have the feeling in a lot of these small communities that it is possible to get these water and sewerage systems in, the time will come around when they will finally get it.

Now what I am asking the minister is, is it this administration's intention to try and supply these small communities with water and sewerage systems or water systems or are they looking at it? Because it is an extremely expensive thing, as the minister well knows. Have they given it any thought? Could he tell us the way it is?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I can only speak for the incorporated areas of the province where there are local improvement districts, town councils, community councils. In the other areas that comes under the Department of Community and Social Development, and the honourable minister's estimates have to come yet and I suspect he will be dealing with it. Where we do have councils of course the request for water and sewer facilities must come from the council and actually it must be related with their ability to pay and with the taxpayers of that community's ability to pay. We do not for instance decide if we are going to put a water and sewer system in a given area. I might say we are getting a fair number of requests. There are a lot of starts already made and a lot of work already ongoing and no doubt there will be other work starting.

I am of the opinion that the time has come in Newfoundland when people are going to continue to demand, and rightly so, water and sewer facilities. There is no way we can assume anything else because after all it is a necessity. It is not a luxury any more. The real problem, Mr. Chairman, is trying to find the funds to carry out the work and this I can assure the honourable member is a concern to all of us. However much we might scratch our heads and however much we might complain about Ottawa not giving us enough, I am afraid it is a problem that is going to be with us for some time because we find that many of the smaller communities are very difficult to service, in terms of the distance which the people live from one another. If we were starting a sub-division, for instance, in St. John's or some of the larger areas

today, we try and keep the frontage, the size of the lot down to sixty feet. You will find a lot of lots in new sub-divisions are fifty-five foot frontage, sixty and sixty-five. That is about the average. You will find that in many of the rural parts of the country you might have to go three hundred feet or maybe five hundred feet sometimes between residences. So I am sure that all honourable members can realize, can appreciate the problem which this poses in terms of cost.

I know of some programmes which are ongoing now where it can cost anywhere from \$10,000 possibly to \$20,000 to provide services to a given home.

MR. ROBERTS: That is not average now.

MR. COLLINS: No, there are some cases.

MR. ROBERTS: Would that be an average?

MR. COLLINS: No, it is not an average. That is an extreme but if you think in terms of the fact that the larger areas in Newfoundland now are serviced and some of the smaller places are serviced. The ones that are left these are where the real problems are going to arise because you find the people are living in a sort of a ribbon development and the costs are really, really staggering. We have a pretty generous subsidy, a pretty generous water subsidy. I would not say it is the most generous you would find across Canada but certainly it is generous. I am not sure whether it is generous enough or if we can improve it. I believe we are going to have to improve it because certainly, when you think in terms of the subsidy which we would provide for a given water supply, I know of areas in Newfoundland where the people, in order to be able to take care of the principal and interest payments on the loans which would have to be provided for it, it means they would have to pay in the order possibly of \$50.00 or \$55.00 a month for water and sewer and that cost, as you know, is such that people just cannot afford it.

June 29, 1972

Tape 1150(Night)

JM - 5

What the answer is, I really cannot tell you. Certainly there has to be greater federal participation. There has to be long-term loans set up. We are taking some very good looks at all the various programmes. I believe that maybe we have to think in terms of some new ways of doing it. They are putting in the water and sewer systems now, something the same as the Romans put them in back in the year 1000. There has been no real improvement. Maybe we have improved the quality of the copper pipe and the quality of the sewer pipe but it is buried underground. The cost, as we all know, is in getting it down there and covering it over and in

3726

Newfoundland sometimes that is quite a task. I believe that we are going to be forced into looking at some new way of providing those services to some of the areas which are not already serviced. That is the only way I can see we might be able to do it.

MR.F.ROWE: What percentage of the homes in Newfoundland have water and sewerage systems?

MR.COLLINS: That does not mean too much, really. I do not mean the question does not mean too much, but the answer is not going to mean too much. About seventy-five per cent of the people, I would estimate between seventy and seventy-five per cent of the people in Newfoundland now have running water.

MR.ROBERTS: Municipal services - many people have it. It is not municipal services.

MR.COLLINS: Yes, but we are talking about municipal services. Some people have their own individual systems. But when we say seventy-five per cent of the people, you know there are still a lot of people in Newfoundland, there are still a lot of people in the smaller places who do not have it. But seventy-five per cent of the people do have it, which is a pretty good -

MR.NEARY: Mr. Chairman, would that be seventy-five per cent with water and sewerage system, so many of them would only have water. Some would have water and sewer.

MR.COLLINS: We do not have the figures broken down, seventy-five per cent with water. I would say pretty close to that with sewer as well. When you think of the larger towns, like St. John's and the larger - I should mention Gander, I suppose - Grand Falls, Corner Brook, Burin, seventy-five per cent with water.

MR.ROBERTS: Let me take that a step further. Would the minister say a few words as to whether or not the government feel that we should have communities in the future which have water installations, by which I

mean municipal, but not sewer? There are at least two schools of thought on this, there may be more. On one hand, I think the officials in the Department of Municipal Affairs, the expert advisers, take the position that providing water and services to a community. This is a new position that has developed as a result of the last few years, that putting water into a community increases significantly the amount of water per home, if you wish, thus increases the amount of outflow amount of sewerage per home.

Similarly, on the other hand you have the position that particularly in the number of our smaller communities, many people manage to find means to disperse or dispose of their sewerage. They have either the septic tanks system, where they have outfalls out to the harbour. That is particularly so in a community where you have the people living around the verge of the harbour. They may be able to get rid of their sewerage but they do have a great difficulty in finding adequate water supplies, especially because in most of our communities, community planning is of course an unknown art. People build in the backyard. The father divides his land among two or three children. This is what has happened up in Harbour Main District, throughout that entire district. People who had been using wells, shallow wells as a rule, dug wells, have not been getting adequate water some of them for fifty or a hundred years. But, now they find that through the growing concentration of population and additionally the fact that the health department now tests water, such water have been drunk with great safety over the years. When it is tested it is turned down then the panic comes on, the delegations begin to form, telegrams start coming in and what have you.

But there are these two schools of thought. On the one hand to provide merely a water system without a sewerage system just compounds

the problem. On the other hand that in some cases, perhaps in many too, to provide a water system is infinitely cheaper. The pipes do not have to go deep nor are they as large and you do not get into the sewerage treatment plant problem. We will have a few words on that because I would like to hear the minister's views on that. But could the minister tell us his views on this problem of water systems on one hand, as opposed to the water and sewer on the other. There are a number of communities in Newfoundland where we may at some stage be able to reach financing for a water system but we may have a great deal more difficulty reaching a water and sewer system because it is more expensive.

We are going to be here a while anyway. We could go into these in detail now.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, there are some arguments for providing a water system, a water system only. In terms of places where the Department of Health has turned down the wells or the source whatever it might be, the source of water. There are a lot of these, sometimes something has to be done on an emergency basis to provide a decent water supply. That is the number one requirement to get a decent supply. If we are going to do that, generally we do the job, all as it were, we put in a proper water system.

Many people will give you the argument; if you are going to put in the water system let us put in the sewer system too. But there are some years we can clapboard one end of the house and have not enough money to do the other end, that has to wait. Very often we find, as the honourable Leader of the Opposition knows, there is a limit to what money can be spent in any one year, generally. We find that; let us put in the water system and try it for a year or two, granted we are going to have to interfere with the sewer system.

But I think what the honourable Leader of the Opposition is leading up to is that once a water supply goes in I think the disposal then is about twenty times what it would have been had people been using the buckets in the well, which I have used and I suspect a lot of other honourable members have used.

MR. ROBERTS: Is it as large as twenty to one?

MR. COLLINS: It is around twenty to one. Of course one can imagine then what happens in terms of pollution of ditches and overflowing of septic tanks and so on and so forth. This is a real problem in fact it has possibly reached the stage now in a lot of areas where the Clean Air Water and Soil Authority will not permit us to install a water supply unless we put a sewer system at the same time. Then of course in many of the areas of the province again we are going to have to get involved in sewage treatment plants. That is something which is very expensive as well. There are no water treatment plants in Newfoundland yet, thank goodness. Hopefully we will never need one. But certainly there is going to be a great need for sewage treatment plants.

It is a case of trying to keep up with the demand in terms of providing clean water, knowing always, of course, that once that is provided the old problem becomes more complex and eventually we are going to be saddled with the possibility of putting in a sewer system to take care of the additional disposal problems created.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, just before my colleagues ask a few more questions of the minister, I was wondering if he had forgotten this business of the possibility of the election of officers of the Local Improvement districts. Or whether he has received any complaints about people being appointed to these organizations.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, there is a lot to be said for local improvement districts. There are places across the province have set up local government - I cannot think of any particular place now - but that is not necessary, I suppose - where a local improvement district does serve a purpose to bring about local government and set up some sort of a tax system and generally educate the people into the overall local government concept. But I am of the opinion and feel very strongly about this, that the local government set up should not last very long, for a year or two years or whatever it might be. I believe then that while we cannot force the people to - I do not think we can force the people, I am sure we cannot, if they want local government, they can maintain local government, I think that we should try and encourage them to get away from it just as soon as they can create town councils and have general elections. Let the people decide who their councillors and mayors are going to be. There is a case to be made for local government, local improvement districts type of government but I think it should be short-lived always.

MR. F. ROWE: That is my own feeling, that they have to answer to the people in the community, they are going to perform their duties much more efficiently if they have to answer every year or two or three years.

MR. ROBERTS: Well this is an interesting thought, Mr. Chairman, in principle, I wonder if the minister could expand as to how he would propose to encourage local improvement districts. I do not mean it facetiously. I welcome the opportunity to spend a lengthy time discussing these questions in principle. It has been years since we had a good long - it is only midnight yet - any moment now the pumpkin will come, it has taken away a number of the honourable

gentleman, then tomorrow the whip will be around looking for people to wear glass shoes, you know - Always count on the whip, Sir, for some intelligent contributions. But as I was saying we have, as I understand it, basically two types of situations in this province where we have the local improvement districts. We will come back to water and sewer because it has only begun to scratch the service. You know, we have 117 communities I think, to ask about, then we have, we are only on the general philosophy of it yet.

There are two types of situation where you get local improvement districts. One is, call it Hogan's Pond or Lawrence's Pond or Topsail Pond. I would like the minister to say a few words on this trend of what amount to summer cabins in a year-round areas becoming incorporated: We have these three anyhow

Mr. Roberts.

becoming incorporated. We have those three anyway. There may be others. The minister could tell us. Lawrence's Pond, Hogan's Pond and Topsail Pond I think are all incorporated. Is Topsail Pond a part of Paradise? I know the people who live at Topsail Pond feel that it is part of Paradise. But it is part of the Local Improvement District of Paradise. That is good. I did not know that. That is good.

We have a situation there and I would be interested in how the minister intends to lead them on, particularly at Hogan's Pond we would have some fun. We would have the present member for St. John's West, myself contending for the mayoralty and the inevitable result would be that the both of us would lose and the people of Hogan's Pond would gain. It would be an interesting election down at Hogan's Pond.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: If he were to leave? Yes that is what the people on the pond say. They spread the word around. You can choose your friends but not your enemies. You cannot choose your neighbours.

MR. DOODY: As Dr. Rowe says, "or your relatives."

MR. ROBERTS: That is funny. That is exactly what my father says too. My father was related to the Minister of Health, not I. I am related to my father. That is the connection. Anyway the other situation we have in local improvement districts is the company town situation. I think this is something we should go into. Buchans I believe has a local improvement district. Wabush, the City of Wabush, in Labrador West, I think has a local improvement district. Goose Bay, near Happy Valley and that is a company town in effect because D.O.T. are the company. Of course, Labrador City has a local improvement district. Now these have gone on for years. I suppose they are ten or twelve years old. They have gone on for that long. Is it planned to discourage something or otherwise, this situation? You do not have much approach to a democratic government in Labrador City, as an example, the people there. It is a large town. It is modern. All the services are there. I know why the company - I agree there are some things missing.

Mr. Roberts.

Relatively speaking, in a municipal sense, the town is well served.

It is not like many other communities where people are drinking what amounts to urine. I know they do not have everything. They have the member for Labrador West and that means they do not have everything. There are other things they are lacking too. What I am getting at is that you got this company town situation. It has always bothered me in principle.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is late in the morning!

MR. ROBERTS: It is only early in the morning. It is late at night.

MR. MARSHALL: You do not seem to be very conscious of the time.

MR. ROBERTS: We are, yes! We are anxious to get on with it. That is why we are willing to stay here all night and come back tomorrow morning.

MR. MARSHALL: If we stay here all night, we do not have to come back tomorrow morning, we will be here.

MR. ROBERTS: That is right. The British House of Commons regularly, not regularly, often meets all night. Sure! When the Premier comes in and sees the minister in his chair - the Premier will not be back tonight.

MR. DOODY: If he does, I will get up. I did not want to obstruct the view of the minister.

MR. ROBERTS: That is a good point. That is pretty thoughtful of the minister. I would like him to say a few words about the company town situation. It has lasted for a number of years in this province. I, for one do not particularly like it. I know that the companies contribute very generously. I do not know what the taxes are, i.e., in Labrador City, the City of Wabush or in Buchans. There are no taxes? Well maybe the people in effect are in a situation where they do not get the vote and in return they do not get to pay taxes. There may be a lot of people in this world who would think that that was not such a bad trait. In Labrador City the company has a programme. Maybe the minister could outline his philosophy on this very important question. We have one type

MR. ROBERTS.

of local improvement district that is really set up to protect an area or to provide a form of government. You have another situation of the company town. I would like to know what the minister thinks we should do about that and in addition he could elaborate on how the department, under his guidance, his administration, will carry forth on this laudable end of encouraging people to move from appointed government to direct election. I think that is something that should be encouraged. I would like to know what sort of plan the minister has in mind. He has made a statement. He has obviously thought about it. I think he now should tell us a little bit about it and take us into his confidence because there are lots of places. In my district, I have a great list of them here. Maybe the minister could tell us and we will give him a crack at that. There are a number of other points we want to raise.

MR. COLLINS: I do not know if I said that I would encourage them Mr. Chairman. Maybe I did. If I did say that I believe it is our duty and the duty of all honourable members and citizens as a whole I suppose to point out, to believe that we believe in the democratic system, free elections and then we should apply that to town councils, local government the same as we apply it to provincial or federal government. I believe that where we do have local improvement districts today, that eventually will insist on having a say in who the mayor and councillors are going to be rather than having the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council appoint them. I do not like it. I suspect that a lot of people in Newfoundland are of the same opinion. I think in time the people will decide to want to have a say in who is going to govern them. The hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to local government in some of the company towns. He referred to Buchans. There is no local government in Buchans. The local improvement district in Buchans governs the community which is on the perimeter of the company town. This is a new development which has taken place on the perimeter of Buchans and as the settlement grew the people came to us and requested a local government set up. They were given the local improvement

Mr. Collins.

type of government, at their request. In the town itself that is still a company town. With regard to Labrador City, I only wish all the councillors in Newfoundland were like the councillors in Labrador City. Very seldom do they make any demands on us and they do provide a real good service down there. We have had no complaints to my knowledge from the residents of the area. They are quite satisfied with the way things are going. We cannot force local government upon them but I suspect that if the people in Labrador City took it upon themselves to solicit our assistance in forming a government there, then I am sure that the Iron Ore Company of Canada would be willing to sit down and talk with us. Actually what I am saying is that if the people want local government, I think they can get it.

With regard to Hogan's Pond where the hon. Leader of the Opposition has a summer cabin and some other honourable members in this House, they have been given the status of local government. I am not sure of their competence to assume that responsibility but we are going to give them a try for a few months and see how they will make out. I know if they insist on elections, we will perhaps have a little "mini" election down there sometime. They do have a form of local government and until they come to us for something else, maybe we will wait and see.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, on the minister's opening remarks I would like to make a few comments on regional government. The first question I would like to ask the honourable minister; seeing that there is a facility outside of his own office and as I understand it there is a branch of Municipal Affairs in the complex in Corner Brook with some of his officials in that particular building, maybe this is the start of a regional government. Most of the municipalities, Sir, throughout this province - I can fully appreciate the honourable minister's responsibility, being I suppose the official mayor or the unofficial mayor of all those municipalities as well as being the landlord or the owner of the number of houses throughout those municipalities and throughout this province. He does, Sir, share a big responsibility. I know that the demands are very great.

June 29, 1972

Tape no. 1152

Page 5

Mr. Woodward.

I fail to understand why regional government will not work in this province. I would like to recite isolated cases, maybe

3737

MR. WOODWARD: in the sense that there are a number of communities, especially the newly formed local improvement districts that have not yet visited any officials of his department because of the fact that they have not had the economic means whereby they can travel a great distances to come into St. John's to be with the honourable minister. I have no doubt that he does get a number of delegations visiting him from the nearby towns and local improvement districts on this part of the province or maybe on the Avalon Peninsula, as well as possibly on the West Coast.

But there is a need, Sir, for a number of regional offices and maybe the honourable minister can comment on the function of say the particular office in Corner Brook. I do not know what purpose it serves. I do not know if it is even considered as being a help to his particular function or department of government. But I am of the belief, Sir, that this department did serve a purpose. I understand that there are a number of delegations from the West Coast do get information from the Corner Brook source.

Maybe the minister could make some comments on this. The big problem with and the expense of a lot of problems - I am sure the honourable minister will agree that the amount of money that is being spent by the municipalities, which is an internal audit provided by the Department of Municipal Affairs, for delegations travelling into St. John's, the expense of putting those people up into hotels and the cost to the community councils and the municipalities while they are here. Maybe he does have the information available. I venture to say, Sir, that this is a large sum of money over a period of a year. I do not know if the minister does have the figures available, the amount of travelling involved through delegations. You get the understanding in a lot of communities that the council again is away spending our money. They are in visiting St. John's.

I see a great need for a better communication between councils and the municipalities and the local improvement districts. If they

MR. WOODWARD: have to travel to St. John's to do maybe the important business of council. then this is a great expense to the taxpayers of this province. Maybe that expense when it is calculated versus the cost of running regional offices will probably bear a great or it is possible that this expense towards regional offices, Sir, will cover a greater portion. But I feel that having a regional office, especially in Labrador where there is a great expense in travelling from Labrador to St. John's here and then having to be around the minister's office, and there are times I understand that delegations do have to wait for a period of time and rightfully so, I suppose. I am not criticizing the minister because of this. But if you arrive in St. John's and you are delayed a couple of days or maybe even a day, Sir waiting for a meeting with the minister or his officials, I understand that a lot of his officials and I know that a number of his officials have travelled throughout the province.

So in this case I see a need for regional government. I do not have the answer what type of government it is. But if the minister may turn around and analysis the situation that exist in Corner Brook, maybe this is the premise whereby regional offices can be set up. I am fully aware of the problems of company towns and I am heavily involved myself in a community that was owned not by the provincial government but was transferred from a federal agency to another federal agency, which we have turned into a local improvement district in Nain, but there has not been too much work done on it because of negotiations with the municipal government and the federal government concerned.

There is a great concern by the people who live in communities that are governed by maybe companies or by other agencies of government like the federal agencies, I referred to the case of Goose Bay when the Department of National Defence relinquished their rights to a particular community that they had developed over the years for their own personnel, which is a military type personnel, turned it over to

MR. WOODWARD: the Department of Transport and then in turn there was an integration of civilians, with civil servants from M.O.T. and now we see a great need for a local improvement district, which we have, but we have not developed it because of the fact that there are complications and negotiations which are going on which take a considerable amount of time.

I can understand the problems of the minister, but in this respect here a lot of citizens suffer to, when you deal with a landlord other than the municipal bodies, you can see I suppose the benefits derived from local municipal rule because of the fact that you have most of the towns in Newfoundland now screaming and especially on the Labrador Coast we have seen some great benefits and developments in the communities by having community councils and getting the people concerned about their own affairs, how they would want to run their own affairs and making those recommendations to the Department of Municipal Affairs.

Maybe the honourable minister can, when he thinks in terms of this - a lot of people feel that they have been jeopardized in one way and another because they are not under this particular type of municipal rule. I have heard a lot about the community of Buchans, where the people were denied the right to move into the company town, to develop the town. Consequently, they were forced to settle on the perimeter of the town and a number of interested citizens got together and developed a local improvement district, but it is not a part of the town of Buchans. The company would not allow people that did not work for the particular mining company into that town to settle.

We over the years in Happy Valley settled on the perimeter of the town and maybe Happy Valley have caused more trouble to the Department of Municipal Affairs than a lot of other towns throughout the province. But this, Sir, was not caused intentionally by the citizens or is it caused by the council now representing the town. This was because of the fact that the town was well on the way before there was some municipal rule brought into the community. When the municipal rule was

MR. WOODWARD brought in it was very hard to correct or rectify the situation that existed before they had the municipal rule. I think this may be the case in a lot of communities.

So the need for communications with the municipal government and to avoid having similar situations of this nature taking place here or at this particular time, I think there is a great need for this thing. There should be, as the Minister of Fisheries stated, that they have six field workers in the field who would like to go and maybe develop more. The field workers are not providing sufficient information. If we do not have a system of regional government where we have offices established through central locations in this province that the communities can easily communicate with, then there is going to have to be a system of field workers. There is a need for more people in the field to travel throughout the province. A lot of our community councils are basically men you get elected to council or you get appointed to council. This is a good thing. It gives maybe the member some status in the community. But very few of the members in lots of cases really realize what they are getting involved into without a lot of coaching. I understand there have been a very few workshops set up by Municipal Affairs to teach the councillors or the members of boards of trustees as to what function they will play.

Now this, Sir, has to be done if we are going to improve the situation that exist today. I feel that there are a lot of unnecessary complaints made to the department that could possibly be taken care of on a local level. But then the newly formed community councils are not aware of what their responsibilities are. If there were a better system, with more field workers, more people in the field, then I am sure

Mr. Woodward.

A lot of the problems that the minister is having today would easily be eliminated. You would not have the petty complaints coming into his office that he considers to be unnecessary and should be dealt with by maybe some of his officials of lesser authority than the honourable minister. I feel the great problem, as far as financing is concerned, in most of the community councils throughout this province, is when the level of taxation was increased or grants from \$75,000 to \$100,000. It did not affect the smaller communities. It did affect the larger communities where they got more revenue from Municipal Affairs. I am sure this was a welcomed thing. I understand that it has been implemented. The system is now in force. This year when you pay out your grants and your revenue grants to the communities this will be into effect. It is into effect, I understand. This is a welcomed thing, Sir. Maybe the minister can elaborate a bit on the situation in Corner Brook. Does he feel that it is helping the situation somewhat? He says that we are not ready for some form of regional government. There must be some sort of a system whereby we would have better communications with the municipal affairs established in this province, whether it is through putting more workers in the field. I have travelled a lot, not only in my own district but in other districts and especially in Labrador, the coastal communities, where community councils are new. There is a big demand for some coaching information services whereby the community councils, the chairman of the councils, the board of trustees or a workshop situation can be aware of what is taking place, what they are allowed, what their per capita road grant should be this year, etc. There is a whole system, Sir. There is a whole new system that should be set up. Maybe we can go as far as setting up workshops in our vocational schools whereby there can be some type of training as far as municipal affairs is concerned.

It is an important subject. It is a subject that touches on possibly ninety-nine per cent of our population today. The system whereby you first go to your community council, if you are concerned about something

Mr. Woodward;

that is happening which has a direct bearing or a direct responsibility of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing. This department, Sir, has become very large as the minister explained to me on a number of occasions. I sympathize with him. I think we should take immediate steps to correct some of the inequities that exist in the department through some form of regional government.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable member is getting confused with regional government or regional offices.

MR. WOODWARD: Well either regional government or regional offices - in your particular case I was chiefly concerned with regional offices but this would be a part of regional government -

MR. COLLINS: We have announced that we will be setting up regional offices. My comments were that I said that we were not ready for another layer of government. I was referring to regional government. There is a regional office in Corner Brook, a development control officer who administers the protective road zone legislation. I think we have one in Grand Falls and the head office is here, of course. Certainly that is a very worthwhile effort but it has very little to do with the municipal functions. It is mainly involved with the administering of the protective road zone legislation and regulations.

MR. WOODWARD: You do have some of your officials in those departments?

MR. COLLINS: A development control officer.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes, a development control officer.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is a need and I feel that it is the responsibility of the minister to report to this committee the way he feels the recommendations should be made concerning the communications and now the lack of communications which exists between his department and community councils and community bodies. The minister has not told the

Mr. Woodward

committee what recommendations he would like to see made.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, we have already said that we are committed to the establishment of regional offices. That I think is a step in the right direction. To say that there are no communications, I cannot agree with that. If the honourable member sat behind my desk for a day or so he would find out that there is lots of communication. I am not sure if that is the proper title in fact I am sure it is not. Before we establish the regional offices, we must make sure that those offices are going to be given some authority. It is not enough to give them responsibility with no authority. As I said in my opening remarks, we want to be sure that when we make the move that we make the right move. I do not think there is anything to be gained from setting up offices all over the province, if we do not give it a lot of careful thought and get the right people to occupy the jobs here. I believe that if we can accomplish that, put them in strategic locations, get the proper types of people to do the work and to be very definite in what their authority is and what their responsibilities are - there is not much sense in a delegation from Comfort Cove coming to Gander, for instance, to a regional office, if that office is not in a position to do something for them, know what their needs are and how to help them out and know what assistance is available and so on and so forth. It is not something one can do overnight. Certainly, we are very much aware of it. We are committed to it. I think I have mentioned it on several occasions and I believe that if it is done properly, it will have some very lasting benefits. Hopefully, it will take away some of the work-load that the office has downstairs. As a result of that, as the honourable member suggested, maybe it may save the councils a little money. He asked me how much money it cost for council delegations to come to St. John's. That I do not know. The councils pay that bill themselves. We do not pay it.

MR. GILLETT: Mr. Chairman, I have been listening with interest to the remarks by my honourable friend here and also the replies from the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. I am just wondering, a regional office, is this going to be merely a liaison between a community council and/or local improvement and the Municipal Affairs?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, what we are talking about actually is an extension of the office here into regional offices. It will be bringing the civil service closer to the people. That is what it is all about.

MR. GILLETT: Well that regional office, Mr. Chairman, to my mind would have to have tremendous powers given to it by the government or by the Department of Municipal Affairs. Otherwise it is only going to be a liaison between the town councils and the ultimate head office of Municipal Affairs which will only delay perhaps -

MR. COLLINS: No!

MR. GILLETT: It would not? They would have to have tremendous powers .

MR. COLLINS: Then it would be useless, if it is going to delay the process and there would be no point in doing it. I think it would be very helpful.

MR. GILLETT: They would have to have tremendous powers to award monies or vote monies or what not for -

MR. COLLINS: No! No!

MR. GILLETT: I agree that if a regional office were set up to take care of *x* number of local improvement districts and also municipalities, with

the proper authority from your office to deal with matters of importance, matters which ordinarily bring a delegation into St. John's. Other matters can be done by telephone, but matters which would ordinarily bring a delegation into St. John's and this I think was the main concern of my friend for Labrador North. Unless that office had tremendous powers, it would not eliminate that necessity of getting to the head office, Would it or would it not? What exactly would be the role, the duty, the responsibility and the power of the head office?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, we have not established them yet and we have given a lot of thought to it, but I can envisage, as I mentioned a little earlier, the inspectors that are now travelling out of this office downstairs would be more readily available to service the various communities. I would suspect that an engineer would be provided there.

Many communities today, if they are thinking about water and sewer systems, might have to come to St. John's several times, conceivably maybe ten or twelve trips, maybe five or six trips, depending upon the complexity of the problem and so on. Whereas if there were a regional office, maybe the engineer, the inspectors and others who are familiar with what councils are trying to do, would go to the councils and meet with them at their regular meeting or a special meeting, so that when the council did decide to come to St. John's, all their information is gathered, we know about it. I think it would be a very useful exercise. I think it is something which has to come and will come.

MR. WOODWARD: In other words, Mr. Chairman, the information and data that would eventually end up here in this office, would come through more expert hands.

MR. COLLINS: Yes, that would be one benefit to be derived from it.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes, it would expedite the decisions made in this office. I can see the point of that, Mr. Chairman, and I think it is a good idea, because we have these small local improvement districts and personally I do not see these little small communities being turned into municipalities. They are too small, for one thing, to have to vote a mayor and all the rest of the councillors and what not, but they do exist I think for a good reason and for a good purpose and that is to improve the area in which they live and, as you have said in the beginning, some of these little communities, it is not impossible to give them water and sewerage but it would be practically out of the question cost-wise.

Now we have areas, I have them in my district, for instance I have a letter before me now from Summerford and no doubt you are aware of the survey being made for water and sewerage there. This is being done I presume on the recommendation of Dr. Sheldon, who made a survey recently and discovered there the drastic number of cases were population, hepatitis. Apparently their water is not good.

They are naturally looking for this service. I have a letter in my file from Pike's Arm where they are looking for deep wells because they have to bring water by boat in the summer. I hope that something can be done for both these communities, particularly for Summerford which has a high percentage of hepatitis.

However we will probably have more to say about that later, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, with regard to Summerford, it is a recently incorporated community, incorporated a year and a-half or two years ago. There have been no detailed studies done for our water system.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, there is not a quorum. We are okay again.

MR. CARTER: To that Point of Order, is it permissible for members to wander around, like the honourable the Leader of the Opposition, back and forth

MR. CARTER: like an amiable captain reviewing his troops. Is that permissible or should he not take his seat or take a seat?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Members of the House may move around as long as this does not interfere with the debate, However a member when speaking, to be recognized by the Chair must be speaking in the member's place.

MR. COLLINS: I was going to add, in response to the honourable member for Twillingate, that Pike's Arm is not an incorporated community and their needs should be dealt with through the Department of Community and Social Development.

MR. WOODWARD: I did not quite hear what you said, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COLLINS: Pike's Arm is not an incorporated community. As a consequence of that, they would have to deal with the Department of Community and Social Development, if they want some assistance.

MR. THOMS: My mike is not on. But really I do not need it you know, because I have lots of energy here.

Mr. Chairman, the record of community councils, local government in Newfoundland is really something relatively new. If you went back twenty-five years, I believe you would only find three in the whole Province of Newfoundland and as time came on and especially after Confederation, local government caught on quite rapidly and this last ten years it has really speeded up.

For example, in my own district we have some thirty-five communities, I believe, and twenty-eight or twenty-nine of them are under some form of local government, from town councils down to community councils.

Mr. Chairman, naturally as each year went by, the estimates of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing increased because of the progress that was being made throughout this province in our local government system. But Mr. Chairman, I note one thing in these

MR. THOMS: estimates, what I consider to be a very disgraceful thing, really terribly disgraceful, we have a decrease this year of \$3.5 million in the estimates. No Mr. Chairman, there will not be any clear water flowing this year in Newfoundland, because of these decreases. There maybe some down in Burgeo, yes, there should be after an investment of \$ 2.6 million, but there will not be in any other area of Newfoundland.

Mr. Chairman, I can only say that this is a disgraceful act on the part of the present administration. Of course here again we can spot the weaknesses in the present Cabinet. Apparently the Minister of Municipal Affairs has again allowed the Minister of Finance to overrule him, Where he should have demanded some kind of an increase, he has allowed the Minister of Finance to permit him a decrease.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we progressed so rapidly this last ten years and I believe that we should continue on with this progress. I cannot see how we can allow this to happen, to allow a decrease in services to our municipalities, when really our municipalities are increasing, the number is increasing, and therefore the cost of services to them must also increase. But this present government is allowing it to decrease and this year to the point of \$3.5 million. Now many of our municipalities, even when we were increasing the estimates year after year, many of our municipalities were in trouble, serious trouble, They were not all as lucky as the local Improvement District of Labrador City or some other larger centres which had money flowing in all directions.

But I submit, Mr. Chairman, that about ninety-six or ninety-seven per cent of our communities that are incorporated are financially in trouble and because of this they cannot provide the services that should be provided to these incorporated areas.

Now looking down the list of estimates, I note with regret and of course, in any community in Newfoundland that is about to be incorporated, the main thing, the one main thing that is needed is water and sewer. This is

June 29, 1972

Tape No. 1155

NM - 5

MR. THOMS: a must in this day and age. It is a must, not only to many of our large centres but also to our smaller centres, not only to some of our smaller centres, but to all of them. When I think about services that we should be giving to our smaller centres, I can only go back to the words that the Minister of Finance used in his Budget Speech when he said, "we promise equal treatment and even treatment," How can we justify equal treatment and even treatment when we allow

the estimates of this department to be slashed drastically by three and a-half million dollars.

AN HON. MEMBER: I do not know what you are talking about.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, does the honourable minister tell me that my arithmetic is wrong, that these estimates are not down by three and a-half million dollars?

MR. COLLINS: I will explain it.

MR. THOMS: Okay, the honourable minister will get a chance to explain it. But, from where I am reading, if I have a correct copy of the estimates, it reads a decrease of three and a-half million dollars.

MR. COLLINS: (Inaudible)

MR. THOMS: I did not say it did reflect, I said there is a decrease in this estimate of three and a-half million dollars and you told me I was wrong.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! order!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member should address the Chair. He does not address the minister, he addresses Your Honour.

MR. THOMS: I agree with the honourable House Leader, Mr. Chairman. I apologize. But, Mr. Chairman, in looking at the estimates, this is what it reads, a three and a-half million dollar decrease. Also of course, embedded within this three and a-half million dollar decrease, I note that in water and sewer projects, although they are not listed here, the total is here for them of \$2.8 million, This is a decrease of \$1 million from the estimates last year. Of course, this really means that the water and sewer projects, I would submit almost all of them are two year programmes. Some of them go to three and four year programmes.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. THOMS: Right, but very few of them are one year programmes. Very few. This means to say that either some of the projects that were started last year are not going to be continued or that we are

not going to start any new projects. By not starting any new projects, Mr. Chairman, this is certainly retarding our progress. We in Newfoundland cannot afford to have the progress of our communities retarded. We cannot afford this, and I cannot see how the minister can allow this to happen. We need new projects, Sir, every year. We certainly need them in my district.

I would submit, by the petitions that are being presented to this House, by all honourable members, that we need them in almost every district, with the exception of maybe four districts. We need new projects every year, not only to take care of the normal increase of our population but to catch up with the rest of our society.

Mr. Chairman, I am very interested in the water and sewer estimates under whatever heading they are. I would like...

MR. COLLINS: (First part inaudible) water and sewer projects this year.

MR. THOMS: All right, water and sewer systems.

MR. COLLINS: Systems, nor anything to do with water and sewer in town council areas.

MR. THOMS: All right, Mr. Chairman, I refer to item 1311-03-09. It says: "Water and sewer systems." I would ask the honourable minister if he could supply us with a list of these proposed projects. Now, he does not have to do like the Acting Minister of Highways did, supply us with a list and then the cost. We do not need the cost. To give the cost is not necessary, we are only interested in the projects themselves. Also, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister if he could give us the list of 1311-03-03, which is the initial grant for local councils. I am quite interested in this. I have a couple of communities in my own district and they are asking me when they are going to be incorporated.

I note also, Mr. Chairman, that there is \$787,000 decrease

in the estimates for incinerators and fire fighting equipment. The programme that has been carried out is a good programme. It is a much needed programme. It is a programme that needs to be extended. I am sure the minister will agree with me on that point because too many of our, especially our smaller communities are without any fire protection whatsoever. Even the ones that have water systems, some of them do not even have hydrants installed. This decrease in this heading is a serious one. I believe the minister should have found enough money, not necessarily to equal last year but at least come up closer to it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Five minutes.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, it has been a long day, and if the honourable gentleman is touchy he may just as well take his time, because we are here for a long time.

AN HON. MEMBER: I will get a set of track shoes for the honourable gentleman.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, there is one aspect which comes under local government which the minister touched on himself. It is the idea of installing sewage treatment plants. In the past pollution has not been a problem. Five or six years ago, you could throw almost anything in our rivers or in the ocean and you could get away with it. Only a few years have elapsed when all of a sudden everyone becomes pollution conscious. Of course, not only the high and elite in our universities, but even every person in every community apparently is pollution conscious, except the scattered drunk who just throws a beer bottle here, there and everywhere and could not care less. Everyone is quite conscious of the fact that raw sewage is having on the waters of our province.

I have seen some of the great regions of Canada which are totally polluted from sewage. Of course, the most common example of this, to any of our people who travelled in

Central Canada, and most of them go to the City of Ottawa, of course, is the Rideau River. This is one big cesspool.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. THOMS: The Rideau River and the Rideau Canal. It is not the Canal, it is the river itself. I do not believe the Canal is polluted, but the Rideau River is. The St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes are. They are simply big cesspools.

To date, Mr. Chairman, maybe with one exception, I do not believe that we are allowing any raw sewage to go into any of our inland waters. There maybe one exception, I am not sure. This is a good thing. Let us sincerely hope that we can keep it this way. Remember this, there are many communities where they are dumping sewage in areas that are not too far from the mouths of the rivers. Many of our communities are dumping sewage right out on the beach and are polluting their own beaches. For example, I know of one little community where I used to swim right on the sandy beach. You cannot swim there any more because the beach is covered with sewage.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. THOMS: I did not say anything unparliamentary.

AN HON. MEMBER: You came dangerously close.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, I believe our minister should approach the Federal Government and see if we could come up with some kind of a programme to provide every incorporated area which has

MR. THOMS: a water and sewer system, to provide them with some kind of a sewerage treatment plant. I do not believe that the cost of these plants, even a part of the cost, should be placed either on the municipality involved or on the provincial government. I believe the federal government should be responsible for such a programme. I think they should be totally responsible because after all pollution is not just a problem for Newfoundland, it is a worldwide problem. If we in Newfoundland can keep our lakes, our streams and our sea shore pollution free, this is to the benefit of not only Newfoundlanders, not only Canadian but a direct benefit to all the people of North America. This is why I believe we have an argument to insist that the federal government finance this programme one hundred percent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the minister has drastically reduced special assistant grants. He has cut it down from \$1,401,000 to just \$200,000. Really I can only say it is shameful because, Mr. Chairman, we have approximately 300 municipalities within our province and no can foresee the difficulties that each community has during a twelve month period in Newfoundland. I would cite one example this past winter, the Town of Badger's Quay had something like forty percent of its water frozen.

MR. COLLINS: Every town in the province has had the same trouble.

MR. THOMS: Possibly every town, Not every town had the same problem but a lot of them had. But this is why I am citing one example. There are possibly many of them.

MR. COLLINS: It was a severe winter. We had no control of that.

MR. THOMS: But because this happened, Mr. Chairman, this cost the Town of Badger's Quay roughly \$14,000. There is no way in this world that this town can finance this \$14,000. It has to come through some kind of special assistance from someone. And of course, the someone in this case must be the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

This however I submit, that the special assistant grant is an absolute necessity, This is only one case. I am sure there are many,

MR. THOMS: many cases. I am sure that if the minister were to give in to all the requests that come in, the figure would go well over the \$1,401,000 which was set for last year or which was revised for last year.

MR. COLLINS: That was not spent for -

MR THOMS: It was spent in connection with the frozen water last year. so I have been told -

MR. COLLINS: In the previous year.

MR. THOMS: No. Maybe you are talking about the \$1,401,000. We are talking about two different things. But I am sure the special assistance grants which would come for such items as this would come under this heading or I believe it would. Correct me, if I am wrong.

Now Mr. Chairman, all these things are not encouraging, certainly very discouraging to the different members who serve on these councils. But, Mr. Chairman, I suppose that the most discouraging thing that has happened since the present administration have taken office and I believe it has happened most frequently in this department, is the apparent refusal of the present minister not to see delegations in his office. This, Mr. Chairman, is shameful, disgraceful, scandalous. It is abuse of his office.

AN HON. MEMBER: Resign!

MR. THOMS: No he does not have to resign.

MR. COLLINS: Now make your minds up about what is going to happen.

MR. THOMS: All he has to do is correct the situation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have had at least delegations from five different municipalities in my district who have not been able to see the minister. They were told either directly or indirectly that they could not see the minister until after the estimates had passed through the House. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not see what the estimates have to do with meeting the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. It is his duty, bounded duty to see these people. It is his duty to give them a hearing, Even if he cannot do anything for them, at least he can take them into his

MR. THOMS: office and say hello to them.

This is what he was elected for. This is what the people of Newfoundland sent him there for. I cannot, and I cannot see why the minister should bar his door on any delegation from any town within our province. This does not happen in any of the other ministers' offices, not to my knowledge. Not to my knowledge or at least I have not come across it yet.

But, Mr. Chairman, I wonder what the minister is trying to do. Is he trying to set up a barbed wire fence in front of his office or is this just a start and if this minister can get away with it, are the other ministers going to do the same? Are we to come into the Confederation Building one of these days and find a barbed wire fence out in front of the Cabot monument? This, Mr. Chairman, I can only state as disgraceful. I am quite sure that the municipalities of this province will not tolerate it.

MR. COLLINS: They all agreed with it.

MR. THOMS: The mayor of Grand Falls did not agree with it.

MR. COLLINS: Grand Falls agreed with it.

MR. THOMS: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable minister will find out in time that no one agrees with it. What good is it to have a minister unless we can see him and even discuss our problems, even if he cannot do anything for them. Why cannot we see him, talk over our problems and tell him the needs of our community? Do not get mad now, I am as happy as a lark.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would submit to the minister that he is doing our councils a great injustice -

MR. COLLINS: Always have.

MR. THOMS: I would certainly beg of him to correct the situation because it could become a nasty situation. It is a nasty situation at the present time. I fail to see why this department cannot recognize any delegation from any community council or any incorporated area within our province.

Now this is not just the idea of getting aboard a car, coming to St. John's and hoping to get in to see the minister. Within this last two weeks I had to phone the minister or I phoned his secretary first and tried to get an appointment for one of the local improvement districts. The secretary passed on the information to me. I said that this cannot be possible. This cannot be true, let me speak to the minister. I spoke to the minister. He said that no way will he see me until after the estimates are through. I was shocked. I was really shocked. I still cannot figure out why. Every other minister in that department saw a delegation. The doors were open all the time.

MR. COLLINS: How do you know?

MR. THOMS: Because I was part of some of the delegations.

MR. ROBERTS: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. Could the honourable minister please stop shouting into his mike?

MR. COLLINS: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, I want to inform the honourable minister -

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Would the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Your Honour, change his designation. You do not refer to a member as "what is his name." These are the rules. These are the regulations of the House. He is bound by them.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I do not want to change the name but "what is his name" is the honourable gentleman, the member for St. John's East, Minister without Portfolio, Leader of the House, our friend, our protector, our guider and a number of other things.

MR. COLLINS: Put it on the Order Paper.

MR. ROBERTS: I want an answer, Mr. Chairman. I could not put it on the Order Paper, I would never get an answer. I am glad I brought the honourable member to his feet. I had my doubts whether he was not awake and missing scintillating exchanges. I am glad Your Honour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With respect to the point of order, since the honourable minister was not speaking in his place, the Chair did not recognize what the honourable minister said. Unless it interfered with the hon. member for Bonavista North, the honourable minister would not be out of order.

MR. THOMS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, I do not believe it is correct, I do not believe it is right for any minister of this government to bar doors on any delegation or delegations or for that matter on any one individual who is within the Province of Newfoundland. After all this government that are now in power, before they came into power said that they would take the government to the people. Barring the doors of Confederation Building is not exactly carrying the government to the people. Barring the door to Confederation Building is a disgraceful act and there is nothing good that can be said about it. The honourable gentlemen across the way are smiling. There is nothing good that can be said about it. They think this is all a dream. Maybe they should be home dreaming. I assure you that the people of this province will not look upon it as a dream. It is not a laughing matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, if this government is going to perform its functions, it will immediately open all the doors to Confederation Building to all our people. We do not get this problem from any other ministry. As far as I know all the other doors of the ministers' departments are open. They will accept delegations. They will accept people. They will listen to them. The Minister of Fisheries will I know, because I visited him. The Minister of Highways does. The Minister of Health does. Why does it have to be this particular department that for some reason or other has closed the doors? Now the Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech said that we promised equal treatment and even treatment. I heard the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing yesterday say that he had seen a delegation from the City of Corner Brook. If he could see a delegation from Corner Brook, why could he not see one from Gambo, Wareham, Dover, Tray Town and Trinity? Tell me this, why can he not? Why is he singling out these people that he will not see? It is discrimination of the worst kind.

Mr. Thoms.

Maybe Mr. Chairman, the Premier of the Province should take another look at this portfolio.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is.

MR. THOMS: He is? Good. I am delighted to hear that. I will be more delighted when he gets a replacement. But, Mr. Chairman, this is not equal treatment or even treatment. This is disgraceful treatment. If this is the policy of this administration, if this is what it is all about, if this is their policy -

AN HON. MEMBER: No, it is not.

MR. THOMS: It is in this department. This is their policy in this department. The minister has clarified this by not seeing these five delegations from my district. I understand that there are more from other districts. But, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the minister himself should reconsider his action and at least see these people and give them a hearing. If he cannot do anything for them, at least he can listen to them.

MR. COLLINS: Maybe I better deal with the delegations. That is the last thing the honourable member mentioned. I have seen more people from town councils since I have been in the office than have been in all the other offices in Confederation Building. The honourable member referred to some places in his own district. I have entertained (when I say entertained, I mean entertained them in my office by listening to them and so on and so forth, no drinks or anything) a delegation from Badger's Quay, Pool's Cove or Pool's Island, a delegation from Wesleyville, a delegation from Centreville, a delegation from Trinity and I have seen Dark Cove three times. The honourable member is all up in arms because Dark Cove wanted to come back again two weeks ago. I really could not see any reason for them to come in. I tried to explain to the honourable member on the phone that we were discouraging any further delegations coming in until such time as the House of Assembly was closed. Now I have seen delegations since. We have not made too many appointments but delegations continue to come, visiting other departments. I did not see a

delegation from Corner Brook yesterday. I saw a delegation today from Pasadena. All in all we are still - did we see a delegation from Corner Brook yesterday? I really do not recall if I saw one yesterday or not. There have been so many people coming in, I do not recall. We have had to try and discourage it until we get the estimates through the House and get over that responsibility. We have been meeting afternoons and evenings. Very often they come in and see a deputy minister and other officials in the department. I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, very much about the numbers who are coming in at this particular time. I am tied up almost one hundred per cent of my time. The deputy minister is tied up there one hundred and ten per cent of his time, if that is possible, and all the senior officials in the department. All we could do now or all we could do up until next week, if we can get this through here, is sit down and commiserate with them. We know very well what their problems are. There is no discrimination at all in the world. A lot of mayors and councillors called me from across the province and really congratulated me on taking that stand, because there is not too much to be gained from seeing people day in and day out - not day in and day out but repeatedly day after

day after day. I have seen the people from Dark Cove, as I have said, three times in the space of three months. We know what their problems are and they have some very great ones down there. We will certainly sit down and talk with them again as soon as we find time.

The hon. member mentions about a reduction in water and sewer systems grants. As I explained to him before, there is a real good reason for this because the figure we are showing here is subsidy which we are paying to the municipal development corporation. However, last year there was a considerable amount of money spent over and above what was estimated. I do not want to start playing politics, with blaming the previous administration with spending money which they did not have and so on, it possibly went for a good cause, but there was \$2.5 million last year spent as a result of some windfall from somewhere. I do not know where it was, special projects, I am not sure. We see it as a special warrant. "Where it came from?" The honourable Leader of the Opposition might be able to tell us.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the Government of Canada made a loan, I do not know if it was one transaction or a number, but there was a programme announced by the Government of Canada, under which, it was to stimulate employment, designed to stimulate employment, they would lend to the governments of the provinces, for purposes of municipal programmes, large sums of money. Now is this the source of this money?

MR. COLLINS: I am not sure what the source was.

MR. ROBERTS: Well maybe the minister could ask his deputy minister, if the deputy minister happened to be within earshot he may have heard the question. Let us get this one cleared up. Was this the money, because it certainly was a windfall and delighted to have it I think.

The minister would be equally delighted to have one as well, but he does not want to bring it into partisan politics, as he himself says. Let us clear the matter up now and we will go on with all the other

MR. ROBERTS: matters we want to discuss here in the committee.

MR. COLLINS: I hope to justify the difference there. Where this money came from, I do not know. Maybe if the Minister of Finance were here, he would know, I am sure the deputy minister does not know.

MR. ROBERTS: The first string has gone home and the second string is now into the breach. We are delighted to have the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources with us, That adds something. But would the minister check with his deputy. The deputy minister may be able to advise him on the point.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, all a deputy minister can say is that the money obviously but evidently did come from Ottawa, For what purpose we do not know, but it was made available to our department. You would not expect anything else from the deputy minister, but the honourable Leader of the Opposition might know more about it than I do. What I am saying is, it is money which was made available last year in an election campaign, let us face it, which was not reflected in the estimates which were approved in the House last year.

MR. ROBERTS: It was not an Ottawa election campaign.

MR. COLLINS: No, that is for sure!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, this is an important point. The minister is, I know he does not mean to give this inference but he is intimating that somehow money came from Ottawa, He says he does not know for what purpose. Well the money came from Ottawa for this specific purpose.

Now true last year was an election year in Newfoundland. It was not in Ottawa, This year there maybe one in Ottawa. We do not know that but it may be, that is the speculation. Last year was an election year in Newfoundland, so was this year for that matter. Nobody planned it that way, but there were two elections within the period of six months. I know the minister would not want to leave the inference, but perhaps he could make that clear.

MR. COLLINS: I really do not know where the money came from.

The honourable Leader of the Opposition might know. Maybe he could tell us.

MR. ROBERTS: I know the minister does not know. I can appreciate the fact the minister does not know. He is making it obvious he does not know that and a great number of other things, but what I am at is not where it came from, we have settled that..

MR. COLLINS: Keep it fair and square, I said I do not know and I cannot establish where it came from.

MR. ROBERTS: That is what I am trying to do, Mr. Chairman, I am trying to keep it fair and square but the minister has left an inference. I know he did not mean to, but I just wanted to set it all nice and smooth and we are getting along so very nicely, going swimmingly, great fun.

Even the Minister of Fisheries, it has been going so smoothly he has been eating chicken and chips instead of fish and chips, Dandy! Just grand! But the minister unfortunately left an impression that the money from Ottawa was misappropriated, was spent for the wrong purpose. I know he did not intend that, He is shaking his head in the negative way, Well I am glad to see it. I just want to set that straight, Has the minister set it straight. I know he would not want to leave the committee with the wrong impression, not even an iota of a wrong impression. Now would the minister agree with that? Then he can carry on, We have lots of things we want to talk about.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, as I said, I do not know where the money came from. All I am saying is that there were funds made available last fall, over and above what were approved in the estimates, That came about at election time, For what purpose it came in, I really do not know but the funds were dispersed during the election campaign. Where it came from, what it was for, if it was for this, I really cannot say, The honourable Leader of the Opposition, as I said, should know.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I said what it was for, Does the honourable gentleman accept my statement?

MR. COLLINS: Yes, we will accept the statement of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, sure.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, let us talk a few minutes about the accessibility to the minister because that is a bit of an issue, He has made it one. He has made it one by his conduct but he has also made it one by the statement he made on - I do not know if he made it on the radio, I saw it in "The Evening Telegram" a couple of nights ago and I saw him on the CBC television network. I guess it was on the radio, was it?

AN HON. MEMBER: It was on the radio too.

MR. ROBERTS: I think the minister should expand upon this a little because it is a new doctrine. He has told us that in his period of months that he has been the minister, he has seen more people in his office, I hope I am quoting him correctly, he has seen more people in his office than any or all of his colleagues put together. Is that essentially the minister's statement? Good! Well he confirms that that is what he said, Sir. Well, that is fine. I have no doubt that that is true. It does not mean anything because nobody else has seen anybody over there.

Now what I want to know - Oh the Premier is back, half back. He is never more than half here anyway, so. I am glad the Premier is here because I have a question here that relates to a communication that was sent to him and has not been answered. Let me read to the House a telegram which came to me today, well yesterday, but today, yesterday, whatever you want, Thursday. The member for Burgeo would be interested in this too. The following telegram sent Premier Moores with copies to Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Evans on June 13, two weeks. "On January 24, we made application for a Federal-Provincial Employment Loan to construct a town hall, the

same date we confirmed to the Department of Municipal Affairs that annual interest and principal charges would be made out of revenue from the municipality, February 9 Mr. Jamieson announced the approval of the loan and we are now told the province refused to accept the loan on our behalf. Inquiries, made to our M.H.A., Cabinet Ministers and heads of departments, resulted in evasive answers and no reasons. Council would like a definite answer as to will the loan be approved and if not why not?" That is the telegram that was sent to the Premier two weeks ago.

Mr. Chairman, I have no idea what the council are or are not. All I saying is that the document I have here is that two weeks ago a telegram was sent to the Premier of this province, as of yesterday it had not been answered because the telegram to me goes on - "no reply has been received to this telegram," that is the one addressed to the Premier, "council at its regular meeting held last night agreed to forward telegram to you for information and any action possible." It is signed Allister Hand, Town Manager.

Now the minister may choose to address himself to that. Obviously the council in Burgeo have been, I will not say driven to this, that is a little too dramatic, but feel that there is no other way they can get information. It is the same sort of thing we had with the Port au Bras Community Council. I do not solicit these things. They obviously come here to my side, to our side of the house, because they cannot get the information.

Mr. Chairman, there is something wrong when a telegram is sent on June 13 from a town council and it is not even acknowledged. They say no reply has been received. The telegram was sent the 29th day of June and the one to the Premier was sent June 13. There is something wrong. The telegram to the Premier was sent only

apparently after some efforts had not succeeded in getting any information either from the member from Burgeo or from the Minister of Finance or from other people. I do not know if word was sent to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It does not say, that this point was - specifically he is not named. It says, "Inquiries made to our M.H.A., Cabinet ministers..." That may or may not include the minister for Municipal Affairs.

But the point is, Mr. Chairman, there is something wrong when the council in a community like Burgeo cannot get even an acknowledgement, cannot get an answer, cannot get any information. The impression is abroad in this province - whether it is right or wrong I do not know. I hope we can settle it here this evening - the impression is abroad that the minister is not available. That could be wrong. But going on the minister's statement that he made two or three days ago, on television, his public statement, and going on the attitude he has shown towards delegations, the minister I think should set them straight. He owes it to himself, he owes it to his colleagues. I would like him to say a few words as well, if he could, on this matter in Burgeo. I have no idea what the problem is, in detail. All I know is that the council has asked me to try to get some information. They have not been able to get it through the more usual channels. Can the minister say a few words on this? Any accessibility trouble is a problem. The minister himself has helped to create it. I have every sympathy for the problem in which any minister of Municipal Affairs finds himself with a few hundred odd councils, all of them thinking they are entitled, as of right, to an hour, two hours, a morning a day of the minister's time. The minister's time, of course, must also include his senior officials.

MR. COLLINS: Lateness in dealing with correspondence is one of the results of -

MR. ROBERTS: This is a very important thing. In fact it has been on the go since January 24 - that is six days after the minister became minister. He is not necessarily being blamed. We have had the town council of Mount Pearl quoted in the newspapers as saying they have had difficulty getting a meeting with the minister.

MR. COLLINS: I wonder what councillor said that.

MR. ROBERTS: I think it was Mr. Lidstone. He was elected -

MR. COLLINS: He was at the meeting the day before -

MR. ROBERTS: We have also had the mayor of Grand Falls say a few words about that. We have also had the mayor of Windsor say a few words about it. Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman opposite seem to be indicating that if a mayor is a Liberal he cannot get to see - well, if he says that he is a Liberal, is that what the honourable gentleman says? In that case boy, there is going to be one awful lot of Liberals in Newfoundland, more than there were, not as many as there will be.

Mr. Chairman, we have had already a number of councils. I do not know, Mr. Allison Hann may be a Liberal, he may be a P.C. he may be - I have no idea what the gentleman's politics are.

MR. COLLINS: I do not worry about that either.

MR. ROBERTS: He signs it as town manager. He signs it on instructions of his council. The gentleman in Port au Bras, of the community council, who wired today, Mr. Dibbon I think his name was, the gentleman from Port au Bras who said he could not get an answer out of the Premier's colleague, the Minister of Justice, so he had to come to the Opposition, I am sure he is very concerned. Sure, he is very concerned, I only wish I could remember his name but I cannot.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Dibbon, in Port au Bras.

MR. ROBERTS: Dibbon? Well, then, Mr. Dibbon, he wired in behalf of the community council. We have a problem here. The minister has a

problem, to begin with because there are a lot of councils, the tradition has grown up over the years that they should come and see the minister and sit down with his officials. I do not know the answer to it. I know the gentleman who preceded the present minister in that portfolio had the same problems day after day. The deputy-minister can doubtless and doubtless has told his present minister that day after day delegations have been coming in and they have been stacked up. You send word to the minister, could he come to a Treasury Board or could he come to a committee meeting. Word would come back he had three delegations to see, he could not come and all that sort of thing. Not a new problem that part. What is new is -

MR. COLLINS: Sure it is a new problem. The honourable Leader of the Opposition knows it is a new problem. We have 300 community councils now as opposed to about 100 before.

MR. ROBERTS: Before when?

MR. COLLINS: Not a hundred, I suppose you could say more than a hundred.

MR. ROBERTS: I am talking about last year. I am not talking about five years or ten years ago. What I am saying it is not a problem which began on the eighteenth day of January. It is not. It existed on the seventeenth day of January.

MR. MORGAN: -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Bonavista South wishes to address the committee, I would be delighted to hear from him. If not, perhaps he would allow me to carry on with my few remarks. Mr. Chairman, I would be delighted to hear from the honourable gentleman. When I am done I will sit down, Sir. Of course I will.

Now, it is not a problem which began on the eighteenth day of January. It is not a new problem. It may be getting greater all the

time. I suppose every council incorporated makes the problem a little greater, makes the problem one three hundredths greater. That is fine. But, Sir, since the present administration or the present minister became minister, people seem to feel that the problem is greater. They seem to feel that they can no longer get in touch. The mayors and people in my district, persons like the mayor of St. Anthony, the mayor of Englee, tell me that they have difficulty getting answers out of the department. They tell me that they have difficulty getting answers from the minister.

They are not complaining about what the answer is, That is a separate matter altogether, whether it is good or bad or whether they get what they want or not. But I think the minister should set the committee's mind at rest on it. He made a statement the other night on the television, which as I recall it - I watched it with interest. The minister was there on the CBC, I guess a film clip or video tape or something, there in person, saying that. "No good councils coming to St. John's any more" - if I am misquoting him perhaps he will set me straight because I did not make a note or anything, just speaking from memory. In particular, the whole system of special grants; there was no point of council asking for special grants any more. I think that was what the minister said.

The point is, the feeling seems to be around the province. I think I can understand the minister's problem. I think I can. I wonder if he could say a few words to the committee: He could indicate that he is anxious to see delegations. My friends from Bonavista North may have a lot of municipalities. I do not know if Bonavista North has more municipalities than most districts. I do not know that. Three hundred. There are forty-one constituencies, I suppose seven per district would be an average. Maybe he has more. Maybe they are

just more anxious to come to St. John's, I do not know. But apparently there is a problem there. The minister has seen a great number of councils from Bonavista North, apparently. He tells us he has. That is it. We can accept that but you know, the fear is there. When an opposition leader gets a cable such as this one from Burgeo, you know there is something wrong somewhere. There is a feeling abroad that they cannot get information. Could the minister set us at rest on this and we will go on and we will deal with all the other problems that need to be talked about on municipal affairs?

MR. COLLINS: Regarding the Burgeo request, Mr. Chairman, we have had numerous conversations with the Burgeo town council. I recall one when the honourable member from Burgeo was attending a council meeting concerning this federal-provincial, concerning an application for funds from the federal-provincial loans programme, which incidentally is administered by the department of community and social development.

We are discouraged for the simple reason we could not see how they were going to gain anything by taking advantage of the loan because the seventy-five per cent they were giving us, as we all know, could only apply for the work done at the end of May. It was then extended to the end of June. But it would be considerable financial outlay on the part of the council. I do not know if we should discuss council business in this Chamber, but where it relates I suppose to the government, we may. We are subsidizing that council to a considerable extent now, in our humble opinion. The officials of the department were involved in this, I can assure you. We thought that we should try and discourage Burgeo from taking on any further financial responsibilities.

with regard to the delegation then, I thought...

MR. ROBERTS: (First part inaudible) because, what the minister said, Mr. Chairman, seems to be very sensible and straightforward. The only thing I would ask is, has that word been sent to Burgeo? I mean, it is an answer and from what the minister said, if the council are being subsidized heavily, if they are in danger of becoming overcommitted, then surely the right thing to do is to tell them: "Dear Council, in our opinion you cannot afford this, therefore, we will not permit you to borrow it." That is one of the reasons, of course, why the government must retain control over borrowing powers by these smaller municipalities.

MR. COLLINS: I cannot really say if it was answered in the form of a telegram. Certainly the town manager and the other people in Burgeo have been made aware of that decision.

AN HON. MEMBER: When were they made aware of that?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I could not give the exact date but certainly within the past couple of weeks, I would say by telephone conversation.

MR. ROBERTS: The wire, I will send it over, Your Honour. It is dated yesterday.

MR. COLLINS: I am not sure about the date, but it is not too long ago.

MR. ROBERTS: The wire came Thursday. Did the minister also deal with the remarks on accessibility generally?

MR. COLLINS: Yes, there is no question of - I remember a headline one morning that said: "The minister slams the door shut on municipal delegations." I was shocked but this is the way things are said and we have to put with it, I suppose. What I did say was that we were trying to discourage delegations from coming to St. John's to see the minister while the House of Assembly was in session. Now the Honourable Leader of the Opposition says they always came. They

always did come, there is no question about that at all in the world, but up until last fall, I would suggest, to the end of the year, there were about two hundred, roughly speaking, two hundred municipalities. We have almost three hundred of them now.

MR. ROBERTS: One hundred of them have been incorporated in the last year?

MR. COLLINS: In the last year, yes, which creates quite a problem. I am sure the honourable Leader of the Opposition must appreciate we did not slam the door shut but we are trying to get a message across to them that there is not much point in them coming in here unless they can see me. They can see the deputy minister and the associate deputy minister and all the other people in the department, but we all know that when people come to St. John's they are not satisfied unless they see the minister whatever department he might be in.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MR. COLLINS: Yes, that is right and I can understand that. We qualified it by saying: "Until the House of Assembly sessions are over with." We hope to be able to make some arrangements to accommodate the councils when we get a chance, a breather to set up the machinery for it. I went further than that. I said: "Really, I do not see why councils should have to come to St. John's so often. They know what their revenue grants are. They know what they are entitled to. They know what their road grants are, they know what the water subsidies are. Knowing that, why come to St. John's and generally try to squeeze a few dollars out?" I went further and said that there was a regular fund and an emergency assistance fund in the department. We know that councils are probably the first ones that came or the guys who came and yelled loudest, or the people who came and stayed longest. I do not know, maybe it is either of those or a combination of all three. Whatever it was, generally speaking they went away with a little extra money. I do not think this is the right way to be

dealing with councils. I believe that if we are going to have a system of assisting councils financially, there should be proper guidelines and yardsticks. We do have the formulas and all councils should be treated alike, without having to come to St. John's and take the minister out to lunch or something. I do not want to put myself in a position of having to sit down behind a desk and decide on giving "X" number of dollars to one council and none to the next one. I do not think that is right and I am going to try to take steps to correct it.

We are not going to take away any funds from them. I believe the revenue grants will have to be increased. I believe the road grants might have to be increased. I believe the water subsidy might have to be increased, but I cannot say what it is going to be yet. I would rather do it that way than leave myself as being the judge and jury in deciding whether the West Coast is going to get a little extra or someone else. I do not think that is right, I am sure it is not right and I am not going to let it continue.

MR. W.N. ROWE: On this whole problem, Sir, of accessibility by ministers to the public who come in to see them, I just have a word or two to say, It is germane I think to the honourable minister's salary vote. When I was Minister of Community and Social Development as I am sure my successor has found himself, every delegation that ever came into any government department, whether it be to see the Department of Municipal Affairs, Fisheries or anything else, eventually, ended up down in Community and Social Development. I think, and my honourable friend will agree, for some reason or other, maybe because of all the stuff about DREE and ARDA and this, that and the other thing, they thought that it was a department where they could sort of - it was sort of a grab bag department. They all ended up down there. Not only the municipalities, not only that type of delegation but every conceivable type of delegation that came to St. John's ended up down

in that department.

I personally did not begrudge the time I spent with those delegations, Mr. Chairman, because I found it to be a very useful exercise, finding out what was going on around the province, making sure that the political head of the department got maximum exposure to the public. I did not find it a waste of time, I did not begrudge four, five or six hours a day spent on that. I did not begrudge it at all. If it meant that I had to do work here in the House, when the House was in session, or at home during the night or over the weekend, I did not mind it. I do not think the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs should begrudge the time either. If there are three hundred municipalities in the province now and each of those municipalities makes two visits a year into St. John's, on the average, and I think there is a tradition growing up (and the Deputy Minister can probably confirm it) there is a semiannual pilgrimage to Mecca by municipalities. I think that is right, is it not? They come in and they hope to be able to get some money out of the ...

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, (first part inaudible) one particular council and the honourable gentleman...

MR. ROWE: Yes, that is an exception, I would admit...

MR. ROBERTS: They may have a special problem or problems.

MR. ROWE: There must be a special problem there, That is an exception. but it seems to be a semiannual visit, a semiannual visit and they are not just interested in coming to St. John's, although it must be an interesting break for them. They are elected by people. They do not have the funds to do what the people think they were elected to do. They are under incredible pressure, so they come to St. John's to see the minister or the deputy minister. They are looking for answers and they are looking for rational and sensible answers to some of their problems. They would like to have money, they would like to have

comitments from the government, they would like to have guarantees of loans and what not. They are looking for an answer. If they can go back to the people of Bumble Bee Bight and say that it is the minister in there who is the son of a gun; "We tried our best and he would not give us any money," well, so be it. The pressure is passed back and forth but I think it is a useful and interesting exercise.

If six hundred visits on the average are made to the honourable minister and he is in his office two hundred days of the year, (He obviously works more days than that) that is only three delegations a day, Mr. Chairman. I mean, that is not beyond the energy or capacity of the honourable minister. If each municipality in this province comes in here twice a year to see the minister, and that takes up three hours, two hour or an hour and a-half of the honourable minister's time every day, that is not time wasted. I for one, as a politician in the province, resent any suggestion that seems to have gotten around the province that it is a waste of time. Even if nothing tangible or substantial of a material nature results from the meeting, there is a give and take back and forth. Does the Premier want to make a speech or something?

MR. MOORES: No, I was just saying something to the honourable member. Sorry if I...

MR. ROWE: I see. There is a Standing Order, Sir, that conversation should be in undertones.

AN HON. MEMBER: Standing what?

MR. MOORES: I am sorry.

MR. ROWE: A Standing Order that conversation should be in undertones. The Premier's voice is such that it carries, I know, but it is a little disconcerting when you are making a speech to be interrupted like that.

I would just like to make that point as firmly as I can, that it is not a waste of time, it is part of the honourable minister's duties to see these delegations and talk things over with them, even if nothing tangible or substantial or material results from it. If the

honourable minister does not like that, the honourable minister (as the member for Bell Island said a day or two ago) the honourable minister does not have a gun to his head at all, he can move out of the department, he can move into another department or he can get out of politics altogether. It is part of his job.

There was a character in the book, "Catch 22" whose name was "Major Major" I think. Honourable members might have read the book or seen the movie. He got so fed up with delegations coming in to see him that he left instructions with his secretary that when he was in he was out and when he was out he was in. So, if anybody happened to come and he was in his office his instructions were, that Major Major was not in his office. If he happened to be out of his office, the secretary could tell anybody out there that he was in and they would be ushered right into his office.

I hope the honourable minister does not fall into that trap of

MR. ROWE, W.N. getting shell shocked about meeting people. I know it is not very comfortable. I am sure my honourable friend the Minister of Community and Social Development does not enjoy having delegations come in to see him and almost invariably his having to tell them that there is no money available for this pet scheme of theirs. There is no money available. There is no programme available for it, the money has already been allocated.

He does not enjoy it. I did not enjoy it. The honourable minister does not enjoy it, obviously, but if he cannot take it, if he cannot take it, he enjoys the give and take of conversation with the delegations. But if he does not enjoy that, well then I can only suggest that he relieve himself of the responsibility because it is a very important part of his job and function as a minister, especially the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 1301-01 carry?

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, there are one or two other things, but I wonder, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the House Leader could indicate whether he intends us to carry on past two o'clock, I was not here when the motion was made. We will then have been in session for six hours, it would have been unprecedented to carry on beyond that, to my knowledge, in Newfoundland. I know I was on my feeting saying we will go all night. We will, of course. But does the House Leader intend the House to sit beyond two o'clock?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: That is fine. Is this because the government may not and I do not know if they do or do not, the Minister of Finance was a little vague on it before, that the government may not have the money necessary to pay the civil service tomorrow? I wonder if the House Leader would indicate the reason for this, why they intend to go on?

MR. EVANS: Order meals to be sent in regularly until Sunday evening.

MR. MARSHALL: I will give an explanation - the government's stand on

this particular matter is something more than we have been accustomed to in this House before. But I can say this, Mr. Chairman, first of all we had the invitation to go on pass eleven o'clock, I do not know if the Opposition are asking for mercy now, that is another thing altogether.

But the second thing is this, the civil service can be paid tomorrow but we are now approaching the end of June, supply has almost run out, all but run out. There is just enough money there for the purpose of meeting the civil service debt. There are other commitments, As a result of the management of this province over the past twenty-three years, we have run up bills of \$1 million a day, which have to be paid. These are almost as important as the salaries of civil servants. So we wish to assure that the business of the province is carried on. But in the meantime I do not want to deter the Opposition, I mean the Opposition have quite freely participated in debate in these estimates and they can continue on doing so.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, we are not being deterred, I am still in good voice and a number of my colleagues have not as yet been heard from. I am merely - I am sorry. I am merely trying to get some indication of what the House Leader's plans are for the House.

MR. MARSHALL: We will continue on with the invitation.

MR. ROBERTS: I am aware of what I said. But does the House Leader intend to keep the House in session all night?

MR. MARSHALL: As long as it is necessary, as was suggested.

MR. ROWE, W.N.: As long as it is necessary for what?

MR. ROBERTS: As long as it is necessary for what?

MR. MARSHALL: For the full debate of the estimates, certainly.

MR. ROBERTS: The full debate of the estimates is going on now. If the House Leader or maybe the Premier would say a word.

MR. MOORES: Yes, Mr. Chairman, as we have been invited to stick at it all night, Never let it be said that we failed in our duty to do that.

MR. MOORES: If we did not have so much wasted time with extra verbage on the other side of the House, maybe we would have gotten a lot further. But we have a job to do, the opposition have a job to do, let us get on and do it no matter how long it takes. Continue it.

MR. ROBERTS: Well then are we to understand from the Premier, Mr. Chairman, if the House is to sit continuously until when?

AN HON. MEMBER: Until the estimates are through.

MR. ROBERTS: All we want to know is how long we are to be here, so we can arrange the necessary shifts and things?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to arrange whatever shifts he thinks that will be necessary, because he is the one who is taking up all of the time with the verbage I was talking about.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, be that as it may, would the Premier indicate how long he intends or the House Leader how long he intends to keep the House in session I am not complaining. I am quite happy.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, we want the estimates passed by the end of this month, which is today.

MR. ROBERTS: There is no way, the estimates may or may not be passed, there are a bunch of supply bills will not be passed.

MR. MARSHALL: That is fine.

MR. ROBERTS: If the honourable gentleman, as we have told him earlier, if it is a matter of supply and they are a little short, we said that for our part, I cannot speak for the other side, for our part we would give the necessary consent to have an interim supply bill put through in all stages in one day. That is not unheard of. We are quite willing to do it, if the government need an extra fifteen days supply or an extra months supply. We have been less time on the estimates by far than was spent on them last year.

MR. MARSHALL: It sounds like the honourable Leader of the Opposition is begging for mercy.

MR. ROBERTS: No! No! I am merely trying to find out, Mr. Chairman, how long the government intends to keep the House in session. That

MR. ROBERTS: is what I want to know.

MR. MARSHALL: It all depends on how much progress will be made.

MR. ROBERTS: Until progress is made. Well that is no answer, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROWE, W.N.: I mean, is he saying we are staying in session until the estimates are passed?

MR. MARSHALL: Is that what we are saying?

MR. MOORES: No!

MR. ROWE, W.N.: Not saying that.

MR. ROBERTS: Until they deem progress has been made.

MR. ROWE, W.N.: Until they deem it.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Leader of the Opposition said we are prepared to stay here all night. Does he mean the statement or is all night until two o'clock in the morning? I mean if he is prepared to stay here all night, he invited us to stay here all night, we would like to stay here all night because it is a job that has to be done. We only to happily accept the invitation to stay all night and I hope he stays around to accept his own invitation.

MR. ROWE, W.N.: Well we would like for the honourable the Premier to do the same thing.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I assume the Premier will be here. But I am quite willing to stay all night, if it comes to that. What I am asking the House Leader is this; the House in the past has sat until two o'clock, to my certain knowledge. I have been involved in sessions here that have gone on until two o'clock in the morning, at least one. There may be other sessions that have gone on later. That is fine.

AN HON. MEMBER: Until four or five o'clock in the morning.

MR. ROBERTS: Four or five o'clock in the morning.

MR. ROWE, W.N.: For interim supply one time, that is right.

MR. ROBERTS: The rules of the House provide that we can go on all night, Yes, of course. Yes, of course, we can. We can go on until there is a motion to adjourn. I assume the House can sit continuously

MR. ROBERTS: for weeks or months, if necessary. What I am trying to find out is what the government's intentions are.

MR. MARSHALL: The government's intentions are quite plain, Mr. Chairman. The government are accepting the invitation of the opposition to sit here all night, after eleven o'clock, the normal adjournment time. This is what we intend to do. Now that is our position and it is crystal clear and plain. This debate has nothing to do with Municipal Affairs and Housing which we are now on, so I suggest we get on with the vote.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I agree with it. They say they are sitting because they have accepted my invitation. Well then maybe I will withdraw the invitation. I am sorry.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is too late.

MR. ROBERTS: Well if it is too late, I mean I can withdraw the invitation. Now the government may change their minds and say they are going to stay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! The item under discussion is 1301-01, the minister's salary - Municipal Affairs and Housing. Perhaps the honourable members on both sides of the House might care to get together behind the Speaker's Chair. But the Chair feels that the debate should not continue on the point as to how long the debate is going to continue but rather should be relevant to 1301-01, the minister's salary and the management of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honour, Of course that is what we will do. Our invitation is not withdrawn. What we have seen is an example of government's arrogance of the first order. Now let me raise a - they are using their majority to override the minority. That is fine, they can do that. I cannot quarrel, I agree.

AN HON. MEMBER: Physically.

MR. ROBERTS: Physically, yes. The Minister of Finance is, but a number of the ministers are away. That is okay, but one or two of my colleagues are absent. It is nice to see the Premier here too. We do not see him often enough.

MR. ROWE, W.N. We take it he is going to stay.

MR. ROBERTS: There are a number of points that we would like for the minister to touch upon, as we get into the debate. He touched upon regional government but I would like for him to go on, really to tell us about his thinking on this.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Just see how long the minister will last.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry. No but I am interested in such things as whether we should have two tier government or a three tier government, what types of function the minister thinks should be assigned to the various levels of a regional government. I would be interested to know what areas, what type of area, what size of population should go into it: I would like for the minister, Mr. Chairman, to tell us about his thoughts on the county system of government? It has been suggested in Newfoundland, on occasions; should we have it? I wonder if the minister perhaps could tell us about what type of taxes should be levied by the various levels in government. Perhaps the minister,

Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Chairman, could tell us a little about which functions he thinks could be assigned to each of the levels of government. If we were to have a two-tier system, what function should be assigned to each tier and what function should not be assigned to each tier and perhaps with some reasons on it? We want to debate the reasons on it. I think the minister should also tell us of what areas in the province he is thinking of with respect to possible regional government. The joint town councils on the Burin Peninsula, as honourable gentlemen are aware, as Your Honour I am sure is aware, have suggested that we might have a form of regional government on the Burin Peninsula. I would like the minister to let us know if he has any thoughts on this and if so what they are. If he has none then, of course, I would want to outline some thoughts and he could react or otherwise to them. I would like the minister also, Mr. Chairman, to give us a list of the various projects of water and sewers which are underway this year. I do not think he has given a list. My colleague from Bonavista North asked for it. I am particularly interested in any new projects which are underway this year or any new projects which are contemplated this year. In addition I would like to hear what the minister has to say on the question that is emerging, becoming important now:

Last year or so there was a possible conflict between the Department of Municipal Affairs on the one hand and on the other hand, the Clean, Air, Water and Soil Authority. The authority by law (I think it is a right policy) have a final say, what amounts to a veto power over the installation of all waste disposal systems in this province. There have been a number of examples, I believe. Indeed the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, who is the minister responsible for the administration of the authority, tabled a number in the House in response to a question that was asked them. I forget whom. It may have been my friend from Bonavista North. The Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources tabled a list of some six or eight municipalities where applications had been turned down by the Clean, Air, Water and Soil Authority. I think we have such

Mr. Roberts

a problem in Twillingate. Perhaps the minister could speak, on this on what it is going to cost the province to solve it. Is there any suggestion that there will be a change in the policy that perhaps the Department of Municipal Affairs, their applications to municipalities may be exempted from some or all the rigours of the regulations of the Clean, Air, Water and Soil Authority? I think the minister is going to rename that. Is that right?

MR. DOODY: - environment or something like that.

MR. ROBERTS: A Scandanavian idea.

MR. DOODY: Something like that, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: As long as that is all he picked up Scandanavian, Mr. Chairman. Medicare will probably cover some of the other things he may have picked up. But the minister might wish to expand a little on this. We are here. Apparently, thanks to the determination of the government, we are going to be here all night. Well we might as well be entertained by the minister speaking on these important subjects. I would like as well, Mr. Chairman, for the minister to let us know a little about what size of a job lies ahead in Newfoundland on water and sewerage. What sort of thinking are we going to need? Are we going to need \$100 million, \$200 million, \$300 million to straighten these out? I do not know. Perhaps the minister could indicate it. He told the committee earlier, Mr. Chairman, that about seventy-five per cent of the homes in Newfoundland had water and most of them would have water and sewers. The minister told us that he could not give us a detailed breakdown of that. A substantial percentage of the seventy-five per cent do have sewers as well as water, municipal sewers. Many of them, of course, would have their own sewerage systems. He might tell us what sort of job lies ahead there. How many years will it take? Is it something we can see in five years, ten or fifteen or twenty? Are there communities in Newfoundland where it will not be possible for the government, working with municipal

Mr. Roberts

bodies, to provide water and sewerage systems? Are there areas where the population is either so small - ah, they have them barred in Mr. Chairman. They got them barred in so they cannot go out. The Premier is gone already. He just came and he is going. Do we take an adjournment until he comes back? I know we have a quorum. The Premier is so insistent on being here -

MR. MOORES: It is very simple, Mr. Chairman. I will not take long.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I suggest perhaps that the parliamentary assistant should get along and assist the Premier. That is his function to assist the Premier. I was not as well paid though. Obviously the thought of all this discussion of water and sewers has moved the Premier as it were. Maybe it was the discussion of the magnesia plants we had earlier with the gentleman from Harbour Grace, who I see has left us for the time being. He will doubtless be back though.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I know he would like to. However, the minister might outline in a broad general way the sort of programme that is going to be needed. He is going to be there, one assumes, for two, three or four years. I wonder if the minister as well might dilate a little upon the present policy with respect to subsidies for -

AN HON. MEMBER: Dilate?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, dilate, a perfectly good word. A perfectly good word and a perfectly good usage. If the honourable gentleman does not know all these words, I will send him a dictionary. It would not be any help though, he cannot spell. We will do something for him. I do not know what. There is some thought. The minister might like to say a few words about the formula for water and sewerage systems, Mr. Chairman, the formula under which municipalities are subsidized. The deputy minister

Mr. Roberts

is smiling. I have but begun to scratch the surface of this. It is sort of a mixed metaphor, is it not? Well we will unmix the metaphor. The minister may care to tell us a little about this. The present system, as I understand it, Sir, is this: A number of years ago the government (indeed it was while the present Minister of Finance was Minister of Municipal Affairs) realized that there had to be some sort of order, some framework put about the programme under which the government paid subsidies to municipalities. Now why do the government pay subsidies to municipalities? Well, of course, the government pay subsidies to municipalities because the municipalities by themselves cannot possibly afford to service the debts that are often incurred (I know the minister will agree) by the municipalities when they borrow with or without government backing, usually with government backing or through the Municipal Development Loan Fund or the Municipal Loan Corporation. When they borrow the money, they cannot afford to service it, they have to get subsidies. They get revenue from their own taxpayers. They get revenue grants in respect of that revenue and, of course, the ceiling has now been raised somewhat. That usually but scratches the surface. They have to get a subsidy to help them repay the principal and to pay the interest on their loans and in addition they usually need a subsidy to cover the operating expenses of running a water and sewerage system.

The then Minister of Municipal Affairs, who happens to be the Minister of Finance at present, sat down and in his own indefatigable way worked out a scheme. He brought it up to cabinet and it was discussed in cabinet and cabinet agreed upon it. Interestingly enough it was in relation to Happy Valley. Was it Happy Valley or Placentia? I am not sure. Happy Valley or Dunville? It was both. Well what the minister did was very simple, very reasonable, quite simple. He looked at the greatest amount that the government had agreed to pay in respect of any individual system (that is what he did) and it came out to be \$75,000 in the case of Happy Valley and \$75,000 in the case of Placentia. It may

Mr. Roberts.

have been \$74,812.07. I am going to need some more water, if I might please. This may go on a while. It is only water, I fear. Coffee keeps me awake. I would not want to be awake.

Mr. Chairman, the minister reminds me of the former Premier's remark that I go to sleep after three o'clock, but we are now coming up to four o'clock.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are proud of you.

MR. ROBERTS: I am glad. I am proud of the minister. I thought of the minister over there in Stockholm. I thought of him. Boy! I thought of him. What I thought of him is another story. I thought of him. We are going to hear almost everything before this morning. I mean, if the House is going to sit continuously, then we have lots of time to hear everything.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Everything is relevant.

MR. ROBERTS: I agree. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Everything that is relevant to the minister's salary vote. This is great water, Sir. The Minister of Municipal Affairs should be congratulated on the quality of the water that is supplied by the municipality of St. John's. It is not fluoridated. It should be fluoridated. Certainly

that will draw another eight letters to the editor in the newspaper, accusing me of selling out to a communist plot or something but it should be fluoridated, of course it should. But we will come to that a little later. I had forgotten that. I thank the honourable gentleman. We will have a few words from him. He served on the City Council of St. John's, very much relevant to the minister's salary, Mr. Chairman, But this is the general administration of the department. It is the debate on the government's policy with respect to municipalities and Municipal Affairs. Where was I? Oh yes, I agree, nowhere, but we are getting nowhere fast.

MR. CROSBIE: We are enjoying it.

MR. ROBERTS: I am glad the government are enjoying it. I am enjoying it too.

MR. CROSBIE: It is your invitation, we are enjoying it.

MR. ROBERTS: I am glad, being a bachelor I have nothing else to do.

MR. CROSBIE: I know that.

MR. ROBERTS: Nothing else to do.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the honourable gentleman found somebody to have him, Maybe I will find somebody to have me. Stranger things have happened, witness him.

Now as we were saying, we were at Dunville coming around by Happy Valley, Sir, as I recall it, and the then Minister of Municipal Affairs, now member for St. John's West, drew up the formula and it said for municipalities with a population in excess of 3,000 people or 3,001, the maximum subsidy that could be paid would be \$75,000 a year. For municipalities with populations between 1,500 and 3,000, I believe the maximum subsidy payable was \$69,000 a year and for municipalities with less than 1,500 within the municipal area, the subsidy I think is \$25,000 a year, I stand to be corrected on the figures. Well that worked for a bit, It was

an ad hoc policy but it did work and it provided at least the framework, a guide line when a municipality came in and wanted to have a water and sewer system installed, provided some measuring stick of whether or not it could be done, a method of trying to determine priorities. So it worked. Within the last couple of years, the pressure against the upward setting was getting close to intolerable. While we were the administration we did not relax it. I suspect if we had stayed there we would have had to relax it just in sheer recognition of realities. \$75,000 in 1965; 1966, it would probably take \$125,000, \$130,000 or \$150,000 to buy as much work today as could be bought for \$75,000 in those halcyon days. Would the honourable gentlemen please keep it down. Thank you. The honourable gentleman have such horrible voices. They really do. They are like schooner captains standing on the deck in the midst of a storm, a gale.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am like the Minister of Mines and Resources, I find it hard to take it seriously at times too. However, it is a serious business. I appreciate the spirit in which the honourable gentleman is participating.

MR. REID: I was thinking aloud just now.

MR. ROBERTS: Is that what the honourable gentleman was doing?

MR. REID: Yes, That is what I was doing, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: I am glad, Mr. Chairman, because we have had our doubts as to whether the honourable gentleman thought at all.

That is it, keep it short. One, two, three, four, five six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve, thirteen, fourteen - they are okay, a couple more have come back in.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I must say it is great fun seeing the member for Burgeo. They should move him closer to the door. The honourable gentlemen say they accepted my invitation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Come on, let us hear some more.

MR. ROBERTS: I am, just refueling.

Now we got to the point of outlining the formula and saying that there was... did some honourable gentleman say something? I mean, I would not want to interrupt them. Did some honourable gentleman say something?

MR. REID: No, I was just saying, did you outline it? I was just hoping you were going back over it again.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wish the honourable gentleman would not say "you" because, as the active House Leader would tell us, it is quite improper, but if the honourable gentleman did not grasp it the first time...

MR. STAGG: The honourable temporary Leader.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry, there was something from the gentleman from Port au Port.

MR. STAGG: What about "it".

MR. ROBERTS: What about "it."

MR. STAGG: You use "it".

MR. ROBERTS: I see the honourable gentleman... that passes for "it", well it is a poor passing. Well if the honourable member for Trinity South, if he could not grasp it on the first time of utterance, I mean I can lead a horse to water but I cannot even make half a horse drink, I will go over it again for the honourable gentleman, if he would like.

MR. REID: All my colleagues would like for you to go over it once again.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the least we can do, Sir, is to go over it once again.

Now, instead of saying the government - they really want it all over again, Mr. Chairman?

MR. REID: Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: We have heard it four times already.

MR. ROBERTS: Could we have a vote on that please, Mr. Chairman?

The honourable Minister of Community and Social Development is outside the

House, now he is inside the House. I am for him. Of course what he knows is that when we stagger through these, as we will at some point in the next twelve or fifteen hours, we are bound to come to an end here, then the honourable gentleman's estimates are next.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is waiting, I am glad.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, as we were saying about the formula, would the minister tell us whether it is proposed to change that formula, either in the absolute amounts involved in it or are the administration proposing to take a different approach altogether? How do they plan to deal with this problem of water and sewer systems in municipalities? I think that probably most municipalities now that qualify within the formula, have in fact qualified, have their systems underway. What about the others? Are they going to get water and sewer systems? Are they going to be denied them? Or are we going to have a different formula? What is the basis?

The minister belongs to an administration that talks of priorities, perhaps he could tell us a little about the administration's priorities in respect of water and sewers. If they cannot do everything at once, and I think that is

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman from Trinity South erupts again, Sir.

MR. REID: I cannot help it.

MR. ROBERTS: What did he say?

AN HON. MEMBER: He said he cannot help it.

MR. ROBERTS: Well if he cannot help it, it is the Minister of Health or the Minister of Highways who is a medical doctor, he should speak to. Or maybe he should speak to the Minister of Agriculture, because veterinarians come under that department.

MR. REID: I usually come to life at 2:00 or 3:00 o'clock in the morning.

MR. ROBERTS: Well as it is now 2:05 A.M., has the member come alive?

There is some doubt on the point.

MR. REID: I am right alive.

MR. ROBERTS: He has come alive, has he? Good!

Well on behalf of the committee, I welcome the honourable gentleman back to the real world. For a while there he was on the Progressive Conservative side but he seems to have come to his senses.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: If it is a real world, Mr. Chairman, we would not want the member for Burgeo in it.

On the formula, the minister may be able to say a little about whether it is proposed to change the formula; if so, in what way? If not, how do they propose to deal with the question of providing water and sewer systems in the other municipalities throughout the province?

I would like the minister to say a few words please, Mr. Chairman, to indicate the administration's policy with respect to the question of the possible or suggested or potential amalgamation of the two towns of Grand Falls and Windsor in Central Newfoundland. The minister says he is not going to say anything on that, Well, that in itself says a great deal. I mean, we have two communities there that are, I do not know if their boundaries are contiguous. Contiguous, contiguous, but it is side by side. Maybe they are or maybe they are not, maybe the Trans Canada actually separates them. The railway as well, of course, runs between Windsor and Grand Falls or part of them, but I know the people out there would be interested in that. There are two different interests in it, of course.

AN HON. MEMBER: Coterminous.

MR. ROBERTS: Coterminous? No, coterminous means an end, means two things come to an end equally. Contiguous is the correct word. I may not have pronounced it correctly. Yes, right I thank the minister but the other gentlemen are wrong, the minister is right. That is the more normal procedure. The minister, he is a great fellow.

The minister, he is a great fellow, a great fellow aye, and very modest about it too. Anyway I would like the minister to say a few words about the Grand Falls and Windsor situation. I do not think the government can duck it for the next four years. The communities continue to grow. They are becoming, that Central Newfoundland Area is becoming a most important part of the province. We must deal with this problem. The minister may indicate what approach he wishes to take. I wonder also if the minister could say a few words about the municipal paving programme. There is an item in the area of expenditure under it, but how is it proposed to carry it on? Are municipalities going to be getting assistance with roads and if so, on what basis? How many? What is the repayment basis? How do they go about applying if the minister will not see them? When will the work be done? How much is to be done? How are the priorities to be determined? In other words what is the policy?

My friend from St. Barbe North made some remarks. There was some talk in the Speech from the Throne on the point but the minister may wish to say a few words on it. We would appreciate that. I wonder if he could say a few words as well on the floridation question. The gentleman from Ferryland has indicated he intends to raise it. We will leave it until the gentleman raises it, but then a number of us may want to say a few words on that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Will we have time?

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know. One will have to ask the House Leader as we are his captives, as it were. There are a number of specific problems in my own constituency, I would like the minister to speak about, please. I think we have settled, he sent me some correspondence. the question of an extension to the Englee water system. He has turned them down, that is the cable that was sent to the Mayor, Mr. Baxter Gillard. The minister has turned them down and said no, they would be too expensive.

The government cannot or will not do it. Whether they will not or cannot, they are not doing it. But what is the situation with respect to St. Lunaire, which is a community council, St. Lunaire and Griquet? The deputy minister will, doubtless, if he already has not filled the minister in on the point, he will brief him on it. St. Lunaire and Griquet about 1,000 to 1200 people out there. It is a long, spread-out community. Last year a start was made on a water system, The water system will not finish the entire community, with the amount of money that was made available, so perhaps the minister could tell us whether it will be carrying on. The people there are quite concerned.

The community of Raleigh is having some difficulty with incorporation. When they get incorporated will they be able to get assistance from the government? If so, on what basis? They are interested in getting a water system. They do not need a sewer system, I would not think, because all the houses in Raleigh happen to be arranged around the bay and they all have their sewer outfalls now, but they do need water. That is going to be an expensive project because it is about a mile and a-half, as I recall it, to the source of water, and that is going to be an expensive system to install.

Maybe we can have a few words as well on Main Brook, the question of water and sewer there. There have been a number of preliminary surveys and I believe the costs are quite high. Could the minister indicate because the people there are terribly concerned and there has been correspondence passing between him and the council could the minister indicate what hope there might be for those people there. They are living there under most unsanitary conditions.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: No, no they --

AN HON. MEMBER: What have you been doing all those years?

MR. ROBERTS: Some of these problems have gone on for years.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, how long have the Leader of the Opposition been representing White Bay North?

MR. ROBERTS: Six years. All these problems have been going on for years, Mr. Chairman. I want to know how many more years they are going to go on before they are solved. I want to know the policy of this administration.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well, in that case they will be solved very quickly.

AN HON. MEMBER: It took six years to find out what the problems were in White Bay North.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, well let us see what we did in White Bay North in the past six years. St. Anthony had a proper water and sewer system installed and there are still some areas that need to be picked up but by and large there is a proper system in that community. Roddickton a system is now underway and at Englee it was started. Those are the three largest communities in White Bay North. Not enough, I agree not enough but not too bad. We are now in the situation where the government is refusing to provide electricity to some of the people in White Bay North. I find it astounding that the Premier may not be aware of the details but there are one or two small communities, he may know them with his background in the fisheries, Fishot Islands - good fishermen - North East Croque, small communities -

AN HON. MEMBER: Do they have electricity?

MR. ROBERTS: No they never had electricity. All the larger communities had been done.

AN HON. MEMBER: They have only been refused now. They never ask before did they?

MR. ROBERTS: They ask over the years and they were told that the larger communities had to be done first, which is a reasonable system of priorities. I know the Premier would agree with that. They are now the only two communities left. There are a couple in St. Barbe North, Big Brook and Bard Harbour, in the same situation. They are very small and it

will be very expensive on a per person basis, but the only way they are going to get electricity on a reasonable basis is if they are given it by the government, through the Power Commission.

AN HON. MEMBER: And get plugged in.

MR. ROBERTS: And get plugged in, that is right, sure! Whether it is a diesel or whether it is a hydro line run down, that is a technical question. There are many municipal needs in White Bay North and we will have a look at those at some length. That will be about four-thirty o'clock this morning we -

AN HON. MEMBER: You are super-conscious of the clock, Sir.

MR. ROBERTS: I am conscious of the clock. I want to make sure I do not keep anybody awake over there. I have not, so far. A number of them have gone off to sleep. The Minister of Supply and Services is awake. I am glad of that.

MR. DAHE: If you talk very much, I will not be staying awake much longer.

MR. ROBERTS: I hope he does not stay awake much longer, Sir, because really if he is not with us, we would just as soon he is not with us. Now I think I may have touched on some of the preliminary points I wanted to raise. We would like - Is the minister leaving?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well, it is not good for the minister's health. We will have to have a few words from the minister on some of these points. We may not wish to say anything or he may. We hope he does. We will leave housing until later but before we pass of the minister's salary we must have a few words on housing, in particular a most inequitable situation which has developed in Corner Brook where an individual is being treated, I submit most unjustly by the government. I am not sure if it is in the Premier's district. No, I think it is probably in the Rumber East constituency, represented by the Minister of Highways.

There is a most inequitable situation which has cropped up in Corner Brook in connection with the arterial road. We will be having a little chat about that because I think it is probably depending on the housing, a house for a house, the commitment of the administration.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is it the urban renewal or the arterial road?

MR. ROBERTS: No, it is the arterial road. The man is having his house expropriated, having his house taken and he is not being offered anything like enough money to provide a new house for him.

AN HON. MEMBER: The urban renewal looks after that.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, well maybe we should have a few words on urban renewal as well, because certainly we have had some lessons, good and bad. Maybe the minister, while we are on urban renewal, could tell us something about where the Mundy Pond matter stands as well as the Corner Brook one. What are the government, when the St. John's Council approaches them, as they have said they will be, to look for more money? What are the overruns? I do not know what they are. There have been tenders called and there have been some announcements made and some tenders opened. Let me see what else we would like the minister to talk about in his opening remarks. Well we will go on to housing before we go off it. The minister might say a few words to describe the new Federal Government programme, how it may affect Newfoundland. I would like him, if he would, Mr. Chairman, to say a little about land bank policies. I would like him to say a little about the possibility of subsidizing mortgages, as suggested in the report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. Indeed he may say a few words on the possibility of merging the St. John's Housing Corporation, the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, the Corner Brook Housing Corporation. All of these I think perhaps should be discussed at some length in the committee tonight. I would like him to say a little about land use. Did the government plan any different controls?

We had today a petition presented to the House by the member from Ferryland District, from a number of the people in Trepassy, in which they indicated some dissatisfaction with the town planning efforts as they have gone ahead in Trepassy, and I gather the problem was not new to the minister. The member told us he discussed it with the minister previously. The minister might give us a little of his thoughts on these lines while we are touching on things. I guess we have given the minister enough to start on, Mr. Chairman. Maybe he could say a few words about these things and then we will carry on and see where we go from there.

MR. COLLINS: I have notes made of most of them, Mr. Chairman. I gave my ideas on resettlement twice already to the committee. The honourable Leader of the Opposition was not here, I believe I do not think it is necessary to go into that again as I have gone into it twice. With regard to projects, he asked a question on what projects are going ahead this year. We are not in the position to say what new projects might be undertaken at this particular time.

MR. COLLINS: We do not operate as the Department of Highways operates nor the Department of Health, we are dealing with town councils. There are a lot of requests on hand, as the honourable Leader must know, from last year and the year before and the year before and some not so long ago. But we have to set up some priorities and that is not an easy task to do either, because some people are bound to be disappointed. But we will be getting around to that, please goodness, when the first opportunity -

AN HON. MEMBER: What sort of priorities?

MR. COLLINS: Well these are some of the problems which we have to face and to try and establish a fair and equitable way to do it. There are a tremendous number of problems, as every honourable member knows. We are going to have to look to the experts for some advice and we have this in our mind, that when we will be in a position to set up the bodies or boards, whichever it might be, we will have to wait and see.

With regards to the Clean Air, Water, and Soil Authority, they do have some control, a very stringent control, by legislation, as the honourable Leader has pointed out, I think possibly with so many councils coming into St. John's looking for water and sewer systems, coming in and sitting down with the minister, I am not an expert on pollution. Neither am I an expert on the construction of sewerage treatment plants or pumping stations or lift stations or piping etc. I believe we are going to have to set up some sort of a board, I do not know what we will call them yet, but some sort of a municipal relations board, possibly.

MR. ROBERTS: Like the Ontario Municipal Board.

MR. COLLINS: Where we will have experts from Clean Air, Water, and Soil Authority or the Department of the Environment, whatever it is going to be called, the Department of Health which are involved as well. Maybe the Department of Highways will still have some responsibilities in incorporated areas. It would have to be composed, I suppose, of senior officials who would draw upon some technical advice, consultants' advice

MR. COLLINS and so on and so forth, so that when the councils do come we can sit down or they can sit down with a board composed of competent people and discuss their problems and try and find out the best way to solve them and to make recommendations to the minister.

With regards to Grand Falls and Windsor - I am certainly not going to get drawn into that controversy. I think it is a decision which is going to have to be made by the people in Grand Falls and the people in Windsor. There are various ways it can be done, through plebiscites, referendums, whatever you might call them. But certainly there is a boundary line there now, the two towns are divided by a railroad track. The Local Government Act does not provide for one municipality to take in the next one nor any people who might not be in a municipality although adjacent to them. It is a decision which is going to have to be made by the people of that area. I believe there might be some advantages to be gained if they did decide to amalgamate, but then it is up to those people to decide.

With regard to fluoridation - not when I was on the Town Council in Gander. before I became a member of the Town Council in Gander, a decision was taken to fluoridate the water. I cannot say I was opposed to it in council, because I was not there. I was opposed to it as a citizen. I thought at the time the people should have a say before fluoride was added to water. My mind has not changed that much, I believe that our department, in co-operation with the Department of Health, has the responsibility to provide all of the relevant information which might be available, to make it available to town councils and to people. I believe that in the end the people themselves possibly, unless there is some information which we do not know anything about, something which could prove beyond all possibility of misunderstanding or doubts, as someone else said one time, there is something to be gained from it. I think the people should be the ones to decide that.

MR. ROBERTS: Through plebiscites or their elected representatives?

MR. COLLINS: Well that would be up to, depending on what debate took place within the community. Chances are the councillors might feel, as a result of meeting with people and representations made to them by people, they might feel they were competent to make a decision. I would suspect it would be by a plebiscite, I do not see any other way.

MR. ROBERTS: Would it require that? Would that be up to the council?

MR. COLLINS: I really cannot say, Mr. Chairman. I have not gone into it that deeply. Certainly there is a more pressing problems facing us today than fluoridation, I am sure the honourable Leader will agree.

With regard to several settlements in his own district, which he mentioned, I really cannot tell the honourable Leader what the status is, what has been done there, I do not think he would expect me to do that.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, I expect the gentleman to get the information.

MR. COLLINS: We might possibly be able to fish it out tonight, but if we cannot we will fish it out tomorrow and pass it along just as soon as we get it.

I think he mentioned something about Mundy Pond Urban Renewal Scheme, which is presently in progress, A couple of tenders were awarded within the past eight or ten days, covering a fair amount of work. We do know that the cost has escalated in there considerably. We know now that to complete the scheme, as it was envisaged in the first place, is going to cost an extra \$1.2 million, if my memory serves me correct.

MR. ROBERTS: One point two million? Will Ottawa contribute anything to that?

MR. COLLINS: Ottawa are not required to contribute anything further, under the old agreement. Then, of course, there is no urban renewal scheme, as such, any more. What we propose to do there and what we have already started in fact is to start negotiations. We have already started negotiations with Ottawa and we also have had some discussion with the

MR. COLLINS: city, hopefully to come up with some arrangements whereby the three levels of government can find ways and means to complete the project which is so necessary in the Mundy Pond Area.

The urban renewal scheme in Corner Brook is reaching completion. It has been a very successful operation. It is kept within the estimates, you know the cost estimates. The work has been done to a great extent by city forces, which possibly kept the cost down. It has worked very well over there. I think there might be one or two cases where people feel that they have not been justly dealt with. We have some people looking into that. But all in all I am very pleased and I think the city, who are implementing the scheme, are very pleased with the way that job has gone.

What else was there?

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, there are a number of other things, to refresh the minister, the municipal paving programme, the whole question of the size of the problem on water and sewer, Mr. Chairman, in Newfoundland and also the minister's thoughts with respect to the formula under which government assistance is made available. These were two items. There were a number of broad questions on land-use planning and so forth and so on. We have not really got into the question of housing, but such items as land banks, subsidies of mortgage rates. I see the report of the Housing Corporation, which the minister tabled in the House today, Mr. Chairman. The Annual Report for the year ending March 31, 1971, had in it a number of policy recommendations. I may add, they are not new. I have seen them before. Without getting into this, we will come to this in a few minutes, Mr. Chairman, because, of course, you know the minister's responsibilities extend to housing as well and there are a number of items there that we would like to discuss. But there were those two or three things: the municipal paving programme and the whole water and sewer situation. You know, how big is it in Newfoundland? What are we going to do about it? Can the minister see a solution? What

MR. ROBERTS: about the formula, is this going to be adequate? Is this going to have to be changed? If so, along what lines? You know what sort of a thing we speaking of in this respect?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be too specific because we have not reached final decisions on them. I mentioned earlier that I believe that the revenue grants and the road grants subsidies are going to have to be increased. I do not have any doubt about that because the costs have escalated to such an extent since those were increased. I believe the time has come when we will certainly have to increase them, to what extent I cannot say.

When the honourable the Leader of the Opposition talked about new projects and the overall water and sewer needs, maybe I should read this to the committee, it might throw some light on what we are up against.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, some honourable member -

MR. ROBERTS: No, just a comment, that we may read the whole report on housing as well.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, there is the financial date on capital projects which are on-going, let us say. Total bank loans due and payable as of now, \$5,591,000, these are bank loans to municipalities for water and sewer projects.

MR. ROBERTS: Guaranteed by the government?

MR. COLLINS: Guaranteed by the government. The total of bank loans which will become due and payable within the next two years is \$26,555,000. That gives us a total of \$32,146,900.

MR. ROBERTS: These are being financed through the Municipal Finance Corporation.

MR. COLLINS: Loans which are coming due now are guaranteed bank loans at the various banks in the names of the various municipalities. Financing required in this year, to continue work on projects which were commenced last year - I can go into that in some detail possibly.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh! do.

MR. COLLINS: Financing required in 1972 to continue work on projects commenced last year, in 1971, is \$4,470,000. The additional amount required to complete the progress on hand or the ones started last year gives us a grand total of \$44,616,900. If that is not hay in anyone's language, I am sure the honourable Leader of the Opposition must know what that means to all of us. In other words we have to find \$45 million to finance projects which had previously been authorized and committed.

Mr. Chairman, that more or less puts us in a straight-jacket for this year. Some projects which we know must start. There is no doubt in our minds at all, Some projects must start this year. How we are going to get the money; the minister of Finance has already indicated the extent of the borrowing this year. What the final

decision will be, how many or how much money we will have, as honourable members opposite must know, it is not going to be mine. I have my own ideas what we will finally get through Cabinet. I suppose it is a collective responsibility -

MR. ROBERTS: Would the minister yield for a second?

MR. COLLINS: Not until I have finished this, Mr. Chairman. What projects we will be able to start we have not really decided. But I want to stress this again that we are talking in terms of \$45 million now to finance projects which were started last year, on-going projects.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, with respect to these figures, I thank the minister for giving them to us. They are most enlightening. They do tell us a little of the size of the job ahead of us. I want to make one or two comments. Before I do, did the minister say, did he indicate that the department which he heads, he is the minister, is not yet in possession of the information as to how much money will be made available to the department, to him, to his officials, through the normal sources - I am sorry, the Premier, I will go over it again because the Premier is the Premier. Did the minister say that he is not aware of, as yet, how much money can be made available, money being either cash or credit (money is money, it will buy things to be done) this year? Is that what he said that the minister of Finance and the Cabinet had not yet decided that.

MR. COLLINS: We do not know what we are going to have for new, to initiate -

MR. ROBERTS: This year? Well they are not necessarily in the estimates but they would be in the -

MR. COLLINS: Would not be in the estimates.

MR. ROBERTS: But they would be in the cash flow figures for the - the figures. Mr. Chairman, this is an important point, it should be in here because we have statement "A" on the printed estimates, the green

ones, summary of borrowing requirements and sources of funds. It includes all requirements, budgetary, debt retirement, guarantee requirement so forth, There is borrowing over and above the budgetary expenditure. The budgetary expenditures of the government are those contained in this book. There are expenditures that are not budgetary but are nonetheless expenditures, Power commission so forth and so on. It is the matter of the municipal finances.

The figure here is that the minister of Finance says that during 1972-1973, \$10 million will be guaranteed on the credit of the province, through the Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation. Now, if that is the correct figure, I assume it is, it is part of the total borrowing requirements of the government which are estimated to be \$203.8 million. That includes everything, redemptions, roll-overs, sinking funds, the whole bit. Roll-overs would be in here, sure. It is a source of financing. It would include the sources of financing, include borrowing, when you pay off one debt and get another. It is not an increase in the net debt of the province but it does show up in the cash flows. They are all included, cash flows of course would include all cash coming in and no cash going out. So the minister will have \$10 million available. That is what the Cabinet have agreed upon, from the Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation. That is fine.

Now, in addition to that he may have access to bank loans, if the government will use their authority to guarantee loans at the bank on authority which is subject to confirmation by the House. We will have a Loan and Guarantee Act in due course. I believe the notice is on the Order Paper, The Municipal Authority Loan and Guarantee Act. Could the minister give us some indication of what he has in mind for this year? Municipalities throughout the province are anxious to know. No doubt they are beating the minister's door down, that is part of

the penalty. But he will have at least \$10 million this year. That may have to go to pay off some of the bank loans. Because of course the way that municipal financing is done as a rule in this province has been that the towns and the councils go to the banks and the banks give them a loan on the government guarantee, then in due course longer-term financing is arranged and it is paid off. We have \$10 million in longer-term financing this year. Now that would free up \$10 million in bank credit, assuming the banks will extend the same line of credit.

That would mean that there is \$10 million available for new work. But the government may not wish to make use of that or the banks may say that your lines of credit are too high, we are going to cut them down. Either could happen. Could the minister indicate to us surely, now it is the thirtieth day of June, the year is three months gone on the financial year, nearly three months, six months gone on the calendar year, the minister must have some indication of what projects will begin in our construction season now. We are halfway through the good construction weather. If projects are not begun shortly, they will not be begun at all. The minister must be able to tell us, Mr. Chairman, because after all we all know decisions are not taken overnight. One has to have preliminary studies done. There is a whole train of events to leave time, maybe a year, a year and a-half or two years. What projects have been, what projects are at the talking stage, what ones are at the preliminary design stage, which ones have final design contracts been awarded? Could the minister give us a little information?

MR. COLLINS: That is a fairly involved question. I am not in a position, Mr. Chairman, to tell the honourable Leader of the

Opposition what new projects we are going to undertake this year. He touched on the fact that we have to decide how far we are going to go with guaranteeing bank loans. I am not in a position tonight to indicate what new projects are starting. I can indicate what projects will be continued. I do not know if this is any great revelation or not. Do I have to read all that, this hour of the morning?

MR. ROBERTS: Is the minister going to read it?

MR. COLLINS: If the Chairman, could bear with us for just a moment here.

Mr. Collins.

Here are some of the areas, Mr. Chairman, where projects have already started and which will be continued this year: The Rural District Council of Badger's Quay, Pool's Island, the Community of Bellburns, the Town of Botwood, Local Improvement District of Carmanville, Local Improvement District of Cook's Harbour, Community of Daniel's Harbour, Town of Dunville, Local Improvement District of Fleur-de-Lys, Local Improvement District of Hants Harbour, Town of Hare Bay, Community of Howley, Town of Lawn, Town of Lumsden, Milltown, Head of Bay d' Espoir, Nipper's Harbour, Seal Cove, St. Alban's, Stephenville, Upper Island Cove, Wareham and Wesleyville.

MR. ROBERTS: Is Englee not on the list, Mr. Chairman?

The work is going ahead down there.

MR. COLLINS: Seal Cove, White Bay, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, but is Englee on that list?

MR. COLLINS: No, Mr. Chairman, Englee is not on the list.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I can tell the minister, Mr. Chairman, that the work is going ahead down there. The construction workers are there. They have a contract. I do not know what it is all about. Maybe they are doing it as it were for charity. I doubt it though. Is Englee on the list? I mean there is work going ahead there now.

MR. COLLINS: I think there is work going ahead in Englee now.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, but the minister read a list but it did not have Englee on it.

MR. COLLINS: Well we have several lists.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh! Well read the rest of them then, please.

MR. COLLINS: No, I will not read the next one.

MR. ROBERTS: Why will not the minister read the next one, Sir?

MR. COLLINS: What the hon. Leader of the Opposition is trying to say - he mentioned the telegram sent to the mayor or the Town Council of Englee a little while ago, concerning a sewerage system and there is work

Mr. Collins

going ahead on a water system down there.

MR. ROBERTS: That is right.

MR. COLLINS: This is going to be continued.

MR. ROBERTS: What the minister says is correct, Mr. Chairman. He sent me the telegram. That is how I knew he sent it. The recipients had already spoken to me about it but that is another story. The minister was asked and he said; "sure I will read the list of the work in progress." He read a list of fifteen or twenty communities on it. It did not include the Town of Englee. Now can the minister tell us how many other communities are there? I happen to know about Englee because it is in White Bay North. Are there other lists? The minister tells us there are. All I want to know is what work is going ahead at this time in municipal affairs in Newfoundland, this year? The minister seems to be searching out the information. We can let it pass until his deputy minister gets it for him. I do not expect the minister to have all the information at the tip of his tongue.

AN HON. MEMBER: Call a recess.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, I cannot call a recess. I cannot do anything except speak. I can do that.

AN HON. MEMBER: He looks tired, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROBERTS: I am tired sure but not that tired. The Premier looks tired. The hon. gentleman from Labrador West looks tired. Is he not tired?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I am on top of the world.

MR. ROBERTS: He certainly looks strange for somebody on top of the world. The press gallery are still holding on up there. Bless them! I suppose there is not too much being said to take notes on now. That does not mean that the discussion is not valuable. This House does not merely sit for the convenience of the press. It is a valuable part of it but it is not the only part.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I would prefer to take notice of that and get

Mr. Collins.

the information for the honourable gentleman.

MR. ROBERTS: Well that is reasonable enough. When will we get the information, Mr. Chairman? Could the minister tell us when we will get the information, Sir?

MR. COLLINS: Well we are not going to get it tonight, Mr. Chairman, because there is no one in the office to come up with the information which we need. We will get it tomorrow sometime.

MR. ROBERTS: It is hard to debate the estimates without the information. Can the minister - when can the minister have the information for us?

MR. COLLINS: As soon as I can, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROBERTS: When will that be? But tomorrow is today or today is tomorrow.

MR. COLLINS: I will get it today.

MR. ROBERTS: Today?

MR. COLLINS: Later this day.

MR. ROBERTS: Well do we let the minister's office vote stand and go on and look at the other one? It is not that this information, Mr. Chairman, is especially unusual or difficult or anything.

MR. COLLINS: I would suggest that there has been more information given out tonight than there was in the past twenty-three years.

MR. ROBERTS: That may very well be. There certainly has been a better opposition than there has been in the past twenty-three years too.

MR. COLLINS: When the hon. Leader of the Opposition was a cabinet minister -

MR. ROBERTS: But whether or not more has been given out than was given out in the past 123 years is beside the point. The minister is here looking for authority to spend some money. He will get it. He will get it with the unanimous vote of the House. There is no problem there. We would just like some information on what he proposes to spend the money on. We are asking for something as simple as a list of the work in progress. The minister I

Mr. Roberts.

thought would have had the information with him. He is accompanied by two of his senior advisers, his expert advisers, his officials. This is not unusual information, Sir. It is not anything that would have to require some special work, to be assembled. There are times the committee asks for information that is not readily at hand but this is mother's milk in the Department of Municipal Affairs. I would have thought that the list would have been on the minister's desk each morning as he has his breakfast down there. He is looking assiduously.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall -

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, Mr. Chairman, the minister is having a look to see about some information.

MR. CARTER: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. Surely there is a limit to the involved detail that this committee should be asked to submit to honourable members opposite. I can quite appreciate that they want to get as much information as possible but on the understanding of the minister's word that the information that is required will be supplied at some future date, I think the honourable members opposite should take that as notice that the information will be surrendered. I think they should be willing to pass on to the next item. I think this is only reasonable. In fact, it is obstructive for them to contend otherwise.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure there is a point of order. The honourable gentleman has accused us of obstruction, which is impugning our motives and that is improper. He does not know any better. I am quite willing, if the committee wish it, to have the minister's office vote stand until we get the information. I submit, Sir, that it is germane. It is not detailed. It is not involved. It is merely a list of the work in progress. It is the same as the Minister of Highways when he tabled a list, (neither the minister nor the gentleman who was the acting minister at the time is here at present) it was very much germane to the debate of the general administration of the department. Indeed, I submit that it is one of the most important subjects. I am rather surprised that the minister

Mr. Roberts.

does not have the information here. Maybe he does. He has another list in his hand now.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, if the committee will bear with me, I have a list of work which is now in progress or about to start. I might miss one or two. I was trying to establish if one or two of these items are paid or not. I will try to point it out as I go along - water and sewers.

MR. ROBERTS: One or two are?

MR. COLLINS: Paving.

paving.

MR. ROBERTS: Paving, well...

MR. COLLINS: What I will read here will be water and sewer. The Community of Admiral's Beach, the District of Arnold's Cove, the rural district - and some of them might be, there might have been a duplication here as well, if there are you can mark those off. The Rural District of Badger's Quay, Valleyfield, did I mention that one? The Town of Baie Verte, the Town Council of Bay Roberts, the Community Council of Bellburns, Bishop's Falls (that was paving)

MR. ROBERTS: Bishop's Falls.

MR. COLLINS: Paved a few driveways up there last fall.

MR. ROBERTS: What are they paving now?

MR. COLLINS: They are all paved. If there was another election I would not need a bit of paving in my district.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are connecting up the driveways.

MR. ROBERTS: Not a bad idea.

MR. COLLINS: The Town Council of Bonavista.

MR. ROBERTS: That is water and sewer is it?

MR. COLLINS: Yes. Burin, Carmanville, Catalina,

MR. ROBERTS: Port Union?

MR. COLLINS: Town Council of Channel, Port aux Basques, Cook's Harbour. That should be a familiar place.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Cook's Harbour is St. Barbe North.

MR. COLLINS: Cook's Harbour, City of Corner Brook, Daniel's Harbour, Deer Lake. There is work taking place in Englee.

MR. ROBERTS: I know there is.

MR. COLLINS: Englee, Anglee, Unglee?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, people pronounce it - but Englee is the usual pronunciation.

MR. COLLINS: Fleur-de-Lys, which I mentioned before. Fortune, Gander, Glenwood, Goose Bay, Grand Bank, Happy Valley, Harbour Breton, Hare Bay,

Heart's Content, Howley, King's Point, LaScie.

AN HON. MEMBER: LaScie?

MR. W.N. ROWE: That is that small job, yes.

MR. COLLINS: That is just about completed.

MR. ROBERTS: I suppose to most people there were just the bills left.

MR. COLLINS: The Town Council of Lawn, Council of Lourdes, Lumsden, Millertown, Mount Pearl, Musgrave Harbour, Nipper's Harbour, Parson's Pond, Peterview, (a familiar name) Placentia, Port au Choix, Port au Port West to Aguathuna, Port Union, Ramea, Red Harbour, Riverhead, Rushoon, Sandringham, Seal Cove White Bay, South River, Clarke's Beach, I presume. Spaniard's Bay, St. John's Metropolitan Area Board, Steady Brook, Stephenville, St. Mary's, Sunnyside, Trepassey, Upper Island Cove District of Wareham.

MR. ROBERTS: This is all last year's.

MR. COLLINS: A lot of it was started, a lot of it has to start yet.

MR. ROBERTS: Could the minister indicate - I thank him for that list.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: I think that is a good question. There are quite a number left. I could name a half dozen in my own constituency and I am sure each member has some. The south shore of Conception Bay is one. There is a project going in Holyrood but that was finished last year, was it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Indeed it was not.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I mean, that will finish. That is DREE and we will get to that when we get...

MR. DOODY: It is not DREE, the previous administration changed the agreement, apparently.

MR. ROBERTS: Who is paying for it then?

MR. DOODY: We are offering up several litanies that a few...

MR. ROBERTS: Let me tell you, that will be no good at the bank.

MR. DOODY: Well, Sir, we have no money so we have to resort to prayers.

MR. ROBERTS: Prayers to the Minister of Finance?

MR. DOODY: To anyone who will listen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! order! shall 1301-01 carry?

MR. ROBERTS: We are just getting into the meat of it now. The Premier has asked what other communities are left and I think that is a good question. Before the minister deals with that one, and I thank the Premier for his help. The Premier is obviously anxious to get the information. The Committee are enthralled. I look about me and my colleague from Bell Island is practically speechless. Oh! even the gentleman from Fortune Bay is still with us. That is good.

MR. YOUNG: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable member for Harbour Grace will let us all down in the long run, will he not?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hopefully.

MR. ROBERTS: Some of us may be put up but others down. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, could the minister answer just a few more brief questions on that? I assume he has the information there. How much is involved in this? Is this the \$44 million total? I would imagine it is less than that. How many of these projects are new this year? I know the Spaniard's Bay one is new, if it has begun it only began very recently. There are obviously some other new ones in there. Could the minister indicate that sort of thing to the Committee?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Carried, carried.

MR. ROBERTS: Whose deal is it?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, this is a very difficult question.

MR. ROBERTS: I think we have a very capable minister dealing with it.

MR. COLLINS: Some of the work started last fall, some of the work is starting now and some will start possibly in a few weeks time.

MR. ROBERTS: Obviously some of the work started last fall, Some started longer ago than that, a year past, I would submit.

MR. COLLINS: No, Mr. Chairman, what we are talking about here were generally started last fall.

MR. ROBERTS: I know Spaniard's Bay was recent because, what other projects are on the go? I mean people are - I cannot think of anything more interesting in the whole Municipal Affairs Department than this question. I can think of things just as important, but it is one of great interest and when we finish that let us go on to the point raised by the Premier. Where does this leave us when we get this programme, when the province has this much done? It will probably take a year or so to finish all that up, Where do we go from here? How many communities are left? Are all the larger communities done? The Bonavista - Port Union - Catalina Area is one of the largest areas in the province without anything approaching town services. The start has been made there, but unless something has changed the projects that were authorized last year are only a start. Many millions must yet be spent in that, it is almost one urban area if you put in Elliston and Little Catalina. Many millions must be spent up there. Could the minister give us a little indication on that?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, we do not have the information on the number of communities which have been left without servicing. It is something that we could possibly come up with but it would be a major task. In the meantime, we could come up with it quickly, you know...

MR. ROBERTS: No, but a good guess.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, on that point I seem to recall when I formed part of the administration of this province, when we were dealing with DREE agreements and that, we had information given to us from the Department of Municipal Affairs showing, not necessarily - I do not recall seeing all the communities listed, but giving some idea as to the financial magnitude of the problem left in Newfoundland and Labrador for municipal services, water and sewer services I am thinking about. Bearing in mind all the time that there are many communities in the

province, I guess, that would like to have water and sewer systems but because of the terrain, rock, and because of the small number of people involved, it is going to be some time before they have elaborate sewer systems and what not. But I think there were figures compiled giving the cost. It is only a ballpark figure. We do not know how much, for example, it is going to cost to look after the south shore of Conception Bay. People talked about thirty or forty million dollars there, but I mean, what are we talking about? What remains after this forty-six or so million dollars which has already been committed? Is there \$100 million left? Is that the estimate to date? Is it fifty million or are we talking in the hundreds of millions or what? I mean, just some kind of a ballpark figure.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, in the incorporated areas we are talking in the order of one hundred and fifty million or two hundred million dollars.

MR. ROWE: Left after this?

MR. COLLINS: Yes. Of course next year we might be looking at two hundred and fifty or three hundred million dollars.

MR. ROBERTS: That is a most interesting figure, Sir. It is almost staggering. Four years at even the current rate of - it is four times the programme that, five times, I am sorry, the programme that is now in progress and has to be financed. It is a staggering amount of money. The minister says incorporated areas and he points out the price may rise. Is almost every area now incorporated in which it would be practicable? They are. So the figure is really going to be far higher than even the two or two hundred and fifty million dollar range.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, if you look at all of the settled areas in the country...

MR. W.N. ROWE: So the total will probably come to three or four hundred million dollars?

MR. COLLINS: It could very well, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROBERTS: That is staggering and that, of course, is capital account, it will all have to be borrowed. That is forty million dollars a year at a ten percent amortization factor. It is forty million dollars a year to service that sort of capital. I would think if you borrow a million dollars it would...

MR. COLLINS: To maintain it and operate it.

MR. ROBERTS: It would cost about \$100,000 a year to service the debt of that order. No wonder the Minister of Finance went home to bed. No wonder he did.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know if any of my colleagues have anything they wish to say on this until we come into Housing. The minister has dealt - I think he has dealt with most of the points we raised. I will not say he has dealt with them to our complete satisfaction, but we would be worried if he had. The various projects which I mentioned, we will all have to wait on those but we will see. The only other area I would like the minister to say a little on is; has he any thoughts on land-use planning and this whole question? We have not run out of land in Newfoundland yet but in certain areas of Newfoundland land is in extremely short supply. The gentleman from St. John's South, he is outside the Chamber for a minute, but he made a speech not too long ago in which he pointed out that down here in the Goulds and in Kilbride, a lot of good agricultural land, indeed, some of the few areas we have in this province of good agricultural land, these are either in danger or have actually been taken over for subdivisions and housing developments. This has happened elsewhere in Canada. The Niagara Peninsula, the best fruit-growing area in Canada, is losing I think a thousand or two thousand acres a year. Once it is gone, it is gone. You can build a house really

on almost any kind of land but you need certain types of land I assume, for farming. Is the government going to move in this direction? It is not an immediate problem but when we talk of longer-range thought in the province, this is surely one of the areas to which our attention should be directed - If the minister could favour us with a few comments on what his thinking might be?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that that is a real problem other than in the immediate urban areas, but certainly there is lots of land around Newfoundland to build on or to provide recreation facilities, In the St. John's area it could be reaching a problem now, as the honourable Leader of the Opposition says. There are studies being done with regard to what sort of government might be needed in St. John's. There are other studies being done.

He mentioned earlier the... he made some reference to housing and land assembly and so on.

MR. ROBERTS: Land banks.

MR. COLLINS: Land banks, one of the real pressing problems we find in Newfoundland now is that it is very difficult to obtain a building lot in any of the urban areas. It is very difficult in St. John's. It is very difficult in Gander and Grand Falls and Corner Brook and Lewisporte and Baie Verte and Botwood and Bishops Falls and Clarenville and all of the areas which are growing.

Now this poses a real problem, of course, in terms of providing housing, because you must have a lot to build on. We are doing a fair amount of work on it. I do not know if I have those figures here with me tonight or not, in terms of set assembly, land banks, if you want to. We are looking at the various needs, the various needs, the various types of needs in the housing. We are taking a very close look at the

subsidized rental schemes or principle, That is a very costly undertaking, as the honourable Leader of the Opposition must know. We are not sure that this is the right way to be providing houses for people. It is designed mainly to meet the needs of the low income groups. We believe that there have to be better ways found to supply that need, hopefully a system whereby the people who occupy those units have some interest in them. When I say interest, some equity in them, at least to assume some responsibility for the up-keep of them and so on, to create a sense of ownership, I think this is very essential in Newfoundland. We are taking a look at the possibilities maybe of - when I say possibilities, Mr. Chairman, I mean the possibility of having to subsidize interest rates, maybe.

We are looking at shell housing which hopefully...

MR. ROBERTS: None of these are new.

MR. COLLINS: They are not new but there are different ways. The matter of financing them has got to be improved. They have looked at the proposed Federal legislation which has been introduced in the House of Commons, which is not passed and possibly will not be passed, Well, it will not be passed this session.

We are hoping there will be some amendments. We have had meetings with C.M.H.C. officials and officials from the honourable Mr. Basford's office. We have had discussions with the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities people. We have had some discussions with other ministers across Canada. We have made certain recommendations to the federal minister in areas where we think their proposals or their legislation must be improved until we know exactly what the federal legislation is going to reflect, it is very difficult for us to determine what our policy might be because we all realize that the vast majority of the funds which are going to be available for housing must come from the federal government and any programmes which we might have in our minds

MR. COLLINS: to introduce to help ease the situation, we would have to wait so that ours would be complementing and supplementing the federal scheme rather than getting involved in areas which they might become involved in.

MR. ROWE (WM.): Mr. Chairman, one or two small matters I would like to mention; The minister has already given us certain lists of projects but I do not think they are exhaustive or exclusive. There are the DREE projects, for example, which were not included in any of those lists, if my memory serves me right. Does the minister happen to have a list of those there? It does not make any real difference. I have the information myself, I thought it might be available for the committee but maybe we can get it from the honourable minister when his estimates come through. I just mentioned it. If the minister does happen to have it Sir, he can mention it. If not, well we will get it later.

I would also be interested, not necessarily at this time, I would also be interested in what the minister proposes to do this year in the field of housing, under the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. Now He can answer that question now, give us some sort of idea, either list of projects, places, types of things that are likely to be done, or he can wait until we come to the Housing head, it makes no difference to me. If Mr. Vivian is hearing me now, he might dig out that type of information on the two places in my district.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: That is a member trying to pick up a quick buck but I can assure him my colleague is alive, Mr. Chairman. He is alive. I saw him breathing there a minute ago. Although he did have his measuring stick out, never be too careful in the House, Sir.

Two small matters, Sir, small in terms of the committee's work but important to the people concerned; Am I to understand now, in

June 29, 1972

Tape No. 1170

NM - 4

MR. ROWE: the Seal Cove - White Bay project that was included as ongoing work in process, read out on two lists of the honourable minister; that this now will complete the job which we have already talked about. I have been in contact with the deputy minister and Mr. Keeping and the minister.

There was a portion of the community left out to be done this year. Is that complete, that job, now? I would also like to get some information concerning Baie Verte. The honourable minister read out the name of Baie Verte in one of his lists, does this mean that the Baie Verte - Newtown development will now be going ahead this year? I know a lot of that depends on the council itself. They are trying to figure out ways and means, with Mr. Vivian and the Housing Corporation and CMHC and the Department of Municipal Affairs and other interested people, to get that new town site developed. Am I to understand now that this will be going ahead?

The minister can answer this, or when the Housing head comes up, it does not make any difference to me. Also, Sir, I would like to bring to his attention the problem which I am sure he is already aware of, that concerns the town boundaries of Baie Verte which have not to date included the mining operation of Rambler Mines and, as a result, Advocate Mines is saddled with 45% of the tax revenue of the town, which has to be met by Advocate Mines. Now if Rambler Mines are brought into the town boundaries of Baie Verte, this does not increase the contribution by those two concerns because then those two concerns, Rambler and Advocate, would share the 45% aspect of it. In other words, what would happen would be that whatever property tax Rambler Mines would pay, that would be deducted from the Advocate Mines - 45%, so that it should come out the same. But the real thing is that Advocate Mines have shown themselves to be very excellent corporate citizens in most respects, especially regarding money and contributions to the town and an interest in community development and all this sort of thing.

3824

June 29, 1972

Tape No. 1170

NM - 5

MR. ROWE: I am sure that if Advocate Mines were off the hook to a certain extent and Rambler Mines had to pick up a portion of that cost, that Advocate Mines would make contributions to the Town of Baie Verte, which would bring them again up to the 45% bracket, (I am sure of that although it is not official of anything) and the whole Town of Baie Verte, not only Baie Verte but the surrounding communities that make use of the facilities which would naturally accrue to the town as a result of that amount of money becoming

available. I would like to know , either privately or publicly, it does not make any difference I feel obliged to raise it publicly in Committee. I can get the information from the deputy minister or the minister at any time in the next few days.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, if I might say, there is an application in from Baie Verte for the extension of the boundaries.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I was aware of that.

MR. COLLINS: It may be approved, although I cannot say for sure if it has been approved or not.

MR. ROWE: I was just wondering if it had been approved, but I will get that information in due course. I am interested in that sort of thing. Also, Sir, for the last number of years, Baie Verte, along with a number of other fairly rich communities and populated communities, have been trying to get this ceiling raised on the amount of subsidy that the government will give them on various municipal projects. I understand from press releases that the government has raised it from \$75 thousand to \$100 thousand. Is that correct?

MR. COLLINS: Yes.

MR. ROWE: Is there any consideration being given to raising this further, say to lift the ceiling completely so that there will be a more equitable contribution from the government to the larger towns around? I do not know for example if St. John's - St. John's and Corner Brook are in a different category altogether.

MR. COLLINS: This does not apply there.

MR. ROWE: I am wondering, some of the larger towns, Gander is probably in the same boat, is it not? Larger towns like that, you know, the ceiling is put. That was a problem that bothered us when we were in the administration. The ceiling is placed on it with regard to subsidies which the government can give the town, but it always struck me as being inequitable because the town of four, five or six thousand people will have needs that will have to be met in respect of four,

five or six thousand people. Why that ceiling should be there more or less arbitrarily, I think not more or less, completely arbitrarily. If the ceiling is drawn, that is it. Is the government giving consideration to lifting that ceiling completely and having a floating ceiling so to speak, dependent entirely on the number of people involved, or what is the government's thinking on this?

I know there is a need. We have seen the magnitude of the financial problem facing this government or any other government with regard to municipal services, but is there any consideration being given to lifting the ceiling in this regard, to allow the subsidy to be unlimited, linked only to the number of people, the population of the given town in question?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the revenue grant, the ceiling was lifted for seventy-five and increased to one hundred this year. About ten or twelve municipalities were affected, as I said earlier this evening. I am not sure that by raising the ceiling further it would be of any benefit. I think all of those towns now are deriving the maximum benefit, I am pretty sure. There might be one or two deriving a few extra dollars, but for all practical purposes this takes care of them.

MR. ROWE: The others are in special categories like Corner Brook and St. John's.

MR. COLLINS: St. John's and Corner Brook, there are no revenue grants applied there.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member for Bell Island is alive and well and about to bury the government six feet under.

Sir, every year around this time, maybe a little earlier than this, because we are late this year, but every year when the House is sitting, the matter of housing for poor people, people in the low income bracket, people with no income, people in the middle upper income bracket comes up every year, Sir. Last year when I rose in my place in this honourable House to discuss the matter of housing, it was before

the House rose at six o'clock and I had to go out and attend a meeting that night. When I got back at nine thirty, the honourable member for St. John's East had received an uppercut as the result of a chain reaction to something that I said earlier in the session that afternoon. Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope that we do not have the same repercussions this year when I get into this matter of housing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the wealth of this earth is not very evenly distributed. We help people, Sir, in this province, I would say a large number of people, too many people, living in substandard housing. Mr. Chairman, we have people living in houses where the chimneys are falling down, the roofs are leaky, the clapboard is hanging off, the window sills are rotten. They are neither windproof nor watertight, Sir. In the wintertime, the snow drifts through the house (and I have been in the houses, Mr. Chairman) right under the noses of the little children.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable member for St. John's South had the gall and the audacity in a recent speech in this House to say that the land down in the Goulds should be protected. Land should be protected for the farmers while people have no place to live, Sir. The land was not protected down in Virginia Waters. We have to go down and spend ten to twelve thousand dollars to get a building lot down there. It is all right for the honourable member to say that, the honourable member for St. John's South to say that, he can sit up in his castle and look down at the peasants down there in Virginia Waters, Sir, while the poor people of this province live in substandard homes, I cannot see how the honourable member can sleep at night.

AN HON. MEMBER: Does the honourable member live in a shack?

MR. NEARY: No, but neither does the honourable member live in luxury either, as the honourable Minister of Social Services said the other day. I would like for the honourable member for St. John's South to stand in this House tonight and tell us what the answer is to the housing problem

of the poor people of this province. I think it is his duty and his responsibility to do that. Tell us where they are going to get the land to build houses.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let the honourable member...

MR. NEARY: I would gladly yield to the honourable member. I would gladly yield, because I have some more remarks to make about lawyers.

AN HON. MEMBER: Carry on.

MR. NEARY: I would gladly yield the floor.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let us heat it up.

MR. NEARY: The honourable member has been silent now in this House for about ten days, Sir. If he wants to make a speech, I will gladly yield and I will pay attention to every word.

MR. WELLS: This is the honourable member's proof that he is awake, Carry on.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, every year the matter of slum landlords comes up in this House. The honourable member for St. John's South knows full-well, Sir, that some of the biggest slum landlords in this province are the lawyers.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the reason for us talking about the slums?

MR. NEARY: We are talking about housing and if the honourable member will just keep quite he might learn something. Sir, I submit, and I said this a year ago, this is what caused the ructions in this House at that time and we do not want a repeat performance of that, Sir. I am sure the honourable member will not come across the House and give me an uppercut. He may feel like it, but I think the honourable member can restrain himself.

MR. YOUNG: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, what purpose...

MR. NEARY: That is not a point of order, Mr. Chairman. What kind of nonsense is this?

MR. YOUNG: We are listening to...

MR. NEARY: You are "diggin' em Dillon."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if the lawyers are not directly involved themselves...

AN HON. MEMBER: Forget the lawyers, why not stick to the point at hand?

MR. NEARY: I am talking about housing and slum landlords, tenants rights and landlords rights.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is the honourable Leader of the Opposition included in the lawyers?

MR. NEARY: The honourable Leader of the Opposition is not practicing law down town. He is not practicing law. Mr. Chairman, if the lawyers are not directly involved themselves, they are collecting rent for slum landlords. The honourable member for St. John's South knows that. That is a fact, Sir, everybody in Newfoundland knows that. I think it is about time that they had a little social conscience, Sir. I think it is time, Mr. Chairman, that the well-to-do people in this province, the millionaires and the well-to-do lawyers spread the money around, spread the wealth around, get out and build houses for the poor people of this province if they are so patriotic, so anxious to help the poor people of this province.

I will venture a bet that if they do not do this, if they do not go out and provide housing for the poor people, for the people with no

MR. NEARY: income and in the low income bracket and newly weds, that we will have a similar situation that took place in Cuba, Sir. The Revolution. The day of reckoning will come, Sir, and the revolution will take place and then Mr. Chairman, they will move in and they will take these great castles away from these well-to-do lawyers and put the poor people in them to live. Sir, I say the sooner that happens the better.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order, would Your Honour request the gentlemen down in the corner, I do not wish to name them, but a number of them, I know my colleague draws a fair share of fire. I sometimes suspect that that is not entirely unwelcome to him. If the other gentlemen opposite want to do him the pleasure of reacting instead of acting, that is up to them. But Your Honour has an obligation to maintain the order of the committee. Would Your Honour -

The point of order is, will Your Honour please maintain order? Mr. Chairman, I submit, Sir, the gentlemen down here are out of order. They are interrupting my colleague. Would you please be good enough, as Your Honour has done consistently, to ensure that order is maintained in the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not so sure that the honourable member for Bell Island is speaking on the heading - The Minister's Office - 1301-01. He is going far afield again. He is making reference to lawyers and slum landlords. I do not see how this comes into housing here.

MR. ROBERTS: This is Municipal Affairs and Housing, if Your Honour would cast Your Honour's eyes upon the top of the page, it says Municipal Affairs and Housing, the portfolio to which the honourable gentleman from Gander was appointed by the Governor at the recommendation of the Premier, and sworn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair feels that heavy insinuations, casting reflections upon the lawyers of this House, particularly the lawyers on the government side of the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that is not so. Mr. Chairman, I was leading up to a point. The Canadian Bar Society are starting their annual conference.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, it is the Atlantic Association -

MR. NEARY: The Atlantic. Well the President of the Canadian Bar Society is here.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: I hope that the lawyers who will be attending that conference, Sir, I hope the honourable member for St. John's South is included in that group, will stand on the floor of that conference and tell the lawyers from the Atlantic Provinces about the high cost of legal fees in real estate transactions in this province. I hope the honourable member for St. John's South will go down to that conference and support a suggestion that I have made in this House, Sir,

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! I fail to see how the honourable member can bring in lawyers fees. We are not discussing lawyers fees here this evening, we are discussing housing.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Mr. Chairman, if I may speak, I do not know if there is a point of order being raised or not. Legal fees have always been a contentious issue with regard to the high cost of housing and the two are very much interrelated. The honourable member for Bell Island is relating completely and is very relevant to the topic under discussion,

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member will keep it relevant without being abusive, please continue.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we had a royal commission set up in this province to investigate the high cost of housing, Sir. The royal commission was set up as a result of -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order. Would Your Honour please, I am sure that my colleague is allowed to make his relevant remarks without interruptions. I do not know which honourable gentleman, but there are obviously some honourable gentlemen who have been interjecting.

MR. ROBERTS: Would Your Honour please allow my colleague to carry on in relevant silence, relevant to the heading.

MR. NEARY: Could I carry on in silence, Mr. Chairman?

So Mr. Chairman, we have this royal commission set up to investigate the high cost of housing in Newfoundland. Sir, that royal commission, one man royal commission, verified what I had been saying for several months, that the legal fees, the excessive charges by the lawyers in real estate transactions, in this province, were the highest in Canada. My honourable friend knows that. The member for St. John's South denied that fact.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would say at this great conference that is starting here tomorrow that instead of doing a whitewash job - legal fees -

MR. ROBERTS: Does the honourable member need medical care?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, Sir.

MR. ROBERTS: Perhaps it is psychiatric care he needs.

MR. NEARY: Instead of doing a whitewash job, Sir, what they should do is take advantage of this little get together to discuss the recommendations of the one man royal commission on the high cost of housing in Newfoundland and put their own house in order, so as to speak and bring legal fees for real estate transactions in this province in line with the rest of Canada. I hope that the honourable member for St. John's South, if he attends that conference, will also suggest to his colleagues that they give serious consideration and support to my suggestion made in this House a couple of weeks ago that the registration of all real estates titles is entitled to changes in this province, to be computerized.

Then, Mr. Chairman, when a person wants to buy a house and make sure the title is clear, all he would need to do is go over to Elizabeth Towers, go down in the basement, Sir, and visit the registry, state the location of the property and an immediate check of the ownership could be run and a certificate issued for a small fee, say a fee of about

MR. NEARY: \$25.00 or \$30.00, just for the cost of operating the registry.

I would like to hear the honourable member for St. John's South comment on these suggestions, Sir. I would gladly yield my seat and let him get up and make a speech. I think it is his duty and responsibility to do that, Sir. I think he owes that to the people of St. John's. The hell hole, Sir, of Newfoundland as far as housing is concerned. Then he says; Oh! we cannot extend out to the Goulds. No, we cannot do that. Will the honourable member tell us where we are going to get the land to develop? Where are we going to get it?

Well, Mr. Chairman, I would gladly yield to the honourable - go ahead. I am going to be speaking for about another three-quarters of an hour, Sir. If the honourable member wants to -

MR. WELLS: Let the honourable member continue on and finish his remarks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 1301-01 carry?

MR. ROBERTS: Just a moment, Mr. Chairman, not quite yet. There are some things that we would like to say about housing. As the minister wishes, I see the gentleman who advised him on housing is here. I am quite open, does the minister wish to discuss housing at this point or on one of the later subheads? It is an important part of his ministerial responsibilities. It is reflected because it is included in the title of his portfolio, if he wishes we could discuss it here if not on one of the later - I am wondering where. Provided it can be as general as it could be under this heading, we will of course go along with that.

The only other question then I have, Sir, on housing, we have some things that we would like to ask about and some of the things that we would like to say. I take it my brother at the Bar, the member for St. John's South, is not going to respond to the invitation of the gentleman from Bell Island to enter into a discussion on the merits of the Newfoundland scale on solicitors fees for conveyancing. Well they would be welcome and one always listens

with attention to the remarks of the honourable gentleman that are quite often, quite usually well worth listening to. So we will be listening with interest when he speaks in the debate.

The only other thing I would like to ask the minister on, Mr. Chairman, at this time, two, one is, could he tell the committee a little about this arbitration which was held at the Blackhead Road. As I recall it, in connection with the urban renewal scheme there, there was a large claim entered by Lundrigan's Limited, I think they were looking for \$1.5 million. I am not sure but it was of that order, a great amount of money. The matter could not be agreed between them and the then government. The matter was referred to arbitration and I understand, I do not know if it has been made public or not but there is nothing secret about it, I understand the arbitration board have brought in what amounts to a split report. I gather two men have said one thing and the third said another. Could the minister tell us where that matter stands?

Finally, does the minister at this point wish to say anything with respect to the Frazer Commission, the commission on taxation in St. John's which made, as we all know - by the way, are any copies of it available? I confess the only copy I have, Mr. Chairman, is the one that the Premier was good enough to make available to me. Are any copies of this report available?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, we have ordered I think two hundred, three hundred, but we should be getting them from the printers pretty soon.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay. So they are entrain. The main recommendation of that report, indeed I think really its only recommendation when one plows through all the words, was that the taxation in St. John's take the form of an income tax levied at the municipal level. Now that is quite an order, if this House wishes to authorize it. It is a direct tax and it would be in order. I wonder if the minister wishes to say

anything on it at this stage. If he does not, I can understand because it is a major policy question and he may not be in a position at this stage to say what the administration proposes to do about this.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the first question was.

MR. ROBERTS: The Blackhead Road arbitration, where does it stand -

MR. COLLINS: The Blackhead Road arbitration, you are referring to the arbitration into the contractor's claim.

MR. ROBERTS: Lundrigan's Limited, the contractors made a claim for \$1.5 million and we would not pay it and it went to arbitration, where does it now stand?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, there has been a further report on it and no final decision has been taken on it yet.

MR. ROBERTS: What is the report, Mr. Chairman? What is the Arbitration Board Report?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, there was a majority recommendation and the figures which I mention might or might not be entirely accurate but let us say around \$1. million. There was a minority report which was much less than that, in the order, but I stand to be corrected here, of around \$600,000, I believe. As the honourable Leader of the Opposition knows, this is a cost sharing scheme and, of course there have to be negotiations carried on with CMHC or the Federal body, but no decision has been taken as yet.

MR. ROBERTS: As a matter of interest, Mr. Chairman, the minister says no decision and I take it he means no decision by the government at Ottawa to share or otherwise. Is this report binding? I do not recall the terms of reference, I confess. I think the honourable gentleman for Placentia West, in his professional capacity as a member of the bar of this province, was acting for the government. Am I correct? He was retained by the Liberal Government I might add, but in tribute to his legal ability, it is very considerable. I do not know the legal position

but is it binding on the government? I do not know, I asked.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it it can be appealed, it can become the subject of negotiations. We really have not decided what will happen to it.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Has the Department of Justice or the lawyer acting for the government appealed it yet? Has he lodged the necessary documents with the court, the Supreme Court, to appeal it?

MR. COLLINS: We have lodged the necessary documents, Mr. Chairman. We have them protected from the time limit but no appeal has been made.

MR. ROBERTS: So there may or may not be an appeal by the government from this finding. Is that the situation, in a nutshell?

MR. COLLINS: That is just about true, Mr. Chairman, there may or may not be.

MR. ROBERTS: Anything on the Frazer Commission?

MR. COLLINS: The Frazer Commission, Mr. Chairman, the main recommendation was the imposition of an income tax in St. John's. That is something which is revolutionary in Canada. There is no part of Canada where an income tax is imposed at the municipal level. We said when we introduced the report that we wanted the people to react to it and the City Council and so on. We are not in any position to say whether we agree with it or not.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order, I will gladly consent to the honourable gentleman speaking from there but the rules do state that an honourable member must speak from his own place. I merely made it - I do not want to have a doctrine of *la 'chaisé* whatever it is operating against us, but let the member speak from there.

MR. WELLS: If the honourable leader has no objection, I will speak from here because an official is occupying my seat.

MR. ROBERTS: Glad to hear you speak from anywhere.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of replying to some of the remarks made by the honourable member for Bell Island on the question of legal fees nor on the question of a private individual living in a particular house. As long as we live in a free country, I presume that a private individual is entitled to build or buy such house as he wishes and as many people as who can house themselves in this country, I think all to the good. I think the question that we are concerned with and a lot of the remarks heard tonight on the question of housing of course have been dribbled but the question that we are concerned with is; can people who cannot afford to put themselves in their own house, what assistance can they expect from government? How can government help to put them into houses? Now I think in the City of St. John's it is an extremely important thing, not only in St. John's but all over Newfoundland and I feel that along with water and sewerage and roads, housing is going to be one of the very, very important issues in the future.

I think Mr. Chairman, on the question of land, there is plenty of land available in Newfoundland and there is plenty of land available in the St. John's area. When the honourable member talks about land in the Goulds, when he talks about agricultural land he has to recognize that it is the duty of any government and certainly I think the duty of the Government of the Province of Newfoundland to devise a policy, which is in the course of preparation, I understand, to make sure that agricultural land is not swallowed up by developers. It is obviously cheaper to develop good agricultural land than it is to go out into the rough country and develop land. There has to be obviously balanced off, the need for the retention of the agricultural community as against swallowing it up in land development. That is something that this government is bearing in mind and the whole question of land development in agricultural areas.

With regard to the Blackhead Road also, I think this question of housing is very important and I make no apology for treating the thing seriously, Mr. Chairman. As I say it is a great deal of dribbled talk, with the hope of provoking honourable members, which quite frankly I do not propose to be. I think one of the basic failures of the Blackhead Road Scheme was that it did not provide in the initial stages for the rehabilitation of homes. In later stages, with Federal help and Provincial help from the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation and Federal grants, homes on the Blackhead Road are being rehabilitated and I think at long last we are seeing the fruition of this scheme develop and come to some good because homes are being rehabilitated. That, it seems to me, goes hand in hand with providing services and making some sense of that community. I hope very much that when this government has had long enough in office to plan its approach, which it has not had yet, the approach to housing in Newfoundland seeking Federal help will be one of providing funds and continuing to provide funds for mortgage loans so that homeownership can be achieved and also, where necessary, to providing funds so that public housing can be achieved. I think both are necessary and I think even with low cost loans or subsidized loans,

there are subsidized loans for home ownership, it still leaves a considerable number of the population out and this is where I feel that public housing has a place also. Certainly these are items which ought to be discussed and they ought to be discussed seriously in this House, and matters that concern members in their private capacities have no place in this House of Assembly.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the only way I could probably get the honourable member up to make that kind of speech was to mention the fact that he was in this big castle gazing down on the peasants down at Virginia Waters. Otherwise, Sir, we would not get anybody on the opposite side of the House to make a speech.

I deliberately, deliberately, Mr. Chairman, I do not mind admitting, I deliberately provoked the honourable member into getting up and making a speech.

AN HON. MEMBER: You have three-quarters of an hour yet.

MR. NEARY: Okay, three-quarters, Well, let us carry on. Now if I could only provoke a few other members into getting up and making speeches, because this matter of housing, Sir, is a very serious problem, most serious. I think every member who represents a St. John's district should get up, talk about housing, make some suggestions, how the problem can be solved, throw out some ideas how we can solve this.

As a matter of fact, I do not think there are any other member from St. John's in the House, apart from the honourable member for St. John's South. No, not a member in the House. St. John's North is here, Let me see how the housing situation is in St. John's North.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable member for St. John's East is just behind Mr. Speaker there.

MR. EVANS: What did we do wrong?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, why does the honourable expensive member for Burgeo not go down and take that beauty parlour and give it to the town council for a town hall. They are stuck for a town hall, Sir, go down and give them

the beauty parlour.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious matter and I think that every member of this House, I think it is his duty...

AN HON. MEMBER: for a town hall.

MR. NEARY: Yes, if it is not in use, give it to him for a town hall, if it is big enough.

MR. EVANS: Definitely.

MR. NEARY: The honourable Premier must have a building or two kicking around Burgeo that he could give the town council down there for a town hall. Mr. Chairman, there we are, there is a gem of wisdom. I have not heard the honourable member make a speech in this House yet. Does the honourable member want me to yield so that he can get up and make a speech.

AN HON. MEMBER: I never had a chance.

MR. NEARY: Well you have your chance now. Go ahead and make a speech. Come on let us see you make a speech. Tongue-tied member, Sir.

On motion total subhead 1301 carried.

MR. ROBERTS: (1302-01) Mr. Chairman, it is up about \$23,000, are these some new posts, upgradings, new positions, why the increase?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, the increase here is brought about by the salary for an executive assistant...

MR. ROBERTS: No, he would be paid out of the Minister's Office, we are down to 1302-01.

MR. COLLINS: 1302-01, that is right.

MR. ROBERTS: An executive assistant is surely paid out of the Minister's Office vote.

MR. COLLINS: Well it is shown here as being under 1302-01 plus normal increments plus the establishment of one new post, an administrative officer.

MR. ROBERTS: Well then, Mr. Chairman, if the executive assistant's salary is shown under 1302-01, why is the Minister's Office salary up from \$18,000 to \$27,000 ? Maybethat would be the executive assistant's salary.

MR. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry.

MR. ROBERTS: I know it has been carried, but the minister has just apoligized and set straight this thing to date.

MR. COLLINS: It is normal increments plus one new post, an Administrative Officer I.

MR. ROBERTS: The new post is?

MR. COLLINS: Administrative Officer I.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay. Thank you.

On motion total subhead 1302, carried.

MR. ROBERTS: (1311-01) Mr. Chairman, a word on this if I may, I assume I am on the right subhead but one of the great weaknesses in the Department of Municipal Affairs, and it is not the minister's fault, he inherited this situation, it is not the fault of the officials down there who are doing yeoman work but this is the vote I guess out of which are paid the gentlemen who travel about to the town councils, and the minister has told us earlier that there has been what amounts to quite a dramatic increase. I had not realized that we had gone from two hundred and some odd to nearly three hundred councils in a period of a year, incorporated areas

One of the problems have been that these places are not getting enough supervision. We have had one or two bad examples. We had the situation in Bay Roberts, nothing criminal but what amounted to incompetent administration. There are, as the minister I know would concur, there are a number of other councils throughout Newfoundland who at any given time have problems. The only real answer to this, among other things, is to get more officers to go out. There cannot be any increase this year because the vote is actually down \$8,000 from

what it was last year. Could the minister tell us if he has any plans to get some more people in this quite important area of work?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I referred to that tonight, again when the honourable Leader of the Opposition was out. I mentioned the fact that we are seriously considering establishing regional offices, which will kill two birds with the one shot as it were. We get more people, hopefully, working and put them in a position whereby they can contribute more. They will not have to do as much travelling.

That is coming. Just when we will be able to institute it, I cannot say.

MR. ROBERTS: (1311-03-01) Is that Corner Brook? Grants to City Councils, is that Corner Brook? Do not say no unless it is no. Why if St. John's were getting \$500,000, they would be happy down at City Hall.

MR. COLLINS: \$528,000 includes Corner Brook and \$28,000 for the City of St. John's.

MR. ROBERTS: The Corner Brook one then is not increased over last year. It was increased last year. It is not increased this year over last year.

MR. COLLINS: It was increased last year but not increased this year.

AN HON. MEMBER: How much does St. John's get?

MR. COLLINS: \$28,000 but the police and fire stations...

MR. ROBERTS: (1311-03-01) Mr. Chairman, only a word on this, Sir. These are the revenue grants. Am I right in thinking that this is the subhead under which the revenue grants are paid.

Now the minister may have gone over it before but I did not hear. The raising of the ceiling from \$75,000 to \$100,000, what would that actually cost the province in a year? What is it - fifty cents is paid on the dollar, is that the idea? It is the last shelf in the scale of steps. The Premier really better be on his guard now, Sir, the member for Bell Island has appropriated his seat. It would not bother me so much, but I

am over here.

AN HON. MEMBER: I would rather me than you.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I would rather the Premier than me. But, Mr. Chairman, what will it cost...

MR. MOORES: Thank you for your vote of confidence.

MR. ROBERTS: I would not call that a vote of confidence, Mr. Chairman. I said I would rather have the member for Bell Island sitting in the Premier's seat than in mine. That is what I said.

Mr. Chairman, the minister is getting us the information but all I really want to know is what it will cost, this raise in the formula. Is this the last fifty cents?

MR. COLLINS: What is that?

MR. ROBERTS: The formula revenue grant is what? Dollar for dollar on the first so many thousand and then seventy-five cents per dollar on so many thousand more and then I think it is fifty-fifty on the remaining balance.

Is there any more of that coke stuff?

MR. ROWE: No, there is lots of it out there.

MR. ROBERTS: That is out there. I am in here. Could I have some, please? But I am interested in... It is only coke, unfortunately.

MR. ROWE(WM.): All the booze is over on that side.

MR. ROBERTS: Want some? We will gladly lend the Premier a little.

Does the Premier want a little coke?

The minister I gather is gathering the information. My question again is how much will it cost the province to carry out the quite laudible intention of raising the ceiling on revenue grants from \$75,000 to \$100,000.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, that means that ten municipalities receive \$25,000 additional this year.

MR. ROBERTS: That is \$25,000 each or... Only ten municipalities get more money because of this.

MR. COLLINS: \$25,000 each.

MR. ROBERTS: So in ten municipalities... hold on now, I am lost now.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, when we removed the ceiling of \$75,000 and raised it to \$100,000, there were ten towns qualified to receive additional grants, ten qualified to receive \$25,000 additional each.

MR. ROBERTS: So that \$250,000 would just about cover the increase in the vote, Mr. Chairman. Maybe I am confused then, Is the \$75,000 which is now \$100,000, is that the total amount paid by the government or is that the amount in respect of which the municipality claims? If this is what amounts to a shared-cost formula, it is dollar per dollar on the first \$25,000 and then lesser percentages.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I can read out the formula. There are two dollars for every dollar collected locally up to \$1,000. There is one dollar for every dollar collected locally from \$1,001 to \$5,000 and then there is .90¢ for every dollar collected locally from \$5,001 to \$15,000. Then it reduces to .70¢ for every dollar collected locally from \$15,001 up to \$25,000. Then it reduces again to .50¢ for every dollar collected locally from \$25,001 upwards to a maximum grant of \$100,000.

Now as a result of raising the ceiling from \$75,000 to \$100,000, ten municipalities qualified and received, so I am told, the maximum \$25,000.

MR. ROBERTS: So the \$75,000 refers to the maximum amount which the province would have paid in the past and the \$100,000 is the maximum which the province will pay now. That might require \$150,000 or \$200,000 in revenue on the part of the council, is that it?

MR. COLLINS: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. THOMS: (1311-03-03) Mr. Chairman, before this subhead carried, could I ask the minister, this is the initial grant paid by councils that will be incorporated this year, is there an allotment there for the Town of Benton and also should not (03-11) be up (03-03)? Because I understand

it is the Conception Bay South, this is also an initial grant.

Is that it, Sir? Is this continued? This is continued. Fine!

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, the initial grant is provided to newly incorporated areas to permit them to buy a desk and a chair and maybe a typewriter and the things which are necessary to set up office.

For the information of the honourable gentleman, I can tell him that the Town of Benton's application for incorporation has been approved.

MR. THOMS: Has been approved? Thank you.

MR. ROBERTS: (1311-03-04) it is a 100% increase.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, the reason for the increase in this particular vote to the Metropolitan Area Board is to take care of the responsibilities in terms of the Blackhead Road.

MR. ROBERTS: What are their responsibilities precisely and what is the sort of thing they are going to spend it on?

MR. COLLINS: Garbage collection and ordinary maintenance and ordinary municipal services which they are taking on this year.

MR. ROBERTS: In effect then the Metro Board is acting as a town council for the Blackhead Road area, is that the situation?

MR. COLLINS: To a great extent, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Are there any plans to have the Blackhead Road area either incorporated into the city or incorporated as a separate municipality or is it intended to continue this type of arrangement? I know all the questions.

MR. COLLINS: Some of them, anyway. Mr. Chairman, as the honourable Leader of the Opposition knows, there is an urban study going on in St. John's now, not in St. John's but in

the general area. I would not like to reflect on what should happen there, I do not think that is for me to say tonight. I would hope that some arrangements can be made whereby there can be more and greater co-operation among these areas in municipalities and other areas around the -

MR.ROBERTS: A very statesmanlike statement.

MR.W.ROWE: What time does the honourable minister expect to receive or maybe he does not - it is a DREE study or financed by DREE, partially or wholly. It seems to me it should be in by now. Some of those studies were conducted or they were started last summer. That is a year ago now. I am wondering what is the delay on that Mr. Chairman?

MR.COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I am told it might be ready within a month. So I would say a couple of months, probably.

Shall 1311-03-04 carry?

On motion items 03 - 07 carried.

MR.WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister can tell me, on this particular heading, if there is any programme for paving in the town of Happy Valley this year? I know that the honourable Mayor of the town of Happy Valley have made representation to the department on a number of occasions. We have the problem with the type of terrain, very sandy soil. In the community we develop the only, I suppose the only sandstorms in North America, are in that particular area, during the summertime when we are not getting any rain. So, I wonder if the honourable minister could say a few words on this. If the town is getting any pavement this year or upgrading on their street programmes?

MR.COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, we really do not know yet where the money will be spent. With regard to the town of Happy Valley, the honourable

member must know there are some very pressing problems down there, with river bank erosion, a need for a water supply, pavement - the municipality is going to have to make some contribution themselves. I suppose what eventually will happen will be as a result of the priorities which they set. I am not in a position to say what municipalities will be receiving assistance here because it is a fifty-fifty cost sharing arrangement. The municipality must be able to show us that they can contribute their fifty per cent of the cost. We really have not got into the business of deciding where it will go. It will depend upon the number of applications coming in and whether they qualify or not.

MR. ROBERTS: On this item, I assume, Mr. Chairman, this is the one of shared-cost paving grants. How does that programme work? There was one and it was ended a couple of years ago. We heard quite plaintive pleas. The minister of Justice, the member for Burin, in particular, could be very eloquent on this subject. How does it work? Is it a fifty-fifty programme? Could the minister perhaps explain briefly what he has - how this works?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, as the Leader of the Opposition says, it is a fifty-fifty cost-sharing arrangement. If a municipality has some local streets which need to be paved, they make application to us for fifty per cent of the cost. In the meantime it is a requirement that they would be able to indicate to us that they have their fifty per cent of the cost as well, which must come from their own sources.

MR. ROBERTS: Could the minister indicate to us which municipalities are sort of on the hitch? He intends to spend \$775,000 this year. Some of that may be for work that was done in previous years. It may

be paid over a period of years, I do not know.

MR. COLLINS: A portion of this amount is to cover costs of paving done in previous years. On the other hand, some of it will be our requirement to meet our cost this year, depending upon whether we finance it over a five year period, ten year period, to determine how much paving we can do this year.

MR. ROBERTS: Well at that rate, could the minister tell us what municipalities are looking for this stuff? By June, the end of June actually, a number of municipalities have been in you know, seeking assistance.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, we have not received too many applications from the municipalities. I do not know if it is known, I suspect it might be but I suppose maybe one of the reasons for not receiving many applications is the fact that they cannot afford to partake in this particular scheme.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the minister I think indicated that the fifty-fifty may not be - may be fine for a rich municipality or better off when it is not too well - has the administration any plan to review this and maybe change the ratio, the shared cost, to make it a little less onerous on the municipality, perhaps a little more onerous upon the provincial treasury.

MR. COLLINS: We are always considering new plans, Mr. Chairman.

Shall 1311-03-08 carry?

On motion -03-08 to -10 carried.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, -03-11, was there not a commitment for a number of years for Conception Bay South? How many years is this -

MR. COLLINS: Five years.

MR. ROWE: Where does it run from? Holyrood to Paradise or -
Where does it run from, Conception Bay South -

MR. DOODY: From Seal Cove to Paradise. It stops just a little bit

near Topsail Beach. There are a lot of people in the immediate area who are not too happy about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1311-03-11 carried.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, if I may just briefly, 03-12, I would like to ask the honourable minister if he had received any representation from any of the communities especially the isolated communities in the north of Labrador. I am thinking primarily about the community of Nain. This year we had a very unfortunate tragedy with a fire in the community where a family of five lost their lives because of the fact that there was no firefighting equipment in that community. When I think in terms of this community, it is the largest community in the north of Labrador, population of around 900 people. There is no snow-clearing programme during the winter time. It is virtually impossible, with no water and sewer. In the event that there is a fire, I suppose it can only result in tragedy.

It is a serious problem and while I was in the community after this tragic accident did take place, I talked in terms of maybe some mobile type equipment. I do not know if there is anything similar in the province here but my experience of travelling to the North West Territories, come across bombardier snowmobiles and that type of mobile equipment equipped with firefighting apparatus.

I was wondering if the minister would give some consideration or have given some consideration to maybe equipping some of the isolated communities. I do not know what would happen, Mr. Chairman, in the event that there was a major fire in a community, of that nature. It could conceivably wipe out the whole community. There is no type of firefighting equipment. It is a serious problem, Sir, and I was wondering if the minister would give some consideration to may be getting - you cannot have the normal type of equipment you must have some snowmobile type of equipment that you can use winter

and summer, maybe with the large C.O.T.2, fire extinguisher or something of that nature. I wonder if the minister would care to comment on this?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, while we do provide some financial assistance for municipalities, we always rely on the advice from the provincial commissioner in terms of just what type of equipment could be supplied. I might suggest to the honourable member if he would want to discuss it with the provincial commissioner, they might have some types - they might be able to suggest some types of equipment which might be adaptable to the needs in that area.

MR. ROWE (W.): One hundred thousand dollars estimated for expenditure this year, Mr. Chairman, is that in respect of fire-fighting equipment or incinerators or both? What proportion does one bear to the other now? The reason I ask, maybe the honourable minister can answer the question. If he has his big thick grey book there, in which is contained the incinerator programme of the last year or so - very, very good social programme, good programme. The honourable minister has a truckload of them out in his district.

I am just wondering was the programme as committed by the previous administration last year, I do not know if it was completed by the end of this financial year or not, but in any event the programme which was committed, is this completed now or is it going to be completed and is this \$100,000 enough to do the job? Are there any communities left which were contained in that grey book which I think got some prominence at the great development conference of February of - sometime before an election. It did not seem to have much effect, if my memory serves me right, Mr. Chairman, but that is another story. Could the honourable minister tell us, is that great programme now completed? Has it been completed? The commitments, have they all been fulfilled?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, \$25,000 is to complete the programme to providing incinerators to municipalities and the installation of them. \$75,000 is provided to continue the programme of paying fifty per cent of the cost of providing firefighting equipment to municipalities. Item 1311-03-12 carried.

On motion items 1311-04, -01 to -04 carried.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, -05 could the minister say a word on Regional Appeal Boards? How is that system working, Mr. Chairman? This was set up, I believe the Premier is having difficulty holding onto his seat tonight, other honourable gentlemen are trying it out. Would the Premier like to share a little of whatever he has over there? It may be a little better than coke. Coffee with sugar, black. I will have coffee, black.

MR. W. ROWE: I always thought coffee had a stimulating effect

MR. ROBERTS: I will get one, just black, without sugar, in a moment or two. On regional appeal boards, I am not sure if there is just one or more than one. There should be more than one.

MR. COLLINS: There is one board now.

MR. ROBERTS: That is the one - Leo Stead, The minister says 'was'. Has the personnel been changed? If so fine, they are appointed by governments, they can be unappointed. The minister intends to change it, obviously.

MR. COLLINS: We intend to -

MR. ROBERTS: Will the minister tell us a little of what they intend to do? How are the boards working? Are there many appeals? Do they find appeals are allowed? Or is the board tending to find that appeals are not justified? Do the administration plan to carry through with the original plan which was to set up, two or three boards, Are they going to change the personnel? He seems to indicate they are?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, notes I have here say approximately fifty meetings in various parts of the province will be held by the regional appeal boards during next year. This vote is required to cover remuneration to members for attending such meetings of the appeal boards and the cost of travel of appeal boards. I am not quite clear what is meant here, but I know my own feelings on them. That is that we have one Provincial Appeal Board, now, headquarters in St. John's. If there is an appeal to a development control officer's decision down in Port aux Choix, the appeal board leaves here and eventually gets down to hear this appeal. It could be months and months later, at a tremendous cost.

What we propose doing, and here again we propose doing it. It is not going to be set up tomorrow morning but, hopefully, just as soon as we can, to set up regional appeal boards. For instance an appeal board on, I will not mention any points, but we can possibly set up five or six appeal boards across the province, constitute people who are aware of the local problems, problems of Port aux Choix, for instance, or the problems of Burgeo or Fogo or wherever it might be. Hopefully we will be able to provide a better service and also eliminate the very high cost sometimes of travelling great distances.

MR. ROBERTS: Cost will not be any less; could provide a better service.

MR. COLLINS: Certainly a better service. ; would be a great improvement.

MR. ROBERTS: Is it intended to replace Mr. Stead? I had not intended to ask the minister, he seemed to indicate that.

MR. COLLINS: At this hour of the morning well, when we say replace - Mr. Stead is not on the board, he resigned.

MR. ROBERTS: Who is on the board then?

MR. COLLINS: Arch Frost; Mr. Murphy, who is in the planning department -

MR. ROBERTS: Graham Martin -

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Martin. Mr. Dalton, in Mines, Agriculture & Resources, Crown Lands,

MR. ROBERTS: Is he on a board or is he an adviser to the board?

MR. COLLINS: He is on the board.

AN HON. MEMBER: As a member of the board, he does not get paid.

MR. ROBERTS: He gets paid as an employee of -

MR. COLLINS: That board will have to be reconstituted because they are down in number, in planning, owing to a couple of resignations.

MR. ROBERTS: When did Mr. Leo Stead resign?

MR. COLLINS: About three months ago, I would say.

On motion, 1311-04-05, carried.

On motion, total subhead 1311, carried.

On motion, 1312-01 through 1312-02-05, carried.

MR. ROBERTS: Could the minister indicate what they spent three hundred thousand bucks on for engineering surveys?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, this is to finance the cost of undertaking preliminary feasibility studies. In certain cases detailed engineering studies having to do with water and sewer systems in the various municipalities around the province.

MR. ROBERTS: I know the purpose of the subhead because it has not changed from year to year. I submit the notes do not seem to change from year to year either. The only thing that seems to change down there, Mr. Chairman, is the ministers. Fortunately the deputy minister and the officials carry on, so there is some hope. But what particular communities - I realize the minister would not know them all, but have any been authorized so far this year, under this vote?

MR. COLLINS: Kilbride, Roddickton -

MR. ROBERTS: Roddickton was surveyed to death. We need cash for Roddickton, not surveys.

AN HON. MEMBER: Boyd Arm.

MR. ROBERTS: Boyd Arm?

MR. COLLINS: Trepassey.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. W.N. ROWE: They left a planetarium on the first survey you know.

MR. ROBERTS: Boyd Arm, someplace.

On motion, 1312-02-06, carried.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Chairman. I mean we had a little bit of fun here, but could the minister give us any indication - the Metropolitan Area of Boyd Arm was voted, one hundred - one hundred and fourteen to nothing I think was the way it went in March and one hundred and twelve

to two in October.

AN HON. MEMBER: Twenty thousand a vote.

MR. ROBERTS: It is really hard to be - the Premier has had more to make him merry that I have at this stage. I think coffee does strange things to people, including the Premier. Maybe he is not accustomed to it. Could the minister indicate if anything has been spent out of this vote so far this year? If so, where?

AN HON. MEMBER: Back to Kilbride again.

MR. ROBERTS: I am always happy to go back to Kilbride. One hundred and forty thousand in Kilbride?

MR. COLLINS: It is pretty difficult to say, Mr. Chairman, what places might be surveyed this year.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not asking what might be, I am asking what has been so far this year. I am not asking the minister to throw his crystal ball up on the table.

MR. COLLINS: I am told, not in excess of \$40,000.

MR. ROBERTS: All right, but where?

MR. COLLINS: Around, Mr. Chairman,

MR. ROBERTS: The minister lurches to his feet. Where? Where?

MR. COLLINS: I said I do not know. I will undertake to find out for the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay, I will be satisfied. The minister is over there, he has spent \$40,000 and he has no idea where it was spent, but he will find out. That is good enough.

On motion, subhead 1312, carried.

MR. ROBERTS: Have we made any progress on uniform assessment in this province? Try that one on for size, "Harold Baby." If the minister does not know, maybe he can find out next year.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the honourable Leader means by uniform assessment.

MR. ROBERTS: How far are we in property assessment? How many

municipalities have it and how many do not? What if anything is the government doing about it? I could go on for some time, but the minister should speak for a few minutes about assessments.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, about forty of the three hundred municipalities carry out property assessments. In fact, that work is taking place now. It is generally done in the summertime. Most of our assessors have taken various courses. They are a very qualified group of men. They are across the province now doing assessments, and as I am told, about forty.

MR. ROBERTS: The government do them for the communities, is that the way it works?

MR. COLLINS: We pay the salaries of the assessors and the local councils pay the costs, the hotel expenses and meals.

MR. W.N. ROWE: How does it work? Does the town or the community assess in the first instance and then if there is any problem, there is an appeal or something and then the Department of Municipal Affairs - I have heard of one or two appeals in Baie Verte, for example. How does that work?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, after the properties have been appraised and the..

MR. ROWE: By whom?

MR. COLLINS: By the assessors.

MR. ROWE: By the department?

MR. COLLINS: By the assessors in the department, the information is passed along to the town clerk, town manager, the town council. The people who own the property are advised if there is a change in the assessment or not. Then, there is a hearing held, at a suitable time afterwards, whereby they can appeal the assessor's appraisal.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the honourable minister if there is some reciprocal agreement with the School Tax Authorities on the assessment arrangement? The School Tax Authorities are using the same assessment as the municipalities. I was wondering

if there were some arrangements with them whereby they can use the same assessment as is being used by the municipalities?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, in response to the honourable member for Labrador North, the School Tax Authorities do use the municipal assessments for the calculation of their rates.

MR. WOODWARD: It is done by your department?

MR. COLLINS: The assessment is done by our department, yes. I am not sure why our department is doing it. There is no reason why we could not have private assessors...

MR. ROBERTS: Private assessors?

MR. GILLET: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the honourable minister - it is property assessment I assume that we are talking about, is it not? Is this mandatory or is it a regulation left to the municipalities themselves? For instance, we have no property tax in Twillingate.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, it is all up to the local government, the municipalities. If they decide to impose a property tax, then they must have an assessment done to arrive at an appraisal value. Many municipalities decide not to impose a property tax, they impose a service fee, business tax, fuel oil tax and others. If a property tax is to be imposed, then of course an assessment is necessary. That is at the discretion of the town council.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the honourable minister if there are permanent assessors on the staff of his department or are there people hired in the particular communities to do the assessments for them?

MR. COLLINS: We have permanent assessors, Mr. Chairman, but there are always a few students taken on to do the measuring and so on.

MR. WOODWARD: This is where we run into the problems.

MR. COLLINS: Well, they are supposed to be under the supervision, of course, of the professional assessors.

On motion, 1312-02-06, carried.

On motion, subhead 1312, carried.

On motion, subhead 1313, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 1321-01 carry?

MR. ROBERTS: This is the item for housing. I think my colleague the member for White Bay South may have a few words, but there are just one or two things that I would like to ask. Could the minister tell us whether any land bank operations are proposed this year? I understand that here in St. John's there is a shortage of housing lots. I understand from the minister and I had understood previously that in Gander there is a shortage. Indeed, I think almost all of the more urban centres in the province have it. It is obvious that the only way that anything is going to be done is if the province gets into it in an even larger way. It has been moving into it the past two or three years.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, we have the problem of speculation in land, which is perhaps a wrinkle on the same problem but is a different aspect of it. Anyway, people developing land privately; a perfectly lawful, a perfectly honourable enterprise, but one which inevitably results in the home owner having to add that much more on to his mortgage or that much more on to the cost of his home. It has been suggested, and I think it is a very good suggestion, that the government might go into the land development business in a large way, as for example, the St. John's Housing Corporation has here in the city, over the years. The Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation I believe have done this in other areas. They might become the developer, acquire land, (as they are in the new town out in Mount Pearl for example) either through purchase or through expropriation. They can assemble the land often much more quickly than a private developer could. They could put in the necessary services and sell the land at cost.

Could the minister indicate what they intend to do this

year? The other thing I would like him to speak about, if he would, Sir, is this suggestion that is repeated again in the report of the corporation, which he tabled here today or yesterday in the House, about subsidizing mortgage interest rates. This might be a means of providing interest - of providing mortgages, I am sorry, for people in lower income brackets than normally qualify under, say, Central Mortgage rules. It is a way of doing it. It is a method that could cost money. It is a matter of a value judgement there.

Also, would the minister say a few words on the shell housing programme. How has it worked out? Have the houses in fact been sold or is the government stuck with them? It was an experimental programme, how has it worked out? I think the other thing he could say a few words on, Sir, he can be as brief or as long as he wishes, is the programme which began last year of loans to individuals. This was one of the more interesting programmes, one of the more worth-while programmes, because, when we looked at the entire spectrum of housing policies, we came to a gap and the gap was the man who was not looking for anything on Central Mortgage scales but needed one, two, three, I think up to five thousand dollars to help him to repair his home or to improve or enlarge it, even to build it. The government, in effect, went into the banking business. Could the minister indicate to us how this has worked out and how much money has been spent? How much do they plan to spend next year and so on?

Those are a few general comments, but perhaps they will do to start the discussion off unless my colleague wants to get into it too.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I will have one or two words to say, Sir. I would like, perhaps the Leader of the Opposition has already asked for some general statement of policy concerning urban renewal programmes that have been going on. I am particularly interested in them, because I had the privilege of serving as Minister of Housing for a year or so

and it was very enjoyable and very informative. It has always been my feeling that the typical type of urban renewal policy we have seen, that we have been forced into by the Government of Canada really, (I think we can say we have been forced into it) has not worked out very well either in Newfoundland or in Canada generally. Whether it is the intention of this government to continue on with the same type of urban renewal policy or whether there is some new departure, either from the Ottawa level or from this government, I do not know.

The other point, which was always a source of dismay with me, was the subsidized housing arrangements which again we were forced into by the Government of Canada, if we were going to have the cost shared. We have seen around St. John's and throughout other places in Newfoundland and throughout cities in Canada, this policy of building these chrome-plated subsidized housing units, large areas of subsidized housing, at very high costs.

MR. ROWE, W.N.: I think, subject to correction, Mr. Vivian might have some figures at his finger tips now, but some of the costs of these units in these complexes were up around \$23,000, \$24,000, \$25,000 I think, if I am not mistaken. A very large amount of money, public money to be spent for subsidized housing, not that the people in them did not deserve it or anything like that, but I have always thought that a much better way was the idea of trying to get home ownership into the picture, as the honourable minister has already mentioned. One of the better ways of doing that would be a policy of repairing and rebuilding and renovation of some of the older properties around places like St. John's, which would be at a very much lower cost.

I think the people involved could have an equity in these houses and there would be a sense of pride, as a result of the ownership and the equity investment. They would have their own homes.

Another much more important purpose would be fulfilled as well, namely to get rid of this ghetto feeling that is often prevalent in subsidized housing complexes, where you had very expensive units going up and people from one particular strata in society moving in and subject to the same environmental influences as they had say in a slum area, in a city like St. John's or Toronto for that matter. And, of course, the same sort of environmental pressures on them in subsidized rental housing, especially in view of the fact that they had no equity interest, no ownership in any of the houses and perhaps did not take as many pains or as much pride in living in these places as they might have had in other circumstances.

I would like to hear the minister's general feeling and some indication as to the government's direction and policy in this field, the field of subsidized housing.

The other problem, which is a very large one in the housing field, is this whole problem of high land costs in Newfoundland. I think this new development going on in Baie Verte, for example, I am not sure but

MR. ROWE, W.N. I think the cost per lot up there is up around \$7,000 or something like that if it is going to pay for itself, if there is no subsidy built into it. It may not be that high, it may be \$5,000 or \$6,000, which - let us face it, Mr. Chairman, it is not so much the high cost of legal fees, although that is obviously an element in housing, the high cost of housing in the province.

The biggest element, the biggest element is the exorbitantly high cost of serviced land in this province. It is largely due to our terrain, I think, and this sort of thing. Mr. Vivian and I went to a couple of conferences around the country, when I was Minister of Housing, and we submitted to the federal government the idea of trying to subsidize the cost of land with federal participation in that programme, that is built in subsidy to bring the cost of land down, taking into consideration the problems which we have which are indigenous to Newfoundland, the terrain and the fact that sometimes, usually in most communities, most towns in the province, a subdivision would not be as large as it might be in some of the bigger communities, bigger towns. bigger cities in Canada and therefore you did not have the economies of scale, for example, which could go towards lowering the cost of serviced land.

Has any progress at all been made with Ottawa in this field and, if not, does the provincial government intend to get into the subsidy of - you know, subsidizing the cost of land? I think in some cases, some municipalities, there is a built in subsidy where the municipality prepares some subdivisions and certain costs are applied towards the cost of developing that subdivision but they are never the true costs. The costs are varied and the land is sold, at a cost to the buyer which does not really reflect the true cost.

Also, as I have mentioned earlier, I wonder is it possible at this time for the minister to give some indication as to the types of projects which the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation will be getting

MR. ROWE, W.N. into this year? Not necessarily specifically, completely specifically, but the types of things that they will be getting into and some indication as to the geographically areas they will be getting into in Newfoundland and Labrador. I used to chide in a friendly fashion, Mr. Vivian, of the Housing Corporation, three or four years ago, concerning the fact that most of the operations of the Housing Corporation up to that point seemed for some strange reason to have taken place to the south of the Trans Canada Highway or on the Trans Canada Highway and there was very little to the north of the Trans Canada Highway in Newfoundland, on the Island. Of course, that problem I think has been remedied to some extent. The Baie Verte situation is one example and there are other examples as well.

Some idea as to the general geographically areas which are hoped to be dealt with this year and some ideas as to the actual types of projects which the honourable minister will be getting into. Also a specific question - what is the status of the Baie Verte new townsite development at the moment? If you have the figures there, maybe Mr. Vivian could supply the minister with the figures as to how much a serviced lot is going to cost, the real cost of a serviced lot in that new townsite. I understand it is very high and I do not know whether it is going to be possible to unload these lots at the actual cost or whether you are going to have to subsidize them or not. But I would like to have some information on that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the honourable member's question of what we are doing this year, the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation: We are involved in land assembly projects to the extent of developing or having available, hopefully, whether it will be done this year, but we are involved in it now, 800 lots. I can tell the honourable member some of the areas we are talking about, Carbonear, Stephenville, Gander, Baie Verte, Burin, and there are others as well. How many there will be I would prefer to leave for the moment because we do not really know, how many lots in any given place depends upon

MR. COLLINS: the surveys and what we find after the surveys are done and so on and so forth.

With regards to subsidized rental units, we are hoping to be able to get started and hopefully, you know, to provide approximately 500 subsidized rental units at various places across the province, in St. John's Area, Corner Brook, Gander, St. Lawrence, Grand Falls, Windsor and other places as well. How many again will be determined by the extent of the need in those places.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Could you say something about the Baie Verte or the status of it. I can get it from the minister later, but if he does have the information.

MR. COLLINS: The Baie Verte -

MR. ROWE, W.N. The new townsite development they are trying to develop up there. What is the status of it?

MR. COLLINS: We have already made loans available for the external services and only today, I believe an approval was given to the internal services at Baie Verte. A lot of work is going to be done by possibly the council themselves.

MR. ROWE, W.N. The council is going to do it.

MR. COLLINS: That is a possibility.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Any ideas as to the projected cost of the lots in the townsite?

MR. COLLINS: It is very difficult to say, We are looking at possibly \$4500.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, before we move on, I would like to ask the honourable minister if there is a proposed housing programme for Happy Valley? I know that the Crown Corporation of the Linerboard Mill Limited is going to be - there is now an acute shortage of housing in the Town of Happy Valley and this will become more pronounced as the development increases with the woods harvesting operation there. I was wondering if the honourable minister could give me some information on this, if there is any proposed plan to add to the recent development that took place here last year? Also if they are assisting in the community

MR. WOODWARD: council with the land development regarding lots and if they are intended to carry on with the shell housing project and the type of housing that went in last year. If I may, it was possibly subsidized by the Javelin Operation. I think the expense of the houses, as far as individual home owners are concerned, was considered to be a little bit too high. I wonder if he could make some comments on the fact - if there is going to be any low cost housing in the Town of Happy Valley?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, there is an application in the process now for designing of forty additional units for Happy Valley, the subsidized rental types. As far as shell housing, that is a field almost exclusive to CMHC. Our shell endeavour is in the field of small loans which the honourable the member for White Bay South referred to a little while ago. That is where we loaned \$6,000, the maximum of \$6,000, to the people who proposed to built themselves. It generally applies to the smaller areas of Newfoundland. We have received 900 applications so far. We have approved about 200. There is a bit of a problem here sometimes in establishing land titles, certainly the lawyers in the House must be aware of. in certain sections of Newfoundland. All in all that programme seems to be catching on and has been fairly successful.

MR. WOODWARD: If I may. Mr. Chairman, would this be single units. the forty units that have been developed in Happy Valley or -

MR. COLLINS: The row of housing, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WOODWARD: The row of housing. While we are on the subject of housing, I would like to ask the honourable minister, Mr. Chairman. what is the latest status on the transfer of the housing in Spruce Park and MOT Area? Negotiations have been taken place for a long period of time between MOT and the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, what the status is and if this is going to materialize this season and if any real decision has been made by the Housing Corporation as to the take over, the transfer of this property to the Housing Corporation?

MR. COLLINS: I understand that has been on-going for some considerable time, five or six years. There are still negotiations taking place, nothing new to report on it.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, if I may go on. I would like possibly, I know that Mr. Vivian is quite familiar with the transactions that have been taking place between MOT and the department. We saw a need for this transfer last year, I know there are a lot of details that have to be ironed out between MOT and the department. But there is an urgent need for an almost immediate decision, Sir, in this respect because of the fact that it is holding back the development of the community or the local improvement district of Goose Bay. I do not blame it wholly and solely on the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. There is a problem involved as to the transfer of the land in question, in the beginning from a military reserve status to the Department of Transport or the Minister of Transport and then in turn application was made for the transfer of that particular land to the Crown Lands or to the Department of Municipal Affairs. Maybe the honourable minister could comment on this, It is not helping the development of the community, it is setting it back for a period of time. Last year we thought we would get in on some of the construction during the summer, We have not had a decision made on it - if the honourable minister could comment further on it. There is an urgent need for it. Maybe in some way we can hasten the proceeding along and have MOT to make a decision as to what they are going to do.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, what the honourable member is referring to is that he owns properties in that particular area. They are trying to enter into an agreement with us to assume responsibilities for maintenance and operation, if you want to, of the housing. There is not too much in it for us

too much in it for us because generally speaking the greater number of the houses would continue to be occupied by DOT people. Their maintenance standards are pretty high, which could conceivably cost us money in the long run. While I am not competent to discuss it fully, I just got involved in it, I am not sure that it would be a good deal for us.

MR. WOODWARD : I do not want to belabour the proceedings in this respect Mr. Chairman. As I understood when I was involved in it, the fact is that the MOT want to transfer all the property to the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation and then in turn rent from the corporation, but having the corporation to maintain a degree or standard of maintenance.

MR. COLLINS: To their standards.

MR. WOODWARD: To their particular standards for their occupancy. I cannot see where there would be any extra cost involved to the department as such because of the fact that the property is now owned by MOT. It would be transferred mainly at a minimum cost of \$1.00 and then the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing would in turn be collecting rent which I feel would be more than sufficient to offset the maintenance cost involved.

MR. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is still the subject of negotiation and hopefully the details can be worked out to everyone's advantage.

MR. WOODWARD: Maybe on this subject, Mr. Chairman, it is a detailed and a very involved thing and maybe it is very unfair for me to be asking those questions of the minister here. Maybe we could privately sometime visit their office and -

On motion, sub-head 1321, carried.

On motion, Block Provision: Canada Pension Plan, carried.

On motion, Block Provision: Unemployment Insurance, carried.

MR. NEARY: Before this -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is too late. Sit down.

MR. NEARY: No, I beg your pardon, Sir, I was on my feet. Mr. Chairman. I wanted to ask the -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is out of order. It is out of order.

MR. NEARY: It is not out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: I wanted to ask the minister, before we pass this total, Mr. Chairman, if Mr. McLean has any contract with the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing or has he had any contract?

MR. COLLINS: There is nothing in those estimates.

MR. NEARY: No hidden votes, Sir?

MR. COLLINS: No hidden votes.

On motion, Heading X111 - Municipal Affairs and Housing, carried.

Heading XVI - Labour: 1601(01):

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, I will try to make it relatively short but I feel that it is necessary that I should make a few comments regarding the Department of Labour estimates. The first thing possibly is I should mention that the whole scope of the Department of Labour at this time is being reviewed and the total structure, as I see it in the Department of Labour, will be changed over a period of time. I have no intentions at this time of doing any criticism of the past or making any comments regarding the past other than to say that in my opinion, since I have taken over the portfolio of the Department of Labour I have considered labour to have possibly been regarded in the past as maybe a poor relation of government, something that was, shall we say, regarded as a necessary evil.

I am not saying that the existing function of the Department of Labour will be disregarded, as labour I think will always be a subject and a department that touches a great many areas of Newfoundland life and will continue to touch a great many areas. I am hoping that it will touch more areas than it does now. If you think of labour from a purely labour management point of view and from the administration of the Labour Relations Act, you are only talking about approximately twenty-seven per-cent of the population of Newfoundland. But I think

Labour has to take on a much broader context than the mere fact of being involved in labour relations disputes, labour relations certification and this sort of thing. It has to become involved in the total context of labour in the form of training, upgrading, in the form of anticipating what is to be needed in the form of labour, in this province, in the next few years, and in trying to supply the skilled trades that are going to be needed in industry. This I hope is the avenue that the Department of Labour will explore. I am not quite sure at this time whether it will be called the Department of Labour or be called by some other name but at the very least it will be geared to labour management relations or industrial relations, if you want to call it that, and the acquiring of training of labour to supply industry as it exists now and industry as it may exist in the future in this province.

The major responsibility of the Department of Labour at this time, one of the major responsibilities, is the administration of the Labour Relations Act. This is essentially administered by the Labour Relations Board and the Labour Relations Board in Newfoundland is pretty well an autonomous body. It is a court, if you want to call it that, but it is certainly a body which exists within the laws of Newfoundland, in which the Minister of Labour does not interfere too much although he does have daily contact with the Labour Relations Board. The Labour Relations Board is responsible for certifying, decertifying unions in relation to bargaining agents, responsible for a lot of things, but it is an autonomous body and I have no intention of interfering with its decisions or its application now or in the future. So I will say no more about that particular point.

Previous to our taking office on January 18, and this is in relation to the various labour standards legislation that we tried to apply to the province as a whole, the responsibility for various parts of the labour standards legislation was placed with various people in

the Department of Labour. There was no real co-ordination of labour standards legislation and I am talking about legislation such as the Minimum Wage Act, the Hours of Work, Vacation with Pay and a numerous number of others. For instance, I found that one of our top conciliation officers in the Labour Department was also the minimum wage inspector and it surprised me because I ask him, "Is there not a conflict of interest there? At one time you are sitting at the front of a desk and you are trying to iron out a collective agreement between a company and the union and probably the next day you are into that company's office and you are trying to nail them down for some violation of the Minimum Wage Act or the Hours of Wage Act." The conciliation officer said, "Yes, there is a conflict here. We cannot really do two jobs at once," and they could not. So I have taken away from the conciliation officers this enforcement of the labour standards regulations and I have made them conciliation officers as such, which they should be, and there is plenty of work for them to do. I have created truthfully within in the Department of Labour a labour standards division.

If any honourable members on the other side think there is some rum in this there is not, it is hot coffee.

AN HON. MEMBER: I suppose it is black.

MR. MAYNARD: It is. I will drink the other kind when I get to the cocktail party with the honourable members.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the area of labour relations has somewhat of a different context in the area of conciliation services and labour standards enforcement services. So therefore, I have divided the two and I am trying, it is going to take some time but I am trying to create specialists in conciliation services and create specialists in the area of labour standards enforcement. Creating specialists in the area of labour standards enforcement leads us to another area which I feel should be done and this is the compiling and the enforcement of the

June 29, 1972

Tape 1178

JM - 5

Newfoundland Labour Code. The Dominion of Canada has enforced a Canada Labour Code. It is a very comprehensive document and there may be some arguments with it. These things I am not going to get into. But it is a code that sets out the labour standards for the Dominion of Canada and I believe and I feel that Newfoundland should have a similar code for labour standards. By creating a division within the Department of Labour which deals with labour standards alone, these people have the opportunity to assess the present labour standards legislation in Newfoundland, They have the opportunity to find the loopholes, if there are any, and they have the opportunity to recommend any amendments they may consider necessary

MR. MAYNARD: To bring the whole ambit of labour legislation in Newfoundland, the labour standards legislation into one practical code. I say we are working on this, we do not have it done. I am sure honourable members will understand that the creation of the labour code is not something that is done overnight; it takes some time but this is the first step. We are working on this.

I mentioned before probably as far as labour is concerned the main function of the Department of Labour is the Labour Relations Board. Again I emphasize that it is pretty well an autonomous body. It is a court, if you will, that the minister does not usually interfere in. But I would like to point out to honourable members here tonight, there has been a tremendous increase in the work done and the work pending by the Labour Relations Board throughout the year and at the present time. There is no doubt that we can anticipate a further increase in the work.

The Labour Relations Board are doing a tremendous amount of work. They have not had any real increase in staff, which we hope to have corrected sometime in the near future.

MR. ROBERTS: Fourteen, Your Honour. I wanted to make sure that all the men were here.

MR. MAYNARD: You did not even give me time to sit down.

AN HON. MEMBER: We do not want the honourable gentleman to sit down, he might not be able to get up again.

MR. MAYNARD: One of the greatest problems, or not problems, that is the wrong word, I suppose, but the increase in work created for the Labour Relations Board, of course, is the new fishing industry, the Collective Bargaining Act which was passed last year, under which now various groups of fishermen within the province are applying for certification. This is creating a great deal of work for the Labour Relations Board more specifically because they have to create regulations under this Act and it is very difficult for them to deal with it. But the Board I am sure can handle this adequately or they will and if they cannot they will certainly make it known to me - enough said on that

MR. MAYNARD: score. I am trying to make the comments very short.

Labour education in the province; the Department of Labour has been involved for a number of years in the Labour College of Canada, we are making a yearly grant to it. It is our opinion, at this time there is a very great need for an intensive Labour Education programme in this province. I think this programme should reach into all areas of the province and this is not saying that it should only reach into the top labour organizations, the top management organizations, it should reach into all levels. We are at this time trying to work out a curriculum and a schedule for a complete labour education programme. I am not saying that this will be implemented over the next month or year, but it is under intensive study and we hope to be able to bring in an education programme which is going to be beneficial to all labour management people in the Province of Newfoundland.

Recently we were presented with the Cohen Royal Commission Report, much talked about very controversial, at least very controversial at the time it was going to be presented to the House of Assembly. We were left with a 630 page document I think that, in my point of view and it may be a very personal point of view, Mr. Chairman, left a great deal to be desired. I am not saying that the Cohen Royal Commission Report did not have anything of interest in it. That would be wrong. But I am saying the Cohen Royal Commission Report set out in very legal language maybe very long drawn out language, the type of opinions that I am sure that the previous honourable Ministers of Labour and I have had for a number of years.

In other words to put on paper in 600 pages the types of things that the Ministers of Labour have known for "X" number of years. You might say then; what was the value of it? The only possible value that I can see is that it presented -

AN HON. MEMBER: Carry on. Carry on.

MR. MAYNARD: The only possible value that I can see, Mr. Chairman, was that the report set out various recommendations -

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable gentleman has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. MAYNARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Is it okay now?

AN HON. MEMBER: Carry on.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, the only possible value that I can see within the Cohen Commission Report (I may be very wrong, I may be very right, I have been very wrong a lot of times and I make no excuse for that. I suppose everyone is wrong in their lifetime) was to present that report to a committee of management and to a committee of labour representatives and ask them to analyse it and to try and determine the points where they were in agreement. There were a hundred and some odd points that were presented in the Cohen Commission Report. Assuming that management and labour were agreeing on fifty of them, well then we were possibly fifty percent ahead of what we were before we even started. But as to presenting to this honourable House of Assembly or to the government specific legislation or specific recommendations, the report was a failure. I stated this before and I will state it again. I have no reservations in stating that because I believe and I know that the report as presented contained no more ideas than I had myself or the previous Minister of Labour or the Minister of Labour before him or the Minister of Labour before him and I am not talking about partisan politics. We will leave the presentation of the Cohen Commission Report to further questioning.

Another main function of the department is the Apprenticeship Training Programme, the Apprenticeship Branch. I might say, and I do not think anyone will disagree with this, I have some people in the Apprenticeship Branch of the Department of Labour who are very well qualified, very interested, very deeply involved in the Apprenticeship Training Programme and these officials are doing a great job not only in apprenticeship, Mr. Chairman, but they are doing a great amount of work that Canada Manpower, I submit, should be doing today in placing people in various positions around the Island, accessing the people or

MR. MAYNARD: the trades that are needed in various positions and placing them in various positions.

We are not ,in the new structure of the Department of Labour, about to take over the functions of the Canada Department of Manpower. We think that they are here to do a job and they should do it. But we will be more involved in assessing the future needs of industry and trying to place as many Newfoundlanders as possible in these industries, present or future, whatever they may be. In this connection we had an on-going committee for the last few weeks. We are now at the position where we are ready to make specific recommendations as far as the employment of Newfoundlanders are concerned. We are on a continuing programme (1) trying to find employment for the greatest number of Newfoundlanders possible in various industries throughout the province, (2) and in connection with (1), if Newfoundlanders are needed or future labour is needed, trying to train Newfoundlanders to take advantage of these jobs.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, it is necessary for me to say anything further on the Department of Labour until the various estimates come up.

MR. COLLINS: Leave it open.

MR. MAYNARD: Thank you.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the honourable minister for his introductory remarks. He seems to have caught on to the Department of Labour since he took over that portfolio. He seems to have a fair grasp of the labour situation as it pertains to the department. Many of the points that the minister raised, I agree with him. I think, when I was there at least, the department was grossly understaffed. The working conditions in the department were extremely poor because of overcrowding. Although, the Department of Public Works did find I think a new board room in an office down in the other part of the corridor, down towards the Department of Community and Social Development, the west-wing board room.

MR. NEARY: Nevertheless, I felt that when I was there that the Department of Labour should have more space. We almost had everybody looking over everybody else's shoulder and I do not think that the employees there are working under one of the most favourable conditions. I suggested at one stage that maybe the Department of Labour should be moved out of Confederation Building altogether, Sir. Because there is - the minister did not mention the Workmen's Compensation Board, but it does come under the Department of Labour, and down in the Philip Building, down on Elizabeth Avenue, they have a surplus of space, as the minister is probably aware. It has not been used, they are paying rent for it. It has not been used for a couple of years. I was exploring the possibility when I was there of moving at least the apprenticeship branch of the Provincial Department of Labour down in the Philip Building. I do not know if the minister has thought about that. He probably has. Perhaps he could, when he is answering some of the questions that we will put to him, give us his views on that. There seems to be an awful waste of space. It is quite a large office vacant down there, it has been vacant for a couple of years.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I would have to agree with what the minister said on the Cohen Report. The one-man royal commission -

MR. ROBERTS: Look who is here, Welcome aboard. Welcome aboard.

MR. NEARY: - to investigate the labour legislation in this province, Sir. I was rather disappointed myself with the Cohen Report. It struck me as being rather peculiar, Sir, that the Cohen Report would have to be put in the hands of another committee to have it summarized. It would almost make one say, Mr. Chairman, that the last installment to Mr. Cohen should be withheld and the committee that is examining the report now and summarizing it and making recommendations

to the department, should be paid the final installment instead of Doctor Cohen. There is a lot of history in the report, a lot of background information, a lot of statistical information and so forth, Sir, but no specific recommendations. Consequently, I would think that this is the reason we have not seen some important labour legislation brought into this session of the House of Assembly, which brings me to the Speech from the Throne, Sir, delivered at the opening of the first session of the thirty-fifth General Assesbly of the Province of Newfoundland, on March 1, 1972.

In the matter of labour legislation, the Throne Speech stated: "My ministers propose to seek the authority of the honourable House of Assembly to make amendments to the Employment of Children Act, so that following such an amendment, the Act may be proclaimed. This, to my knowledge, Sir, has not been done. "You will be asked to repeal the Trade Union Act and to pass new legislation relating to the registration of trade unions." Honourable members will recall that these were two pieces of controversial legislation and the previous administration was severely criticized for leaving these, at least the registration of Trade Unions Act, on the statutes of this province.

"You will further be requested to revise the fishing industry Collective Bargaining Act to make it more effective in meeting the problems and needs of that industry. My ministers feel that the legislation enacted in 1970 relating to collective bargaining within the public service is inadequate in many respects. The Public Service Collective Bargaining Act of 1970 is little more than enabling legislation which provides for details of collective bargaining to be prescribed subsequently by regulation."

Well Sir, this was a controversial piece of legislation. To my knowledge no action has been taken on this statement, a policy that was made in the Throne Speech. I would like for the minister to

tell the Committee what he plans on doing about this piece of legislation. I understand Mr. George Dyer, the former Deputy Minister of Labour, is administering this particular Act. I do not know how busy he is, I do not know if he is researching or just what his duties are. Perhaps the minister could tell us when he answers the questions that will probably be put by some of my colleagues.

"The view of my ministers" the Throne Speech stated, "Is that this is not in the best interest of the public service and more comprehensive legislation will be introduced during this session." I would like for the minister to tell the Committee what has happened to this piece of legislation. We have not seen it yet come into the House.

"Manpower training and placement and training services will be more closely co-ordinated with Federal programmes. The aim of my ministers is to relate the type of training to the demands of the labour market. They shall set up a research division for a constant monitoring of the future needs of the labour market and a counselling service to devise and relate technical training programmes to these demands." This is a pretty broad statement of policy, Sir, and I would like for the minister to inform us just what steps have been taken in the Department of Labour to implement this policy.

Mind you, Mr. Chairman, I agree with it. I think there should be a special consulting service. One thing that I would recommend, Mr. Chairman, is that a special consulting branch be set up to advise young people, in the seventeen to twenty-five year age bracket, on matters such as the opportunities for youth projects, career guidance and employment opportunities in the province. I think the minister touched on this, but I would like to have a little more information on it, because I think this is a very important aspect

of the Department of Labour. I do not know how far the minister has gone in reorganizing the department, but the minister is probably aware, Sir, that part of the unfinished business that was left behind by the former administration which was being worked on...

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Oh! the "Burp from Burgeo" is here. The two point six million dollar member for Burgeo is here. The playboy of the Western World. Is the honourable member getting mad?

MR. EVANS: No, no indeed I am not.

MR. NEARY: There is an awful racket on the other side, Mr. Chairman. What we had planned on doing, Mr. Chairman, was to create a Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I will not bait the honourable member, it would be a pity. It would be a pity to bait him. I do not mind baiting the honourable member for St. John's South, but - The Minister of Justice is back in the House. What he did not miss tonight. He must have heard me on radio a few minutes ago telling the people of Newfoundland he was home getting his beauty sleep. He should have been in the House.

My predecessor, the late W.J.Keough, was in the process of reorganizing the Department of Labour, Sir, creating the new Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations, when he passed away. I would like the minister to inform the Committee if it is his intention to proceed along the same lines as we had already planned and build on the foundation that had already been established.

Now, Sir, as I said in my opening remarks, I think I would have to agree with the minister, that the department was grossly understaffed. When I was Acting Minister of Labour, the matter of investigation I think, was well behind. There was quite a backlog. In some instances, the conciliation officers were out carrying out investigations into the various Acts that come under the Department of

Labour, Termination Of Employment, Hours Of Work, Vacation With Pay Acts, and so forth. I agree again with the honourable minister, Mr. Chairman, that people should have a specific job in the Department of Labour. One thing that always concerned me, when I was there as Acting Minister, was that many of the staff did not really know what their duties were. They were doing a variety of jobs and they were a little bit confused. I hope what I am saying will strengthen the minister's case when he goes before Treasury Board.

MR. A.J. MURPHY: We are taking in every word of it.

MR. NEARY: So, the Conciliation Branch of the department, in my view Sir, was being penalized and they really could not do the job that they should have been doing. Instead of being out trying to prevent strikes, they could only be put into action when a confrontation had actually taken place, I think that more emphasis should be put on the preventive. I think the conciliation officers should undergo an intensive training programme. I think they should specialize in certain industries. Oil is going to be a big industry, mining is a big industry in the province. I think that conciliation officers who are sent in to try and resolve a dispute in the mining industry or in the oil industry, they should know that industry, they should have researched it.

The Department of Labour should have quite a comprehensive library and the conciliation officers should be familiar with the particular industry and the union involved. Is this happening now on a federal level? I notice Bryce Mackasey did this when he became Minister of Labour for Canada and it seemed to work. Mr. Chairman, when I was Acting Minister of Labour, I did not hesitate to become involved in disputes myself. I think this is good. I do not think the Minister of Labour should take sides, but, Sir, when you have a major strike such as the one we have at Come by Chance at the present time and the one we have in Labrador West, which is affecting the whole economy of the area, I think one of the top officials of the Department

of Labour and, if necessary, the minister himself should become actively involved in the dispute.

The way Bryce Mackasey did it, and he told me this personally, that he would send in his officials, his specialists, his experts and they would do all the ground work. They would go away somewhere in a hotel, get away from the scene of the strike, lock themselves up in a hotel room, do the same thing as we are doing in this House tonight, have continuous discussions all night long until the matter was resolved. The officials and the experts would do the spade work and then at the psychological moment the minister would enter the dispute. Bryce Mackasey, I think, had a fair amount of success in settling disputes. I think - I do not know what the minister's views are on this, but I think if I were Minister of Labour, I would become involved in some of these disputes.

Mr. Chairman, I am also very concerned about the safety education programme in the province. Sir, we are all aware of the situation at Long Harbour. We had a second serious accident at the ERCO plant a few days ago, the second accident within a couple of weeks. I think, Sir, that this should be a matter of deep concern to everyone in this province, especially to the Provincial Department of Labour. In my opinion, Sir, there would seem to be no alternative now but to proceed with the immediate fact-finding industrial enquiry. Sir, if the accidents and the severe injuries resulting from these accidents are caused by faulty equipment, then I would suggest, Sir, that the regulations governing the installation of this equipment at Long Harbour will have to be beefed up.

On the other hand, Sir, if human error is the cause, then it would seem to me that the department should initiate immediately an intensive safety education programme among all ERCO employees. Sir, in my opinion, if the present staff of the Department of Labour or the Workmen's Compensation Board cannot handle this, then I would suggest that safety educators should be hired immediately. I think

this would be a good springboard for the minister to get into an intensive or a stepped-up safety education programme in the province. Because, once the safety educators are finished with the ERCO situation, when it is looked after, taken care of to the satisfaction of the department, then I would say, Sir, that there is a great need for

accident prevention training in other industries all over the province, to prevent accidents, Sir, that are damaging either to employees, to the personnel on the payrolls of the company or to the environment. I would like to hear the minister's comments on that.

Now, Sir, I do not intend to delay the committee but I am most concerned about the number of wildcat strikes that are taking place in the province. As a matter of fact, I am most concerned about the strikes that are taking place in the province period. Sir, I do not know what is causing this rash of wildcat strikes. Since I left the department the situation seems to have deteriorated. I do not know why. I would like for the minister to give us his views on the rash of strikes that are taking place in the province and what the department intends to do about it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not have anything else to say at this particular point. I have a number of questions that I will be asking as we go through the estimates, item by item. But I am sure my colleagues would like to have a few words on this subhead (10-16) Labour and probably would like to ask a few questions. But in the meantime, if the minister would care to answer some of the questions or comment on some of the points that are raised, I would be very happy to hear them.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I think I tried to make notes on all of them but I will see if I can go back over some of the important ones or more specific ones.

I think the honourable member for Bell Island, Mr. Chairman, mentioned that it would seem that after the Cohen Commission Report was received there were other committees set up to study this and I do not know if that is completely the right context or not, The reason that I asked two committees to study this report was to try to cut corner, if you will, because I wanted to find out in how many areas or how many specific issues of the Report or chapters or paragraphs or whatever,

labour-management agreed. Assuming that, I say they agreed on fifty per cent of the points set out in a report, well that would certainly eliminate fifty per cent of the points which we would have to discuss and try to analyse in labour management meetings. So I was trying to cut corners because the report was not really specific enough.

The honourable member also brought up the point that there has been no real important legislation brought in in this session

or so far in this session of the House of Assembly, and again. I have to refer to the Cohen Commission Report. We were waiting, rightly or wrongly and it appears to have been the wrong thing at this time, we were waiting for the submission of the Cohen Royal Commission, to see what they had to say on labour legislation in this province. When we received it, there was not too much really of substance in the whole thing. So in essence, Mr. Chairman, the officials of the Department of Labour and I were starting from square one. We had a suggestion but I am sure it is the same suggestion that the honourable the member for Bell Island made when he was Acting Minister of Labour. It is the same suggestion that the honourable W. J. Keough made at some time or another and this sort of thing.

But these suggestions had to be put into the form of draft legislation and ideas had to be put into them. We are at it at this time and we do have several pieces of legislation that are being drafted this time by the legislative draftsmen but they are not completed. I am hoping that some of them will come up, more especially the repeal of The Trade Union Act, which I think is very essential, and the amendment to The Child Labour Act or The Employment Of Children Act, whatever you want to call it, and then the proclamation of that Act.

However, there is one specific piece of legislation that there is quite a bit of concern with. As a matter of fact I spent until eleven or eleven-thirty last night meeting with a group of people who were more than casually concerned with the piece of legislation and this

is The Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act.

The Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act, Mr. Chairman, is something that puzzles me although at the time it was passed I was at that time an organizer for The Fishermen's Union, but it is not a piece of legislation that is applicable to fishermen in Newfoundland and really I am at a loss and I have to confess this, I think everyone within the fishing industry, buying or selling or whatever, is at a loss as to how it should be applied. It was a piece of The Labour Relations Act and it just substituted "employer" for "fish buyer" and "employee" for "fishermen" which I think, as the honourable members of the House realize, is not applicable.

Now I have asked various people who I thought were very knowledgeable in this subject to submit suggestions to me as to what form the Act should take and these included the unions and the fish buyers. I have not had any response from them, probably because they do not know what form the Act should take either.

I had a delegation into my office last night and I spent a couple of hours or more with them. They were complaining about the Act but neither could they come up with any specific recommendations. So I am at a loss to know what to do with it. I think it is essential. I think fishermen should be given a right to bargain collectively but I think it does have to take a different form from the group of steel workers in some particular plant who are bargaining collectively with the steel worker employer. It is a totally different concept.

This is something I hope that I will get an input from all honourable members who were involved with the fishing industry or who had been involved in any way with labour management relations. Maybe they will make some suggestions. I am looking for an opening. I think it has to be revised and I think the honourable member for Bell Island, who is the previous Acting Minister of Labour, would agree

with me that it has to be revised. What form it should take, we are searching for some clues as to the whole thing.

The form of Manpower training, I mentioned this briefly before, I think it has to be more closely co-ordinated. One of the first steps we have taken insofar as co-ordinating the thing is concerned is to set up a committee, which I mentioned in the House some days ago, to assess the problem, to try to make an assessment of the problem in Newfoundland as far as the employment of Newfoundlanders are concerned in major industries in the province, to find out if there is a problem. If there is one, to try to make suggestions as to how it can be overcome.

Now we have made quite a thorough assessment, I think, of the problem. The largest problem I would say, well I can be more specific, the largest problem of the employment of Newfoundlanders in this province is the construction industry related to large industrial projects in this province.

The problem is not as acute as it would first seem, if you look at it from an outside point of view. We really do have a large number of Newfoundlanders employed on large construction projects in the province, either by accident or design I do not know but they are employed, with the exception of a couple of expansion projects which may be going on or a couple of other projects.

On the Island we have a very good record. In Come By Chance, for instance, which is the biggest one I suppose, we have a record of I think at this time of 94% Newfoundlanders employed. In Stephenville I think it reaches 81%, I could be one or two percentage points out.

However, at times it has been a problem and a great part of the problem has been the fact that we have not had the trained personnel available to take advantage of the jobs created.

What we plan to do now is to set up, within the Department of Labour or some similar department, a division which will try to assess or analyse the future needs of industry in this province, in conjunction with the Department of Economic Development or Department of Finance or whatever department is going to be responsible for economic development in this province, and then try to take these future needs and gear our trade and technical schools to the point where they will supply these future needs as much as possible. This will, I think, create a whole new concept in the - maybe not a new concept but a new direction as far as the technical and vocational schools are concerned.

The honourable member for Bell Island mentioned that there were moves afoot to create manpower and industrial relations and this is still in the works. I would like to mention something at this point; I have become very much aware, since I have become Minister of Labour that this whole thing was created back in the days of the honourable W. J. Keough. I would like to say at this point that I appreciate very much and I think that all of Newfoundland should appreciate the efforts, the work that was done by the late honourable William Keough in the field of labour in Newfoundland. I think he brought the Department of Labour from a very obscure position into the forefront of the departments of government in Newfoundland. He was a very intense and very sincere man.

While I am on this subject I would like to say this, it is a personal point of view but I am sure that it is shared by government, that we are very pleased to have Mrs. Keough as our Human Rights Commissioner in Newfoundland. She is doing a very tremendous job, and I certainly hope she is with us for a great number of years, but I think we should honour the late W. J. Keough because he did do a tremendous job within this department.

June 29, 1972

Tape No. 1181

NM - 6

Another point that the honourable member for Bell Island mentioned was that the department should not be hesitant in being involved in strikes. Well I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that I could be accused of being hesitant in being involved in strikes. I probably stuck my neck

out a lot of times and took a chance on getting it chopped off. I have just been lucky so far that I have not had it chopped off. I would say this that my staff and I are willing at any time, under any circumstances to offer any help or assistance that we can give in any industrial dispute in this province. If we have the expertise, it is available and if we do not have the expertise, we will find it. As far as industrial specialists are concerned, and I think this is the point that the honourable member from Bell Island was making. I talked to the honourable Bryce Mackasey about this not too long ago and he suggested the industrial specialists and of course he is Minister of Manpower now not Minister of Labour, but he outlined his views to me. I agree with him wholeheartedly. There is only one problem, Mr. Chairman, and that is that I do not at present have the staff to institute the industrial specialists concept.

Wildcat strikes. I have said that we are at this time devising legislation aimed at bringing to a halt or curtailing wildcat strikes in this province. Now I fully realize, Mr. Chairman, that legislation that have been brought in in other provinces, in other countries, to try to curtail wildcat strikes, has not been effective. However I do not think that is any reason for any jurisdiction to keep from trying. I think we should, because wildcat strikes, illegal strikes, illegal walkouts or whatever you call them, do make a mockery of the whole collective bargaining process and it is our duty as a government and was the duty of the last administration or the next administration to come whatever it is, to try to halt them. If we cannot find a way then hopefully somebody else can in the future.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman I would just like to make a few brief remarks on labour and maybe the honourable minister in his wisdom can give us a satisfactory reply. Looking over the labour situation in this province this year and not only I suppose in this province but

in the whole of Canada, we have had a number of major disputes and wildcat strikes that have taken place in almost every form of industry, on a daily basis. I marvel at the success that has taken place concerning the giant union agreement of the Churchill Falls project. I think possibly this particular project has been one of the very few major projects in Canada that have not been plagued by labour disputes. Maybe the honourable minister, in his wisdom, and no doubt if he is familiar with those giant union agreements concerning the construction of the Churchill Falls, can possibly learn something from the negotiations and the agreements that were reached by bringing a number of unions together and conducting themselves and having co-ordination between the different groups and conducting themselves so ably as to accomplish a great feat of engineering, a lot of labour involved, to the extent that we did not have one strike during the construction of that particular project.

Well the minister was away. To sum it up very briefly, I was commenting and saying I would like to have the minister's remarks on the success of the giant union agreements of the Churchill Falls project. No doubt the honourable minister has studied those union agreements. Myself, I did have copies and the success of this, maybe there is a lot to be learned from it, a number of people getting together. I do not know what part that this province or the Department of Labour played in the negotiations or drawing up what I consider to be that great union agreement, getting all the unions together and agreeing on doing a particular project and then pulling it off with some great success. When you look at the Come by Chance deal there is one union or another, either the steam fitters are going out and holding up the whole project, as we have today at the refinery, the heavy equipment operators or whatever the union is called is out and, consequently, it freezes the whole project.

AN HON. MEMBER: Operating engineers.

MR. WOODWARD: Operating engineers. But maybe, Mr. Chairman, looking at a giant project like the linerboard and having different unions going in and representing different trades of the particular construction, one wonders why there has not been foresight to see the need for co-ordination and the need of having a giant union agreement so that when one particular segment of the operation is disrupted or cannot agree -

AN HON. MEMBER: We have it now.

MR. WOODWARD: You have it now but why is one particular union on strike if you have a giant union agreement? But I want to make a few comments on this. I think it has been a tremendous success and I am sure that the minister is quite familiar with it and maybe he can make some comments on it that will be valuable to this honourable House.

I would like to go on a little further and talk about the Department of Labour's contribution to the employment situation in this province. Mr. Chairman, I fail to see what great need the department is serving as far as employment is concerned, it may be the monitoring sense or the monitoring value of keeping control of the percentage of local people or Newfoundlanders that are hired on the particular jobs. Personally I feel and I am sure that a number of other people do, there should have been more utilization of local labour, Newfoundland labour and in turn local Labradorian labour on the Churchill project. There were a number of cases where people from the Labrador Coast were referred to the manpower office in St. John's and consequently were asked on several occasions, Mr. Chairman -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

MR. WOODWARD: On a number of occasions, Mr. Chairman -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman has not even been here all night. He should have been here.

AN HON. MEMBER: Come on now so as we can get out of here before Saturday morning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Do we have two moderators in the House now, Mr. Chairman? No, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to suffer to sit here all night and be bothered with the -- I think when we are putting through estimates, we are having government expenditures, the people's money we are spending, why not make the thing serious, Mr. Chairman, and get on with the business at hand. It is not a cocktail party we are getting involved in. We are dealing with legislation. I am serious about it. I am serious and I am contented to stay up and work and I would like to be able to speak my piece when we are dealing with the estimates of the Department of Labour, Mr. Chairman.

So it was a serious case in this particular instance and I would like to bring it to the attention of the honourable minister. He is going to be conducting that Department of Labour and no doubt he is going to be monitoring what is going on in this province. I think that jobs; as far as people getting a means of livelihood, they have to find jobs in order to do it. We had several occasions on the Churchill Falls project, and I will get back to the Labrador Liner project where there was an isolation, people from the coastal communities of Labrador were asked to come in to St. John's in order to obtain jobs to go to Churchill Falls. That is a serious situation. Maybe the honourable minister has some solution to this problem. I am

sure it has been brought to his attention and no doubt they will work out some procedures or some guide lines or put some officials in the field whereby we can get the fullest out of these projects as far as labour is concerned.

I appreciate the honourable minister when he says there are a number of cases where we do not have qualified people in this province to take advantage of all the jobs that are taking place. Maybe some of the honourable ministers have been involved in the Churchill Falls project and know the feeling that exists in the camps where the people live and no doubt they have existed in Churchill Falls, as I was heavily involved in it myself. There were a lot of disgruntled Newfoundlanders saying that there were other people from outside the province taking our jobs away. We have similar situations, similar cases right now today in Goose Bay, concerning the Labrador Linerboard project. We are not at all happy with it, as you know, and the management are coming from the mainland. Most of them are hired by Forestall, which is a consulting firm from B.C. The key personnel are coming from there, Sir. As they do in construction jobs. Where there are key personnel, there is a following and those people will collect around them and rightfully so. Maybe as an industry see it, for efficiency and other reasons, wherever you see a good superintendent or you see a good woods manager, he has to have his own key personnel to follow along behind him. That situation is happening in Goose Bay right now, today.

It is happening in Goose Bay right now, Sir, and I think this is an opportune time when we are having a large project of this nature.

I am sure that the minister is sincere, I know the man personally, I think he is sincere. I think he is out to do a good job.

AN HON. MEMBER: Does someone have a camera in the gallery?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I do not think the honourable member is perhaps aware of the fact that the government and the opposition have both agreed on this, a matter of a documentary that I did not pass on to my colleague, and I think he will agree that this is worthy of

a documentary, but we gave him the permission.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): On the point of order, Sir, the honourable House Leader is right. There was an agreement but someone should realize that it is common courtesy to members on both sides of the House that unanimous consent is needed for a camera to be brought into the House and I am ashamed or disappointed in the honourable House Leader for neglecting to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, I think this is an opportune time, as I said, now that we have a new industry and no doubt that we preach and I have heard preached in this House the ways and means in the long-term planning. We are not going to follow the same pattern that have been followed in previous years. We are going to do more research. We are going to do upgrading and I am sure that the honourable Minister of Labour fits into this particular category and no doubt that he will set up some strenuous monitory control on the utilization of labour by the local residents of this province. I would like to bring those particular subjects to his attention now. It has been forecast that there will be somewhere in the vicinity of eight to nine hundred people directly employed in the woods harvesting operation at Goose Bay, Labrador -

I see and I am sure that it will be brought to his attention a number of people creeping in from the outside. Rightfully so, Sir, I am not hypocritical enough to say that we do not need those people. There may be a need and maybe we do not have people in the province that can solve those particular jobs. But then again, I am sure that in lots of cases, as we have stated in this particular House - whether the Labour Department is going to act as an employment agency for this province. I would like to hear the honourable minister's comments on this.

He stated briefly that the department's function, now, is to deal with labour disputes, conciliation boards, workmen's compensation, and a few other things but they are going to broaden the whole concept of the department and maybe even change the name of the department. I cannot see any greater need for a department than an employment agency or some type of employment agency in this particular province, Mr. Chairman, to co-ordinate the labour, the employment opportunities that exist in the province. I am sure that the honourable minister can give us his views on this particular subject.

I would like to go on further, Mr. Chairman, now while I am on my feet. I think there is a great need for the co-ordination of labour. If the honourable minister of Fisheries is in his seat, and he is going to catalogue the number of fish stages that we have in this province, he is going to catalogue the number of dories that are owned by the government, that are going to fish off the coast, he is going to do an inventory of government facilities as far as fisheries are concerned, I think this is a good idea. I think that any efficient minister or department should have at his fingertips all the necessary information concerning that particular

department, cataloguing of facilities and the degree of maintenance that is needed and the type of facilities are a great source of information to any administrator.

I am sure that the honourable minister, Sir, will set up some sort of system whereby they can catalogue the number of unemployed in this province. They will probably co-ordinate the thing and have available in the field a number of workers. I am not thinking in terms of the federal department of unemployment insurance. I am not thinking primarily of the manpower centre. I think that most of the honourable members in this House will agree that there is a lot less to be desired. Naturally, so, the manpower in this province is in its infancy, merely started some five years ago.

But, as you travel throughout this province and you listen to the people that are seeking employment, when you think in terms of the good that they are doing, sure, they are doing good but there is a need for the upgrading of those manpower centres. There is a need, Mr. Chairman, and they have it here on the island, a mobile unit that is travelling throughout the province. I do not know to what extent it does travel, but it is travelling into communities holding clinics and selling the manpower programme.

I do not know if the honourable minister of Labour is thinking in terms of something like this for his department. But, I feel that there is a need for cataloguing or finding out how many men are in the community. Maybe in some instances a need for some sort of a means test whereby you can fit the people that have not gone to trade school. We have a problem on the Labrador Coast and I am sure that it exists on the Island. We have a number of qualified tradesmen, not qualified to the extent that they have certificates to prove what they can do. but qualified in the sense that they can do

excellent jobs, but not recognized in their profession as such. Therefore when they present themselves to manpower, if they do not have some paper to show or papers to show what they can do, then they automatically turn them down and they select the persons that do have papers.

Now, I am primarily thinking in terms of carpenters. Throughout the province of Newfoundland, if you travel into all the small communities, I am sure that the honourable ministers here will agree that we have a number of skilled carpenters in this province. I am sure that a number of those people, if there was a facility whereby they could come in, get tested, they would be automatically given papers. Not necessarily go to a technical school, but they would be given papers because they are qualified, they can do that particular job. There should be some means whereby we can have a catalogue of those people, and they in turn, Sir, can take advantage of the jobs that are available, we think in terms of having to bring in some one from outside of the province to fill.

I think this is a good point. We have a number of people, handy tradesmen that can do excellent jobs, that are not considered as tradesmen as such. I do not know what part the department of Labour play in our trades schools. I understand it is a part of that responsibility. Maybe there is some, but the whole thing Mr. Chairman, is we depend on people to come to us and we do not have the services whereby we go out and look at the people that are in the area. We have had unfortunate circumstances over the years. Through the housing development programme in Labrador, we have gone in with skilled carpenters, skilled plumbers and tradesmen from this part of the province. They go in continuously, Sir, every season, to work in the construction field. Then the local people that have

followed along this trade over the years, some of them have worked as carpenters helpers, plumbers helpers for as high as ten to eleven years. Now I am sure that if there was some means whereby you could test those particular people, they would be more than suited for those particular trades and consequently they should in turn be given that opportunity.

I would like to see the honourable minister take this into consideration. I would also like to go back, then go briefly on the Labrador linerboard programme that is taking place in Goose Bay - Happy Valley, no doubt the spin-off of that industry will go into other communities in this particular province. I, personally, myself, would like to see this operation expanded into the Cartright Sandwich Bay Area and into the Port Hope Simpson Area in Southern Labrador.

There are a number of - there are two depressed areas, Sir I am sure that the honourable minister, I do not know what programme they have in this respect but I am sure that he knows and is quite aware of Southern Labrador. He is quite aware of the number of jobs that are available there. The problem of transporting the people out to Labrador and if you are asked to go down to St. John's for an interview with the manpower centre, I have known cases where they have refused to go.

So, this is a case where we are having new industry into the province. We or the administration profess to be looking at long range programmes. They analyze all the errors and mistakes that was made in the past. We are not going to have any re-occurrence of any errors or any mistakes. So I suppose in this incidence here that we are more than - I can assume that the operation or the government is more than prepared to meet the challenges and to deal

with the problems that I have presented.

I am not sitting down, Mr. Chairman. I have asked the honourable minister a number of questions. I would like to know if the honourable minister is prepared to answer the questions?

MR. MAYNARD: Well, I feel Mr. Chairman, that it is just as well to answer the questions now, as it is to answer them under a specific heading. But, may I start from the last? I believe the honourable member said that we were aiming towards no errors no mistakes because we were going to eliminate all the errors and mistakes that were made in the past.

With all due respects to anyone who has been an administrator in the past or will be an administrator in the future, not in this world without making some errors and some mistakes. However, I think we would be somewhat amiss if we did not try to learn by some of the mistakes that were made in the past. But I am not going to mention any specific one, because I do not think it is worthwhile at this time.

The honourable member mentioned the fact of going to Trade School and the fact of getting some experience in certain jobs in a specific trade, where there is tractor operating, operating a crane, being a welder or what have you, probably not being qualified as per the certificate you have. I think it is a very important issue because it is one that I mentioned when I talked to the graduation students at the trade school a couple of weeks ago. The Premier has mentioned it a number of times. What we have stated quite plainly is that we can no longer in Newfoundland consider a university education whether it be a B.A. or M.A. or a doctorate degree or what have you as a passport to security.

Now I am not saying anything and I do not intend to say anything against a university education. I think it is a very fine thing, ore

power to the person who gets it. But I think we all realize at this time that it is not a passport to security, especially when I look at a hundred and some odd operating engineers in Come by Chance today (I have to mention this because it is sort of ridiculous situation) who have a base rate of \$4.30 an hour and they are going out for another \$1.50. I have a feeling that some university graduates would just love to be earning that amount of money.

These people are called operating engineers and they are essentially tractor drivers, crane operators, what have you. They are making a fair wage. I am not saying they should not go for more. Probably they are right. I am not arguing that point at this time. But it just goes to show that once you get a B.A. or an M.A. or a doctorate degree, it is no longer the key to open the door to all, to a bright future, to every thing that you ever wanted to have. This is why the Premier and I have emphasized in two graduation ceremonies now, it is the policy of government that we have to consider the trade school graduate, the College of Fisheries graduate and the person who has just naturally learned himself over the last few years or whatever, as being qualified.

We cannot say to a person who has been operating a D7 tractor for the last ten years, he suddenly wants to go on a shovel, we cannot say to him; "look you are not qualified." What we have to say to him is; "okay, two hours on a shovel, you can operate the thing." We cannot demand that man's certificate. I think it is absolutely ridiculous.

Now convincing companies who are operating in Newfoundland, convincing contractors who are operating in Newfoundland to think that same way may be a little bit of a problem. That is possible. I think the honourable member from Labrador North will agree with me, that may be a bit of a problem. I think we have to find some way

MR. MAYNARD: in order to overcome that problem, we have to find some way whereby we can certify that man. Now he may be a person who cannot read or write but he can operate any type of a piece of machinery. If he cannot read or write, under our present regulations and examinations and what not, therefore he cannot pass an examination. You know we have to find some way, I am not saying that I have the way right here now. What I am saying; if I am to do my job as Minister of Labour, I have to find a way whereby that man can be qualified. Because certainly the ability to read or write does not mean a thing when he is out there on a crane or a shovel or bulldozer, So therefore we have to qualify him.

But these are the things that we have to iron out. I think these are specific things that the honourable member for Labrador North is inquiring about, Right? This goes a long way towards getting, I believe, Newfoundlanders employed, I am not saying that all Newfoundlanders cannot qualify unless you give them a special examination. But there are a great number that had experience up through the years and they never bothered with going to an upgrading school, because they never had to. They have operated a tractor all their life or they have operated a shovel or whatever and they suddenly find themselves out of a job. They want to go to Churchill Falls or to the Lower Churchill or Labrador City or whatever, they have to be considered as qualified. So I think we have to make a special case.

We are working on that, Mr. Chairman, and I think with the right amount of work and the right amount of ambition in this particular field, we will solve the problem. As far as the catalogue of the number of unemployed is concerned, Canada Manpower right now is suppose to be doing a very specific job in Newfoundland, cataloguing the number of unemployed and trying to find jobs for them. I have my reservations about what Canada Manpower are doing. I do not think anyone else in this House can argue with them.

MR. MAYNARD: I have no more to say at this time, if there are any specific questions to be brought up under any heading, I will certainly try to answer them.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, before we carry on, may I ask the question of the honourable minister and I would like to hear his comments on the joint union agreement with the Churchill Falls Project. I think there is something to be learnt from him, and I think that if more attention were paid to this particular agreement when we think in terms of having industry come into the province, then we would not be plagued everyday by the problems that we are having on the other projects. I would like to hear the honourable minister's comments on this.

There is another question that I think is of great concern to this province and it particularly applies to the upgrading school in Stephenville, where you have heavy equipment operators. There have been a number of qualified applicants turned out from the school and immediately presented themselves to industry and inquired for jobs and they were automatically turned down. The first question was asked was; what experience do you have? So I do not know how you would gain an experience if you were not employed. I think this is a very pertinent question. This question has been brought up on a number of occasions. "We need a guy with five years experience. You do not have any experience and therefore we cannot hire you." But how do you acquire experience if you cannot get a job? I think this is an important issue. It is a very important issue - I am not trying to delay the estimates, Mr. Chairman, we are gone into six hours, additional seven hours, we are on to other departments and I think Labour is as equally important - not because of the late hour Labour is equally important, as Municipal Affairs and Housing was before. So if we have the stamina to go on, let us carry on with the same degree of debate.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, on the basis of the Churchill Falls Agreement in some aspects at least or in most aspects it is one of the best labour management agreements that has even been signed or negotiated. I would love to say that I had a part in it, but I did not. I was not around at that time. But it is a master agreement, there is no doubt about that. I think definitely there should be specific recommendations made in the Labour Relations Laws of Newfoundland to provide for such agreements, Right now it is a special projects agreement which is a very qualified sort of thing. It is hard to say what is a special project. I think Come by Chance has been declared as a special project, but the agreement that has been worked out there is not quite so ironclad, if you will, or specific as the one has been worked out in Churchill Falls.

The Churchill Falls Agreement has been very good and I think it should be used as a model, I am not talking about wage levels and this sort of thing, but I think it should be used as a model for other specific projects in Newfoundland. In the Come by Chance thing we do seem to be having some problems, but I do submit that they are relatively minor. The agreement has been signed, it has been signed for a period of three years. Those people are making a fairly good wage and I think you know this is a minor grievance caused by a few people who are not really responsible to their agreement or to the company.

What was the other issue that was brought up -

MR. WOODWARD: The other question that I asked the minister and I can appreciate the honourable minister being tired. He had a soaked-up night. One of the big concerns in the province, the Happy Valley situation, is an important issue. The other issue it not only applies to Labrador, it applies to the whole of this province where we are getting a number of graduates, if you want to call them that, from the upgrading school in Stephenville. Today in as far as heavy equipment operators are concerned and things of that nature, crane operators, immediately you go to the big industry in the province,

MR. WOODWARD: which namely are Bowaters, AND Company:Price Newfoundland, and you go to now Labrador Linerboard or you go to CELCo or you go to the Iron Ore Company of Canada or the Wabush Mines. These are the ones I think primarily and the Procon people at the Come By Chance Refinery. Coming out you have your certified graduates. A lot of these graduates are only young, nineteen, twenty, twenty-two and some of them twenty-four years of age. They are presenting themselves to the employment personnel and the first question they are confronted with is: "What experience do you have?" Now if a graduate from an upgrading school or something is not employed, he does not have any experience. If you are not employed you do not have any experience.

So how do we overcome this gap in between from the time that he is employed until he becomes experienced in that particular field? I think this is an important issue. It is a very important question. A number of our people coming out of the upgrading school have been turned down because they do not have experience.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, this has been something that has always puzzled me for a number of years too. I am a graduate of a trade's college myself, in electronic technology. It so happened that I was in an area by being employed by the Royal Canadian Airforce where I could get the necessary number of years of experience before I had to go out into the field. It has always puzzled me as to how trainees could get the four years or five years experience that the honourable member was talking about. I do not quite know how we can overcome it, except through the regular apprenticeship training programme. This works in the case of a person who is coming right out of trade school and they enter into the field of electrical technology or they enter the field of mechanical work or whatever. But it does not really apply, it applies I suppose, but it is not really acceptable to the person who has torn apart cars and tractors and put them back together for the last ten years and then has to go into an apprenticeship programme to get the necessary amount of training.

MR. MAYNARD: It is a problem I might say that has puzzled a hundred administrations before and it will puzzle one hundred administrations after and no one that I know of has been able to come up with the necessary answers. The only answer that I know, and I can be corrected on this, the only answer that I know is the point of a government or an agency using friendly persuasion or a little bit of arm-twisting with various projects they are setting up in the province.

Assuming that you are going to set up an industry in this province and it requires a certain number of shovel operators, and I know a certain number of people who can operate a shovel but they have never gone to trade school, they are quite experienced -

MR. ROBERTS: May I count the committee again please. Okay we are all right again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carry on.

MR. MAYNARD: The least that I am worried about, I am just trying to get these estimates through.

MR. MURPHY: He has very good intentions of getting the estimates through -

MR. MAYNARD: Do not worry about it, we will get it through.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable member would not know anything about that.

MR. MURPHY: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

MR. MAYNARD: Really all I am trying to do, Mr. Chairman, is answer the questions proposed by the honourable member for Labrador North. I think I should do that, or to the best of my ability at least.

MR. WOODWARD: This is all we require, Mr Chairman.

MR. MAYNARD: If I have done this to his satisfaction, well I am willing to let the other things slide right through and say no more.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the minister is doing an admirable job of presenting the estimates. I think possibly we are all spellbound,

MR. ROBERTS: except those of my colleagues who are off duty. They will be back. Indeed the Premier has gone off duty, I see now. He could not take it.

AN HON. MEMBER: He will be back at ten o'clock.

MR. ROBERTS: He will be back at ten o'clock, okay.

MR. ROWE: The Minister of Finance was never here.

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier could not take it, the Minister of Finance has not been here at all, all night. The Minister of Justice, I assume he went home, he looks refreshed. Yes, I agree the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources has been here all night, representing

MR. DOODY: Representing co-ops.

MR. YOUNG: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: What was that?

MR. ROWE, W.N. He was here all night, you can tell by the look of him.

MR. ROBERTS: It is obvious that the member for Harbour Grace has been with the committee all evening, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Certainly has been with the committee, drinking in the fruits of our discussion,

MR. ROBERTS: Taking it all in as it were, and then we do welcome back the Minister of Provincial Affairs, I think it is his first appearance. We now have been meeting in the committee a little over nine hours and twenty minutes. We are doing grand.

Now there are only three points that I would like to hear the minister on with respect to this item. I believe my colleague still feels he has not had his question answered, but he will be back again.

MR. MAYNARD: I am sorry, maybe I missed some.

MR. ROBERTS: No, well we will come back at it, the minister, Actually it is only three points that I am concerned about. Now he has spoken

MR. ROBERTS: the Collective Bargaining Fisheries Act, I have not got the title correct, but he knows the legislation. The minister is quite right when he says that this legislation is essentially the Labour Relations Act with "employees" struck out and "fishermen" put in, to be more precise with the definition of "employee" brought in to include "fishermen." It is not necessarily a satisfactory solution. I have seen in the press on a number of occasions and the minister said in the committee as well, when he opened on the estimates, Sir, that the Act has unsatisfactory features.

What I would appreciate is if the minister could tell us briefly, it does not have to be at length, what are the unsatisfactory features in it. I do not question that there are many. I have no doubt there are many. The important thing about that Act was the principle behind it, that it was the first time the fishermen in Newfoundland has been granted the right to bargain collectively, by law. The principle was carried into effect by legislation. It was not carried into effect as well as it hopefully will be. But I am interested in hearing the minister say that, although he has spoken with a great number of people and sought advice

over a wide horizon and he has not yet found anybody who is able to give him advice as to how the Act could be improved. I think that is quoting the minister accurately. People think that there is much wrong with it, but it is interesting to note that nobody has been able to suggest improvements in it.

But if the minister could outline for us the sort of thing that is causing trouble under the Act. I know there has been only one local certified, and that is up on the Strait Shore and Bonavista North and Fogo districts. I understand there are a lot of others that are before the Board now and presumably now that one has been certified, we may expect to see ten to fifteen more assuming - I do not know, maybe there will be vote, maybe not, it is up to the Board, but the minister might wish to expand on that for a few minutes.

The minister made a speech the other day over at the College of Trades and Technology. I believe he was filling in for the Premier who once again had chickened out, not checked out, accepted an invitation and then did not show up. He is getting a name for that. But over at the College of Trades and Technology, the Premier, I was intrigued by the minister's speech. He made some reference to it here this evening and I must say, what I know of it is what I read in the newspapers. But I was particularly pleased ... The morning set comes on now. I was particularly intrigued and pleased by the minister's statement that more and more manpower training policy in this province will be aimed at trying to bring into a more exact balance the types of skills for which people are trained, as against the types of work that is available.

That surely has to be the basic aim, Mr. Chairman, of any manpower policy. It would be no good, for example, to train one hundred blacksmiths a year when Newfoundland may need one blacksmith a year or she may need none, but we must try to bring into balance the job and skill factors. What I would like to hear the minister say, talk about, is how

he proposes to do this. First of all, how he proposes to forecast the labour market requirements, over what period, by what mechanism and with what accuracy? It will be a difficult task.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I know of nowhere in the world where it is done. I know of many places where it has been attempted but I know of no place where it has worked satisfactorily. I am quite sure that the speech which the minister gave, I am not sure it was a speech prepared for the Premier or it was the minister's own speech, but I am sure the speech was not just a pie of platitude, I am sure the minister had thought out or, if the Premier, if it were his speech, had thought out the implications in what he was saying. Now perhaps the time has come when he should be a little more specific.

I would like also, when the minister has told us how one forecasts, and this is a difficult job, how one forecasts the requirements, how many engineers we will be needing in ten years or twenty years. Remember, Mr. Chairman, the working life of an individual now is forty-five years. If one enters the labour force at twenty, one will retire at sixty-five, That is forty-five years.

AN HON. MEMBER: Politicians have a shorter life span.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes politicians, fortunately for the country, have a shorter life span.

But also, Mr. Chairman, would the minister indicate to us what his thinking is along the lines of persuading people to enter the various categories, because, supposing we were able to determine, for example, that we would need 12.3 dental technicians a year for the next twenty or thirty years, we need some dental technicians, how does the minister propose to go about attracting people into that? Are we to have a system of incentives? I do not know. I could go on at some length but the whole matter intrigues me. I think it is very much the guts of any manpower policy. Again, as with the forecasting side of it, Sir, nobody has ever, to my knowledge, found a satisfactory solution. But I would like to hear the

minister's ideas on it.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the third point, the first was the Fishing Act, the second was this speech over at the college. The whole area of labour forecasting and supply demand factors; has the minister any information he could give committee with respect to the government's policy on exparte injunctions in labour matters. I for one would like to see them ended. There may be instances where they are needed, there maybe I am not prepared to say there are not. I cannot think of any, off hand, from my knowledge, but it is not a field in which I am terribly expert at all. The gentleman from St. John's South, if he were here I think knows a great deal about this type of thing. Generally they are offensive. Generally they are offensive in policy. They are a weapon that employers use to try to harrass people on a lawful strike. I think the history of them in this province has been to that effect. The history of them in another province has been to that effect. It is offensive in policy as well, I submit, that an injunction is issued on an exparte. It is perfectly lawful, of course. But an exparte injunction by definition is with only one side having been heard. I cannot think of very many situations in 1972 when a court cannot arrange to hear immediately, or as quickly as possible, as immediately need be, both sides of the party and the court, if an injunction is issued. Injunctions may still be necessary. It is the exparte injunction that I find offensive.

MR. MAYNARD: Sure injunctions are going to be necessary.

MR. ROBERTS: Injunctions are a weapon of the court to . It is the order of the court.

MR. MAYNARD: In illegal strikes, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Or a lawful strike with unlawful acts involved in it. Unlawful picketing. One might have a lawful strike, Mr. Chairman, yet have striking which in the common law and the statute law amounts to unlawful picketing.

However, could the minister -- let us put it this way-- we would like to see the exparte injunctions ended. I believe it will require legislation. Could the minister state the administration's policy with respect to that particular point.

Anyway those are the three points, Mr. Chairman. My colleague for Labrador North has asked me to say that he is still not satisfied with the answer to the question he put. The minister may want to take another go at it. I know it is a -- the member for St. John's Centre picks himself up --

MR. MAYNARD: What was the question?

MR. ROBERTS: Okay, my friend and colleague will come back at that point, but the three I raised again were the question of the exparte injunctions, the question of the forecasting of jobs and inducing people into the various categories and then a few specifics on just what is wrong with the fisheries collective bargaining legislation.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, let me see if I can get through these notes I have here. What was the first question? No, I think it is necessary to answer the honourable member's question because if not it comes up under the various headings and it is the same now as it would be at that time.

To answer the first one - no. Pardon me, the last one. On the exparte injunction, it is the government's intention to introduce legislation eliminating the exparte injunctions. Specifically for the reason that an exparte injunction is a one-sided thing and if I am accused by someone of murdering a specific person, I am not automatically fined or jailed, I have my day in court and therefore, anyone else should have their day in court. The exparte injunction will be eliminated. This is part of the legislative programme or the legislative amendment programme that we will be introducing at sometime during the 1972 Session of the Legislature.

June 29, 1972

Tape No. 1185

NM - 5

MR. ROBERTS: 1973 session.

MR. MAYNARD: Do you think it is going to go on that long?

MR. ROBERTS: Does he mean the current session or does he mean next year's session?

MR. MAYNARD: The current session, not next year's session.

MR. ROBERTS: We are going to go on that long. We will meet all summer and all winter, is that it?

MR. MAYNARD: I hope we will break for Labour Day, because I have a holiday scheduled for then.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are going to get Labour Day off?

MR. MAYNARD: Nobody gets Labour Day?

MR. ROBERTS: We are going to get Labour Day off.

MR. MAYNARD: I am going to take Labour Day off, I do not know about the honourable member.

Collective Bargaining for Fishermen. I have said before and I have to say again, Mr. Chairman, that this is something that really has me puzzled. I was a part, as a matter of fact I was an organizer of the union at the time that collective bargaining for fishermen was brought in by the Legislature in Newfoundland. I am not going to suggest that the Collective Bargaining Act was bad as such. There are a couple of problems with it. It has no defined employee-employer relationship which is the biggest problem I suppose. The Fishermen's Collective Bargaining Act has no specifics indicated in it. This is the problem that the board faces, the Labour Relations Board faces when they receive an application from the union and the union says: 'We have applied for so many hundred fishermen, or such a percentage of fishermen in this specific area.' There are no defined areas and the board can say they will accept that area that you applied for or we will expand it twenty miles on either side, fifty miles on either side or whatever. It is at the discretion of the board. It is not set out the same as the ordinary Labour Relations Act, where a unit of employees applies for certification as bargaining agent for a specific industry or whatever.

I have to confess, Mr. Chairman, that I do not know what the answer is. I have asked various people who are supposed to be experts in this. I have asked various people who are supposed to be experts in the Scandanavian system where they have had this for a number of years. I have never gone to Sweden, Norway or Denmark and studied the system there. Hopefully the Premier will send me there one of those days, because I would like a vacation. Anyway, I have never gone there so far. Other people have, but they still come back and they have never been able to indicate to me what the system is in these countries. They have collective bargaining apparently between fishermen and fish buyers. They have a union or at least a socialist type of relationship between fishermen and the processors and whatnot. No one, for some reason or other, has ever been able or if they have been able, they have never agreed to put it down on paper for me and I think this holds true for the previous Minister of Labour, just exactly what they mean by collective bargaining for fishermen.

I agree with the principle because I helped to organize over half the fishermen in Newfoundland. I will be quite truthful with you, I did not know what I was organizing them for.

AN HON. MEMBER: I hope that is coffee.

MR. MAYNARD: It is coffee. If it were rum I would not be here. Anyway, I think the main problem with the Fishermen's Collective Bargaining Act, as it exists now, is that there are no defined areas. There is no real definition of what is a fisherman and what is not, as considered under the Act. Therefore, the board, which is a court in itself I suppose to a certain extent, has a very difficult time in setting the regulations for this particular Act. Really, Mr. Chairman, what I would like and I am sure the last Minister of Labour and I know by his correspondence that he asked for the same thing, is somebody who is familiar with this type of bargaining and somebody who has studied this type of bargaining to please make some

recommendations.

We have an Act. The board are trying to use it as best they can. Fishermen want an Act, they want collective bargaining rights. I guess it is the duty of everybody, nonpartisan, to try to bring this concept into view and to try to give the fishermen the type of bargaining relationship they want. It is going to have to be a totally different type of thing than the ordinary run-of-the-mill contract.

The honourable member for Labrador North I believe asked how we could fit different people into jobs in Newfoundland and this sort of thing. There are two ways that we can fit people in Newfoundland into jobs that exist. Number one: I think we can start right now making regulations and if I wanted to open up the files here, I could show you regulations that are made by Order-in-Council in Quebec, which restrict the number of jobs that can be held by outsiders in the Province of Quebec.

We have done a considerable amount of study on this and the Committee has done a considerable amount of study. I do not think it is necessary to bring in as stringent regulations as those that exist in Quebec. I do not think that we have to be that harsh. I do think that the provision of jobs for Newfoundlanders has to take a two-prong approach. Number one; I think we have to analyse the future needs of industry and upgrade our training programme if we can but, in case we cannot, I think we have to bring in a certain number of regulations.

As strange as it may seem, the only problem that exists, as far as acquiring Newfoundlanders is concerned, is in the construction industry, not in the regular industries. I am talking about I.O.C.C., Wabush Mines, the permanent type industries in this context. We may have a problem, but normally they have a seventy, seventy-five to eighty percent Newfoundland context. The construction industry is

the culprit. I am not suggesting that the member for Labrador North has anything to do with this, but in Labrador they are the real culprits. These are the expansion people who are doing the expansion for the mines and what not. I do not think the agreements with I.O.C.C., Wabush and Churchill Falls are ironclad enough, I think the member from White Bay South has mentioned this, but there are provisions in the agreements. I looked over the agreements today, especially the agreement with CFLCo., and it is a good agreement. Somebody is not enforcing the agreement.

It is a good agreement and it specifically states that Newfoundlanders have preference. The other clause that states that Quebecers are going to get preference is subservient to the one that stated that the Newfoundlanders have preference. But somebody is not enforcing the first clause. This may be our fault. This may very well be our fault and I am willing to take some responsibility for it. To tell you the truth, I never read the agreement before. Now that I have read the agreement and I hope I can talk it over with the member for White Bay South, I hope we can do something about it. It is in essence an ironclad agreement which somebody is not following. I think it is the responsibility of the Government of Newfoundland to follow it.

I assume, I do not know but I assume that much the same agreement exists with I.O.C.C. and Wabush as far as contractual things are concerned and expansion. Maybe they do not but if they do not, then I think we should go after them immediately. This is all I can say at the present time. Thank you!

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Chairman,

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh no!

MR. ROWE: They can leave, Mr. Chairman, they can all go. Cracky's corner over there, they can all go home if they want to. If they cannot stand it - you know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the members to hear the honourable member for White Bay South and also caution the member for White Bay South that his remarks are not necessary.

MR. ROWE: I have a point or two to make on Labour and I am sure the minister will at least bear with me and try to provide some information for our benefit at any rate.

I do not know the percentage rate of the labour force which is unionized in the province. What is it, about thirty-odd percent?

AN HON. MEMBER: Twenty-seven.

MR. ROWE: Twenty-seven percent. It must be the lowest...

MR. MAYNARD: Something like that.

MR. ROWE: Yes, that is right. It is in the report there somewhere that Cohen came up with. Say thirty or less than thirty percent, which must make us of any political unit in North America, outside of Mexico say, one of the lowest percentage rates of the labour force which is unionized. Would that be correct? It is a bit of a damning feature of our labour and industrial labour relations and our organizational ability or whatever - organizational history or something in the province.

I must confess that I have not perused in a profound way Professor - Dr. Cohen's remarks regarding this, but I understand that he did make some suggestion, from the scanty glimpse I have given the report to date, he made some suggestion about going out in the field and getting a greater participation, a greater organization, a greater unionization in the province. I must say, Sir, that I must agree with that position. We need to get more people, especially in the service industries. I think that is sadly neglected. In industries like that we need to get more union, more labour organization, not only for the sake of a few dollars and cents extra, although that is important, but for the general social benefits that will accrue from such organization

among various units in the labour force.

My question, Sir, having stated my own position on it, my question to the minister is; does the minister think that this is something which should just follow its natural course? Should there be sort of a laissez-faire attitude?

Allow people to unionize or become involved in labour organizations on their own, spontaneously, without either encouragement or discouragement? Or does the minister think that in Newfoundland today there is a need for the government actively to encourage, by the dissemination of information, by the use of staff in his department or by any other way, to try to get the people, who are working in the labour force of this province, as highly organized as possible, for their own good, for the sake of their own wages and to bring their wages up? I think that in Newfoundland, one of the things we have lacked, (I think the honourable minister worked for NARDA for a while on the Northwest Coast) in this province is organization, whether it be community organization, labour organization, rural development organization, the types of things, that without which this idea of participatory democracy so-called, has no meaning whatsoever.

I wonder if the minister could give us the benefit now of his position on that sort of thing. Whether he sees his role as the Minister of Labour, or the Minister of Manpower, whatever the enlarged department will be, as part of his role and the government's role to actively encourage this kind of organization? The previous administration, at least latterly, tried to get - the Department of Community and Social Development, for example, tried to get into the act of encouraging organization of rural development groups, by financial incentives and this sort of thing. I wonder if the Minister of Labour will take the same tack with regard to labour organization, where there will be some financial encouragement or some other encouragement, educational encouragement, information encouragement, in order to try to bring labour organization, the unionization in this province up to at least the average found across Canada?

If the minister is ready to answer those questions, I will resume my seat or I can warble on, as the case might be, while he is coming back.

MR. A.J. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, on this particular point, not wishing to

delay the discussion, I have heard some statements made but this last one must take the cake. The Minister of Labour has been more or less requested to act as a labour organizer. Are you going to discourage, are you going to encourage? The Department of Labour is there, I think set up more or less to mediate and advise on labour problems. I think if the honourable member is trying to delay time, he certainly hit the jackpot on that one there. What he expects the honourable minister to say, I do not know.

MR. W.N. ROWE: He may differ somewhat from the honourable minister.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to echo any words, but I do not think it is the function of the Department of Labour as such to participate in the act of organization of labour groups in the province. I have a background and I am well aware of it, I have been made aware of it, if I did not know it before, of organizing such groups as NARDA and as a matter of fact, I was the first business agent, organizer of the Newfoundland Fishermen's Union. But I do not think it is the function of the Department of Labour as such to actively participate in trying to organize people in the province. I do think it is the function of the Department of Labour to try to educate people in the province as to the advantages or disadvantages, if you will, or the general concepts of labour organizations.

If they are willing to be organized, if they want to be organized, I think it is our duty to tell them the exact laws, the rules, the regulations that apply to labour organizations in this province. I do not think it is our function, I do not think it ever will be our function under any administration to go out and try to organize the unorganized sector.

The Cohen Commission Report states that - I am not quite sure of the figures now, but I think it is that twenty-seven percent of the labour force in Newfoundland are organized. Personally, I think this is quite repulsive, because, being a former labour man, I think a great number of people should be organized and a much larger percentage.

It is not my function and it never will be my function to go out and organize these people. This organization and this grouping into organizations for the purpose of collective bargaining, is the purpose and the function of the various unions in the province. The Department of Labour exists at the present time to try to assist these unions and these organizations, the labour management groups and what have you, into reaching a mutual agreement whereby both parties can live together for a certain number of years and they can agree to a certain amount of wages and this sort of thing.

I think that at certain times the Department of Labour, if we are talking about labour, has to take on a much broader concept. I would be very, very disappointed, Mr. Chairman, if it did not take on a broader concept than it has at present. But in no way, even though I have some experience in organizing people into labour unions, in no way do I consider it a function of the Department of Labour to go out and organize these people. I consider it the function of the Department of Labour to assist these people in reaching a collective agreement if and when they do organize. Hopefully they will, but until such time as they do, I think the Department of Labour has to act as a labour department, not as a manpower department but as a labour department has to more or less stay out of the picture.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, contrary to what the Minister of Provincial Affairs had to say, I never suggested that the minister—

AN HON. MEMBER: They are all punch-drunk.

MR. ROBERTS: Better to be punch-drunk than the way some other honourable members are.

MR. ROWE: The minister — Mr. Chairman, can you obtain some order in here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. A.J. MURPHY: The honourable member has no cause to refer to any other member of the House, he is addressing the estimates. Carry on.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Is it all right?

MR. MURPHY: (First part inaudible) section twenty-seven.

MR. ROBERTS: And the honourable minister is sober, that is the strange part.

MR. ROWE: Yes, but the honourable minister is always like that.

I never suggested and I do not expect the Department of Labour to be - the Minister of Labour to be out organizing.

MR. MURPHY: What did you say then?

MR. ROWE: I do not expect the staff of the department to be out organizing. What I am talking about is the encouragement of organization. When we look at the figures of twenty-seven or thirty percent, as the minister himself has said, it is a pretty dismal figure to know that only twenty-seven or thirty percent or whatever it is of this province's labour force is organized in that fashion. What I am talking about is the encouragement of the department. Not the Department of Labour, because I couched my terms in the - couched my statement in the context of a department of manpower, an expanded department which is concerned with every facet of the manpower and labour market of the province.

I am glad to see that the minister is I think taking the right approach in the matter. There will be a dissemination of information and education, (the word the minister used) in order to bring home to people who are involved in the labour force the advantages or disadvantages, (I would say the stress would be on advantages) of organization of this sort. I hope that within an expanded Department of Manpower or an expanded Department of Labour, whatever it is called, that before too long, in another three, four, five or six years we will see the amount of unionization or labour organization in the province up to somewhere around the average that we have in the rest of Canada. I think that Newfoundland as a province and the people involved in it will benefit directly as a result. I am glad to see that the minister is at least leaning in that direction.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, before we move on, I asked the honourable minister for his comments and I would like to add to the question. I mentioned briefly the manpower programmes in Newfoundland and the inadequacies of them. I would like the honourable minister to elaborate on what he feels the manpower centres contribute to the filling of jobs in this province, as well as the legislation that he brought in. He mentioned legislation with regard to fitting Newfoundlanders into particular jobs especially in the Labrador area. He branded the people or the construction companies in Labrador as being the biggest offenders, of not abiding by the regulations or legislation that was put into force when those particular jobs start.

I would like to hear the honourable minister's comments on what monitoring control should be set up. I sincerely feel that there is a lack of control. If you make laws but do not enforce them, what good are the laws? I think this is basically the situation that he was getting at. Does the honourable minister feel that his department should be enforcing the labour regulations and the agreements that are set up? Possibly he should add additional staff to his department to do these particular jobs or functions. There is a need for it. There is not a need for it to be out of this particular office or out of this building. I sincerely believe that there is a need for field workers in this respect. So that the honourable minister can do his job properly, he needs good people in the field to report directly to him or his deputy on what is taking place.

We only do things on a piecemeal basis. If all of a sudden the media comes up and says that there is less than sixty percent Newfoundlanders hired on the Churchill jobs, government automatically collect two or three people and go on a fact finding mission. I do not think this is the way to administer legislation that is brought in in this province, Sir. When people sit in the Chamber here they should not act as irresponsible as some of the actions have been here tonight. I think legislation is a serious thing. It is going to pilot this province and

the livelihood of the people of this province along for a number of years. We make the legislation but people on the streets have to live with it. In our wisdom, we should have some means of monitoring that legislation. In this instance, I think it has been suffering from the lack of monitoring for a long time.

I agree, Mr. Chairman, I do not have any arguments with what went on in the past. I am not looking back, I personally would like to look ahead and hope that there is going to be something worth-while done. I would like to hear the minister's comments in this respect.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman,

MR. WOODWARD: I did not yield, Mr. Chairman, I asked for the minister's comments.

MR. MURPHY: I did not ask anybody to yield. Are you finished your question? Then I will take my turn to speak. I am a member of this House the same as anybody else. Is the member finished or not?

MR. WOODWARD: I did not finish, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MURPHY: Well, all right.

MR. WOODWARD: I would like for you to rule on this, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, with reference to the remarks of the honourable gentleman, look, after spending time in this House and bringing the same matters up year after year, day after day, with regard to Churchill Falls and the arrogant bunch on this side completely ignoring you, now he wants to know what this minister is going to do. Who created the monster? Who created the monster that is labour regulations? We appointed big men there and everything else. This kind of bull is a lot of wasted time and stupid, stupid!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, with respect to that, the honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs took the night off, of course. He did not hear his colleague the Minister of Labour in his opening remarks or in reply to—

MR. MURPHY: In his opening remarks? I am speaking about...

MR. ROBERTS: In reply to one of the questions that were raised: At one point during the committee session overnight the Minister of Labour went out of his way to say that the labour incentive worked very well at Churchill Falls. I remember him.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the argument now then?

MR. ROBERTS: My colleague from Labrador North is raising a different point. The gentleman from St. John's Centre, Mr. Chairman, has leaped into the fray boots and all, The only problem is that his colleague the Minister of Labour, who has done quite a good job of piloting the estimates through...

MR. MURPHY: Hear! Here!

MR. ROBERTS: He has done a good job. If the Minister of Provincial Affairs could do one half as well, he would be doing very well indeed.

MR. MURPHY: Mine went through, I do not think they are still hung up.

MR. ROBERTS: No, he has gotten through, I agree more out of sympathy than anything else. What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that the Minister of Labrador Affairs has jumped into the breach, boots and all. He has gone out of port, riding in all directions at once. The Minister of Labour has said -

MR. MURPHY: What item are we on, Mr. Chairman?

MR. ROBERTS: We are on the minister's salary.

MR. MURPHY: Are you going to cut his salary?

MR. ROBERTS: No, we are not going to cut his salary. I would like to be able to increase it. I would gladly take it off the honourable gentleman's salary because he is overpaid. The Minister of Labour is worth every cent, every nickel, every dollar. What I am saying is that the Minister of Labrador Affairs has just leaped into the breach and made a speech in (He waved his hands metaphorically. He did not do it actually) which he sort of said that the Churchill thing was such a bad thing.

MR. MURPHY: I did not say that.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, yes he did, Mr. Chairman. I heard him. That is what he said. The Minister of Labour earlier referred to the Churchill Project as being in many ways a model project. I think I am quoting him. He said, "it is the agreement in particular." He referred to the Statutory Agreement between the people of this province, the government, the House and CLFCo. and the subsidiary agreement between the Brinco companies and Hydro-Quebec and so forth. It is the same point that my colleague from White Bay South made the other day when the Minister of Finance got off one of his diatribes. All I am merely saying, that it is too bad that the Minister of Provincial Affairs did not join us here in our little tea party overnight. We would have been spared his speech and I would have been spared this one now.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, in respect of the hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Labrador Affairs, I feel that in my remarks there was nothing derogatory towards the Minister of Labour or for that matter the government as such. What I did say was the fact that as the minister stated, there was legislation brought in which he felt was ample to look after the particular

Mr. Woodward

jobs concerned. Then again the legislation was not enforced or monitored. The question that I asked the honourable minister: "What are his views and his policies that his department will set forth?" I would like to hear it in this House, Sir. What are his views as far as monitoring the employment situation and fitting as many Newfoundlanders into those particular jobs? It is a concern. It is a concern to all the people of this province. The hon. Minister of Labrador Affairs would not know, Sir. He has not lived on those yachts. He would not know. You do not hear it around St. John's. He is not living on his yacht. It is very pronounced in the construction camps among our Newfoundland people. I do not think I should bother to pay any attention to the honourable minister, Sir. He is not concerned about his job. Maybe he is not willing to fill the job. I asked the honourable minister previously, in the debate earlier, and his views were that there was a lot left to be desired of the manpower situation. I personally feel the same way. I would again direct a question to the hon. Minister of Labour on how he would like to see manpower set up in this province. It is dealing with the jobs of our people, Sir, and the people are depending on that manpower centre. If there are inadequacies in that system, this province has the responsibility to correct those inadequacies. I would like to hear the minister's views on how his policy would be to monitor these jobs and see that Newfoundlanders are fitted into most of these jobs?

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, I regret that I did not answer the honourable member's question the first time it was asked. Maybe I am a little bit fuzzy at this time of the morning, I am not sure. "What are my views as to full employment for Newfoundlanders in Newfoundland and to the manpower problem?" I think I have to state, Mr. Chairman, quite clearly and without reservation, that Canada Manpower may be doing the job that they were set up to do but they are not doing the job that we require in Newfoundland. Regardless of what repercussions that has, I have to state it because I have experienced it so many times. What is the option? The option open is for us as a government to try to fill the gap. This is what we will try to do. We will try and fill the

Mr. Maynard.

gap probably first of all by regulations, regulating the number of employees, if you will, from outside Newfoundland that can be employed by any industrial project in the province. That probably is a way. Let us look at the number of Newfoundlanders who have been employed in industrial projects in the province. We take the top one, Come by Chance, ninety-four per cent Newfoundland employment. The Linerboard Mill at Stephenville is number two in line, eighty-one per cent. The Churchill Falls Corporation is number three in line which has from sixty-five to seventy-five per cent (Perhaps Mr. Rousseau can correct me on this if I am wrong) over a period of three years. We may be able to say that this is not enough. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, it is not enough for me. The question arises quite simply: Do we have the technical expert personnel that are necessary to have ninety-five or ninety-six per cent employment in the Come by Chance Project? The answer is simply no.

Let us assume that in two years from now (I said, "assume.") the Lower Churchill or some other power project similar to Churchill Falls is developed and the hypothetical question arises: Do we at that time have enough trained expert personnel to handle that project? The answer is no. I submit, Mr. Chairman, we are failing in our training programmes. I am not suggesting that we have failed as a government, as a group but our policy in training has failed. If we know now that a certain power development is going ahead, if we know how many electricians are going to be required, how many tractor drivers, how many shovel operators, how many generator technicians or what ever have you on that power project and we do not make an attempt at this time to provide these people, then essentially we have failed. The new concept of the Department of Labour (I use the name "Labour" very loosely because I think it is only for a few days more that it is going to be called the Department of Labour) is to try in every possible way to provide the personnel, if they are not already available then to train them for any future projects. How do we analyze future projects? Obviously we do not in

Mr. Maynard

the Department of Labour analyze future projects or the requirements of personnel in future projects in this province unless we are in direct and constant consultation with the Department of Economic Development. If the Department of Economic Development does not know what is going on, God help us! We have to be in constant consultation with them and based on their forecast and their assessment of future projects and future developments in this province, it is up to the Department of Labour to say that this is what we need. This is what we will provide a year from now, two years, three years, five years or what ever the case might be. But be prepared to gear our technical and vocational training to that and to provide the people (whether or not they went to vocational school is not the issue but whether or not they are qualified is the issue) for it.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the minister for his remarks. I would like to at this time inform the House of a particular incident that happened in Labrador. I am sure that the hon. member for Labrador West is aware of this particular situation. During the opening of Churchill Falls there were a number of people employed to help and assist with the opening ceremonies and to take care of the nine hundred and some odd guests that were to arrive at the site. Those people were not experts, Mr. Chairman. Those people were in a sense catering type people, people to conduct traffic, people to do other odd jobs which were not skilled jobs in any sense of the word. Did the CFLCo. come to Newfoundland and pick up the unemployed and fly them into Churchill Falls and then in turn bring them back to Newfoundland to their homes in either some central location like Gander or St. John's? No, Sir, this did not happen. They brought in over two hundred and some odd employees from Montreal. I am not disputing the fact that the intentions are not good. The intentions can be as good as they like but if you do not have someone there on this particular job site to monitor what is going on and to say to the CFLCo. people; "we know your need. We know that you are going to take on 200 or 300 people." Your employment agency says to the honourable minister, "this is what is taking place, Sir." Only then can you correct the situation of that nature. That situation has been going on not

Mr. Woodward

only in this - there are things creeping in, Sir. I can cite you numerous cases where there are a number of people who have crept in and taken jobs away from Newfoundlanders on this particular job. I know it first hand because I lived with it. I have a number of people, a lot from the coastal communities, who do not have the opportunities or the facilities whereby they can go to the Manpower centre or the Manpower counsellors or they do not have mobile units travelling into communities and explaining the Manpower Programme. The Manpower Programme is a very comprehensive programme, Mr. Chairman. It is a very comprehensive programme. It is a programme that not only involves the employment of people, they have mobility moves. They have other programmes that people can take advantage of but very few people around this island know that there is such a programme. When the honourable minister mentioned an educational programme to educate the populus of this province as far as the Department of Labour is concerned and to sell that particular programme, I suppose in a sense you sell the Department of Labour Programme or any particular programme as the Manpower are selling their particular programmes to this province - there is, Sir, a need for this type .

of education centres but as a number of other things have taken place, that the people closest to wherever the centre is, the people that enjoy it, and when you do not have any centres and you only have an office like the office of the Minister of Labour here in St. John's, the people in the far stretched areas of this province have little opportunity to learn what is going on in this particular case.

So I am pleased with the answers from the honourable minister. He did not give me a satisfactory comprehensive plan as to how he would monitor this particular situation, Sir. I do not know how it can be done. I do not know if you do it through regional offices. We went through the estimates here tonight, with the Municipal Affairs bringing in the great cry, the great screech, and I believe in it. It is funny but I do. Is regional government bringing government to the people?

As we go through those estimates and we see the lack of communications between the centres and the people in the outlying areas, I see a need, I see a need for senior officials in regional offices throughout this province and people in closer contact with the government departments, even the Department of Labour, Sir. If your department is responsible for monitoring the industrial projects in this province and getting Newfoundlanders into the jobs that they are qualified to do, then you must have people in the field and people who are going to explain this particular programme and people who are going to sit down at the same level as industry and say to industry, Sir, after the legislation has been brought in here, "these are the regulations, this is what you are going to do," and you do it on a day to day basis.

Then you have a weapon, Sir. If they do not abide by this legislation, then you can throw the book at them, as it is used in law. So the wheels are all set up there, but the big lack, Sir, the big lack as in everything else, the honourable Minister of Labrador Affairs, one of the greatest procrastinators of this, Cabot Apartments.

MR. MURPHY: What is Mr. Conway doing up there?

MR. WOODWARD: Well Mr. Conway is the same thing, Sir.

MR. MURPHY: ...Liberal, did nothing for anybody.

MR. WOODWARD: Did the same thing.

I do not want it overnight. I am not sitting, Mr. Chairman, unless you rule me out of order.

MR. ROWE (WM.): Mr. Chairman, are you going to maintain order in the committee, Sir? Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Mr. Chairman, are you going to maintain order in the chamber.

MR. MURPHY: I do not care what kind of a point of order it is.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, are you going to allow the honourable minister to get away with this kind of abuse of the rules of the House? Mr. Chairman, I ask you to enforce the rules of the House and to permit my colleague, the member for Labrador North, to speak in silence.

MR. WOODWARD: I appreciate the honourable Chairman having a long, weary night, we have all had it, Sir. I express my views on this, Mr. Chairman, and I am concerned and I am sincere. The things that I have said here Sir, I am sincere in, I think there is a lack. There is a great lack.

I think that the ministers, as I have said before, could do a better job if they had more people, competent people in the field to enforce the legislation that is brought in in this House. I think it is an exercise that is useless, worthless, to sit down here at the expense of the people and bring in legislation in this province that is not monitored. When I think in terms of labour, that is the prime case. There is no monitoring system set up to enforce that legislation.

MR. MURPHY: You can say that for five years.

MR. WOODWARD: I have conducted myself.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The honourable gentleman from Labrador North will be heard. He is entitled to a hearing.

MR. WOODWARD: I have conducted myself in what I consider a constructive way, Sir. I believe in doing this in this particular House.

I appreciate the minister's patience. I feel that the views that I have brought before the House on the Labour estimates, Labour is an important department. The functions that exist now, I hope that the minister is sincere when he thinks in terms of changing the department. Labour can be defined in many ways and possibly it is not the right name or nomenclature for the particular department, Sir. But I am pleased with the minister's answers, Mr. Chairman, and if he would care to elaborate, he has tried his best, a little more on how we would set up policies, control on legislation to see that it is enforced, then I will be happy.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, the policies and regulations are a very complex thing. I am not at the present time willing to state the policies of the Newfoundland Government regarding the things that the honourable member has talked about. We are working on that. We have researched the things that are indicated in the regulations. I might say they are quite restricted. If the Quebec Government ever really enforced 100% the regulations they have, it would probably be a disaster to the maritime provinces, maybe not in Newfoundland but it would be disastrous to the other maritime provinces.

Maybe they do not, I think there is a certain amount of leeway in it. We do not at this time think that strictly controlled regulations are the answer. We think that a certain amount of regulations and a certain amount of friendly, if you will, persuasion. A combination of both is somewhat the answer. Now that may not work, but if it does not work, we certainly have the regulations to set down by an Order in Council in Quebec. We have a copy, very restrictive I might say, and if honourable members want a copy, I would certainly provide them with it tomorrow, but there is no copying machine open tonight I am sure.

We could bring in those regulations very easily but we are aiming at, as I said before, a two-pronged approach, first of all regulations providing for security for Newfoundland labour but mainly and most important of all, a provision for training Newfoundland labour. I do not think it is enough and I know the honourable members in this House will agree it is not enough to say we must employ Newfoundland people. The thing that we must do is employ Newfoundland people at the highest rates available. Therefore we have to train them so that they can take advantage of the labour that is created in the province. Is there another question the honourable member would like me to answer?

I would like to point out at this time that in my humble opinion, Mr. Chairman, Labrador and Newfoundland is one unit. I consider it the same.

MR. WOODWARD: If I may add a few comments to the minister's last remarks: I am in complete agreement with him, Mr. Chairman, but by saying it does not necessarily make it so. This is not necessarily the case. If you say they are one, this does not necessarily make it so. Labrador and Newfoundland will become one at such time as they have the equal treatment that we have been asking this House to give.

MR. MAYNARD: That is right, Sir.

MR. GILLET: Mr. Chairman, I have been listening all night to the various arguments put forth, I was particularly interested in the fact that when construction companies, and I think we were referring mainly to the large construction companies and perhaps those from another province, when they come into the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, whether it be on the island portion or the mainland portion of the province, and when they are looking for employees, particularly heavy equipment operators, they specify that they must have four or five years experience. Now they have a reason for that, we all know that. They have a reason for that and this is their reason - productivity.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the key which will unlock the door to Newfoundland's future is productivity. I think that Newfoundland is behind in productivity. I think the maritime provinces are behind in productivity.

We have here in the paper this morning, "The Dockyard May Close Because Of The High Operating Cost," that spells one word - productivity. I can see the handwriting on the wall for the shipyard in Marystown. I do not know if anybody else here has a ship but I have. My ship just came off the dry dock in Marystown last week and I received the bill. She had a little bit of work done to her bows and a tail shaft, what that bill represents more than fifty per cent of the market value of the entire ship and for another \$15,000 I could have purchased the motor vessel "O. K. II", how this is productivity?

Unfortunately it is the first time that that ship has ever been on dock without my being there from the time she was lifted until she was put back again.

AN HON. MEMBER: You have got to be joking, have you not?

MR. GILLETT: No, I am not joking.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you sure?

MR. GILLETT: Productivity.

AN HON. MEMBER: Fifty per cent of the cost of the ship.

MR. GILLETT: More than fifty per cent of the market value of the ship, at Marystown.

I will give you one instance. One example, we required forty feet of one and a half inch galvanized pipe, salt water pipe, to put on her deck, my engineer had no pipe dies, so I said, "okay, I will get the dock yard to put it there," \$950, for forty feet of one and a half inch galvanized pipe, A three kilowatt generator was taken ashore and cleaned up, I paid \$25 for the generator because I did not want to invest \$300 in a brand new one, and the bill for that was \$410.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not bad.

MR. GILLET: No, no to clean it, to take it out and clean it - \$410.

I think a Royal Commission should be set up to investigate what goes on up there and I have heard complaints from every ship owner in Newfoundland who has ever gone there. I went into the shed the one day I was up there, there were about thirty men there, and if there were any more than ten men working, there were one hundred.

The first year I went into that shipyard I was impressed with it, it was in 1969, my ship went there. I said to two or three of the men there that day, I said, "this is the best shipyard on the eastern seaboard barring none, Marystown cried out for an industry, and the government put it here, you are not going to have it if you do not produce," and they pretty nearly lost it, did they not? But it did not teach them a lesson

MR. GILLET: Now I had not intended to bring this before this House at all. I had a feeling of what was going on. When I was home the night before last and my brother-in-law gave me the invoice, boy! I am telling you, it made my blood boil. So I think, Mr. Chairman, that our biggest problem in Newfoundland in labour today is productivity, I think everybody agrees. We are not all - perhaps I will be blasted all over the island for saying this, I just have to.

I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to have the opinion of our Minister of Labour on productivity. Why I ask this is because - I have a reason for asking this, Mr. Chairman, I have a reason for asking this, because it is very softly and gently put into the Speech from the Throne. I just hope that Newfoundland gets the message. I got it. What was the term used? Per capita. "Increased per capita productivity. I hope they got the message, I did.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder before the minister deals with this matter, I would like to say a few words on the matter that the honourable member has brought up concerning the Marystown Shipyard. I would like to ask the honourable gentleman, and I do not mean to imply anything by this, other than by saying I hope the words will be taken in the good spirit in which they are given. I would like to ask the honourable member whether he received or requested a quotation as to what the work which he requested to have done was likely to cost at the shipyard?

Now I ask this purely and simply because in my field, which is law, and in many other fields of endeavour, on many occasions there are things which people want done which for some reason or other and in the place that the honourable member was speaking of maybe because of the difficulty involved in doing the job or the type of job, it often becomes a question of the the job. It was a repair job, costing more than it is worth. In other words, we will often have the occasion where we bring an automobile to a garage and we will ask that it be repaired. Normally we will ask before the work is done; "how much it is going to

MR. BARRY: cost?" And it is not unusual, in the case of an older automobile particularly, in the case of a new one if it has been in an accident, it is not unusual at times for the work, the planned work to cost more than the automobile is worth. You are into dollars and cents. You are into men being employed, a certain number of men, for a certain number of hours, at a certain hourly rate. You are into plant and equipment being tied up and being applied to a job for a certain number of hours at a certain rate. To be more specific with respect to the Marystown Shipyard, my understanding was that the rates that were charged for local vessels, as opposed to foreign vessels, for repairs on local vessels, my understanding was that the rates were not competitive, they were too low. I am not too familiar with the way in which the rates were drawn up or why they differ for local and foreign repairs, but my understanding of the work being done at the yard, particularly over the past year, has been that the yard has developed a very good reputation with respect to getting ships in and out as quickly as possible. This I understand is the name of the game, as far as ship owners are concerned, in many cases because if a ship is tied up it is costing money. The yard is attracting more and more business everyday because the word is spreading that the yard does a good job and that a ship that goes in there will not be unduly delayed.

But as I understood it and this is hearsay, I have not seen the books of the company but as I understood it from fairly reliable sources connected with the yard, the work that was done by the yard on local repairs was resulting in either a loss or just a break-even proposition, I am not quite sure what the case. But the repairs done on foreign vessels were proving very remunerative. My understanding was that there were two different rates drawn up and being charged. As I understand, it is just a matter of the local rate not having been brought into line from the time it was first put out a couple of years ago. It was just never revised and at the time it was put out,

MR. BARRY: it was too low.

I say this and I raise these points only because I am concerned that a particular case, such as the honourable member's, might draw unwarranted bad publicity, adverse publicity to the Marystown Shipyard. And if this is not deserved, then I think a great injustice is being done to an industry which I believe every honourable member in this House should encourage and should do everything possible to ensure that it will be a success because it is the type of industry I believe that we need more of in Newfoundland.

But the danger is there. I am sure the honourable member must have a legitimate complaint or definitely one that is deserving an explanation. However, I would hate to see an isolated incident because of some reason, whether it be an omission to clarify exactly how much work was to be done, an omission to clarify exactly what the expected cost was and perhaps the honourable member would not have had the work done if it were going to cost as much as it turned out.

But I would hate to see an isolated incident draw adverse publicity which would impair the amount of work or detract from the amount of work which is likely to come to the yard either from local ship owners or from foreign ship owners. Because it is my understanding that the work now being done in the Marystown Shipyard is as good as you will find in any shipyard in the world, that the morale of the men in the yard is high, that the efficiency is good, that their productivity is good. I can confess that I am greatly amazed to hear of the honourable member's case and I say that I believe that this is an isolated incident and I would definitely like to have further information. Maybe the honourable member can supply it. The only reason I speak is to try and point out the danger of creating an unfavourable image on a thriving industry because of what may be an isolated incident that may have arisen because of some omission or other or have been compounded by failure by the owner or an individual at the yard, on this one isolated occasion.

MR. BARRY: So I would ask the honourable member if there is anything that he could clarify on the point as to whether he got a quote, whether he realized the extent of the work? We all know I think the danger of cost-plus contracts, I am just saying okaying this amount of work whether it will be the Marystown Shipyard, the garage who takes your automobile, the lawyer you go to or anybody else that writing a blank cheque inevitably I think results in a higher price than you probably expect to pay.

But I would ask the honourable member if there is something that briefly he could state to clarify this and if not I hope that at a later date we will get further information on the point.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, I do not think the honourable member would mind for a moment, I believe we are entirely out of order in discussing this. I think we all appreciate the facts of the honourable member, Sir. May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable member bring his case, I would say to the department concerned and bring his invoices. Because you know we could go on now, perhaps. I can see the honourable member's case, I can see the honourable member for the district wanting to sort of save face or redeem his own project down there, but I think we might get into a hassle on this, Sir, so all I suggest is, if it is in order, that we could stop it here now.

MR. ROWE, W.N. I believe there was a point of order raised. On the point of order, I intend to agree completely with the honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs on this matter. The only thing that I would suggest is, since the member for Placentia West has raised a point or two on which he wants clarification, I wonder would it be in order for the honourable member to say a word or two and then we will cease and desist on it, as far as I am concerned.

MR. MURPHY: So long as we do not get into a general discussion on it.

MR. GILLET: Very briefly. Actually as I said before I had no

MR. GILLET: intention of bringing it up. I intended to fight this out with the shipyard and with the man up in the top in the shipyard, whom I have not met.

In answer to the honourable member's question, for Placentia West, yes, a part of that work was contracted, because it was an insurance job. A firm price was given. Those prices were approved by Lloyd's surveyor and I have no quarrel there. The only quarrel I have is that because the prices were so high my insurance premium automatically goes up and I pay for it in the end. The other jobs were my jobs and as I have said, because I was not there, up she went. I just talked with the people on the phone. I asked them, when I was up there, "I am sorry we put this piece of pipe in, not dreaming it was going to cost \$950." I asked them to clean up the generator, not dreaming it was going to cost \$410. They cleaned up another one that they billed me \$1,350 for, because I was not there, I could not get a contract price on them. I could not question them on it. It was contracted. I think what the honourable member has in mind is that most jobs that are done at the shipyard are contracted. A firm price is given. I agree with him there. Had I been on the scene

and ask them for a price on putting this piece of pipe in and they said \$950, I could have gone up to a store, bought the pipe, bought a set of dies and have my own engineer put it in.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I did not give the minister or the honourable member from Placentia West did not give the minister a chance to answer my question. To ask his opinion on productivity in Newfoundland generally. On motion total subhead 1601 carried.

Shall 1602-01 carry?

MR.W.ROWE: On -02-08 does the honourable minister have the actual figure of expenditure for last year, \$600 revised about half way through the year, what was actually spent for computer services?

MR.MAYNARD: I am not quite sure maybe I could look it up in a few minutes but I believe the actual figure spent was \$600. Would the honourable member care to -

On motion total subhead 1602 carried.

Shall 1611-01 carry?

MR.W.ROWE: Mr. Chairman, this seems to be, I do not know too much about the history of this particular vote. This seems to be a motley type of figure, \$400 revised estimate, than \$700, I think a very precise estimate. Could the minister say what this involves?

MR.MAYNARD: Which one is this?

MR.W.ROWE: Minimum Wage Board, Mr. Chairman, I think we are on.

MR.MAYNARD: Well, the estimates for last year was \$400. We are hoping to, in this year make a little bit more or take more advantage of the minimum wage board if I might say so. They get a per diem allowance and we are hoping they will meet more often this year.

MR.W.ROWE: On 1611-03, Mr. Chairman, do they pay their salaries out

of the trust fund or the funds of the board?

MR.MAYNARD: It seems that every year there is a token amount voted for the Workmen's Compensation Board. It is always \$100. I do not know if it is traditional or what because they are always self-sustaining in their whole operation. We do have a vote for it in the event something happens.

MR.WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, on the Workmen's Compensation Board where there is legislation as to the function of the particular board but the fees charged for the different types of industry in the number of cases is that the fees are considered to be high in the number of fields of industry. I would ask the honourable minister--I do not suppose he has any of his officials here from the board to give him any technical advice as to how the scale is set for the Workmen's Compensation Board. I know it is a revenue-making body. They turn in more revenue than the expense of running the particular board. I do not know if this is a fair thing to the province or it is a fair thing to industry. It is the , the rate is based normally on your payroll. There are percentages of payroll in different fields of industry, where you pay as high as four per cent of your gross payroll through Workmen's Compensation. This is not necessarily based, it is not treated, any particular accident in this respect is not treated as a separate entity. The different classes of industry are, I do not know how it is done, I guess grouped together then the amount of compensation paid out in one form or another, the rate is somehow set in that respect.

I was wondering if the minister could advise the committee as to how the particular rates are set for different types of industry? It fluctuates from seventy cents per hundred payroll up to four per

cent of the total payroll. It is a big fluctuation there. I do not think that the total overall concept of the industry in this province is taken and grouped together and says this is what you are going to pay. I think one industry is penalized, because of the nature of that industry, whereas another industry in effect they do not pay the rates that they should be paying.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, I do not know, I cannot say the natural criteria used for this particular time. I do know that different types of industries are set on different basis. The way that we assess them in Newfoundland is pretty well scattered across the Dominion of Canada and as a matter of fact North America. The amount of assessment also, in most cases, depends on the accident records of that particular industry.

This is a very complex formula which I would not like to try to relate at this time because I do not have it at my disposal. But I would if the honourable member requires it, I would undertake to give this -

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, if I may there are loopholes in the system. There are a number of flaws that I consider to be in the system in your rating or classification of different industries as set by the Board, and they apply the rates. Now, a small industry that is involved in the same type of business that a large industry is, say for instance the ERCO plant where there could be a number of very serious industrial accidents, this rate is applied to another small industry of the same nature, where the accident rate at that particular plant or the compensation could be very, very high. Consequently, the small industry would not have any compensation but they would pay the rate applicable to what that industry pays. I do not think it is fair. I do not know how the rates are set. I do not know if you have an appeal board or who sets the rates in this particular

case. Do you have a board as such? Is there a ministerial board that sits in on the rating and the structure of it? Or is it left up to the director of the compensation board to set the level of remuneration?

MR. MAYNARD: Within reason, I say within reason because a Crown Corporation such as the Workmen's Compensation Board is always subject to government approval. But within reason, the Workmen's Compensation Board, which consists of three members, have the right to set assessment rates based on what they consider will give them at least a reasonable return, that is not to say a profit but a reasonable return on the amount they pay out in workmen's compensation benefits or whatever. They have a very complex system of rate structure which, as I say, I am unable to relate to you at this time.

There is a certain amount of merit - if you do not have so many accidents and this sort of thing. There is, if you are thinking about a specific disaster, shall we say, such as ERCO, if you want to call that a disaster, it does not really drive the rate up suddenly all that much to all industry, because there are a certain reserve kept in the disaster fund.

This reserve in the disaster fund which is able to absorb so much - now if the disaster is such a magnitude that, you know, thousand people involved well then obviously there is a disaster fund. An accident fund cannot absorb that much, therefore something has to give, either the assessment to industry or a new input from the consolidated fund or whatever. But they do reserve I think it is approximately a million and a-quarter dollars in an accident fund, to more than take care of emergencies. So, every accident you see at ERCO or some other industry does not necessarily drive the assessment rate up, because that can be absorbed. It is only

if it is a major disaster, let us say for instance the St. Lawrence disaster which did not drive the assessment up but was of such a magnitude that it really - it certainly reduced the amount of latitude that the board had in its accident fund, this sort of thing. But this is a major disaster and only happens probably once in a hundred years. So, ordinarily the assessment to industry is increased more or less on the basis of the increase cost of the wages that you are paying or whatever. If you increase your wages, which I hope you do by the way, -

MR. WOODWARD: I appreciate the honourable minister's comments, Mr. Chairman. Maybe it is unfair, I have noticed over the last two to three years there have been great increases in costs in, and it is applicable to most of the classes of industry. As far as the rating structure of the board is concerned, the rating structure itself is not that complex because of the fact that it is a very small pamphlet and there is a grouping, I do not know, maybe in the whole rating structure there are somewhere in the vicinity of ten or twelve different types of industries in the province. So, I would, maybe the honourable minister at some time, if he would supply me with the information as to how the rate structure is set. I think this is what I am primarily concerned about. I am concerned about the escalation in costs. There is, I would also like to know what type of reserve fund is set aside. If they are building into a reserve to meet at some future date some unforeseen accidents - like the St. Lawrence disaster, where you get into some heavy expenditures. Maybe there is a fund being set aside. I do not know if you go for a certain number of years until you build up a certain reserve then the rate goes down.

I know that the board itself is at no cost to the government as such. The token vote in here is merely I suppose to get the thing into the estimates. It is a self-supporting board. You have a number of good business people

on the board. I do not know if they are building a reserve. But maybe this is the questions that the honourable - my colleague here says there are millions in it - I do not know if this is the case or not. There could be . I do not know what would happen in the case of, how responsible the board would be in the event that a ship went down at sea and there were a number of - I do not know the implications of it.

I am concerned about it. I think industry in this province are concerned about it. I think that when you get an escalation in cost when you do get an escalation in cost and it keeps repeating itself year after year there is some concern about it. I think the House should be made aware of, this committee, as to how the restructure is set forth.

MR. GILLET: Mr. Chairman,

Mr. Gillett:

I do want to speak on this heading not for the same reason, although I am concerned too. Our rates are five per-cent and what always hurts me is that we have to pay five per-cent on the food they eat too because that is considered as their gross pay and God knows food is expensive as it is. The one important thing that I wanted to bring before the House, Mr. Chairman, is I am wondering if there is any possible way of getting workman's compensation for fishermen per se. When I say fishermen per se I mean inshore fishermen. I think perhaps it could be arranged on the same basis as unemployment insurance for instance and there again I know you come into this realm of the employer and the employee. But I think myself that any fishermen and all fishermen in Newfoundland would be very pleased, I think and they would welcome the opportunity to pay four per-cent of their gross earnings to be covered.

Now why I say this also, Mr. Chairman, is because last fall we had two family men, young men, drown. One had a wife and five children and the other had a wife and seven children and these men receives no compensation whatsoever. They are just at the hands of the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation whereas had they been employed on a dragger fishing they would automatically have been covered. I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to ask the honourable Minister of Labour if the government is considering or has considered some system of compensation for our fishermen per se.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, on that point, in case the honourable member has not read the Act I ask to introduce a couple of days ago, I suppose the copy of it is not around yet, but I ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting an amendment to the Workman's Compensation Act," and ironically that was the specific thing. We are amending the Workman's Compensation Act so that workman's compensation will be available to individual fishermen, individual farmers or individual persons on what-

ever basis. The only thing is, of course, as you say they will have, as their own employers and as self-employers, they will have to pay but it will be available to them as soon as this act is passed. Presumably the opposition will agree with the bill as such.

MR. ROBERTS: 1611(04) If Your Honour will excuse me, I have just finished a piece of toast but normally at eight o'clock in the morning one does have breakfast you know. It is just marked conciliation board and I do not know if that is a misprint for conciliation boards. Maybe it was a typographical error there. What does that cover and why is it down \$800.00? Is there any particular reason?

MR. MAYNARD: I think conciliation boards are quite well known to all honourable members on the opposite side or at least I hope they are. However we estimate I think all these lower than it actually cost because it is ever possible I do not think to estimate what exactly conciliation boards are going to cost throughout the year. I believe the honourable member from Bell Island will substantiate that, that you really do not know. You may appoint one board throughout the year or you may appoint a hundred. That depends on the circumstances involving the labour relations situation in the province.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, one of the problems that I saw when I was acting Minister of Labour was the fact that it was very difficult to get chairman for boards and it was very difficult to get arbitrators. There was a list in the department but it was very, very limited. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, if the minister were asked to appoint an arbitration board or a one-man arbitrator that the list that you had to draw from was probably about eight or ten names and most of those were concentrated in St. John's.

MR. MAYNARD: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, I am not criticizing the minister. This is not the minister's fault but I am wondering if the minister has been able to

expand that list and if he has been able to take in other parts of the province like Grand Falls, Corner Brook and Labrador, because most of the names that I saw on the list when I was acting minister were people who lived here in St. John's and mostly university people, because it is very difficult to get independent people to serve on these boards.

Could the minister comment on that?

MR. MAYNARD: Well I am afraid that we still have a predominant problem although we do have a couple of people in Corner Brook who are willing and able to serve on conciliation boards and have in the past couple of months. We have called on them quite extensively but I do not know if they are going to get tired of serving on conciliation boards and making no money outside of that. We have some people outside of St. John's who have served on arbitration boards, of course for the most part they are not our appointees. For the most part I have to agree with the member for Bell Island that the greatest number of people who are willing to serve, for some strange reason or another, come from this immediate area here. I am sure it is not the remuneration because this is the same no matter where you serve and the expenses are the same and what not.

The Labour Management Committee as set up in Newfoundland are trying to spread over the island and I would tend to leave it to them as to how far they can spread and how many people they can make available to us as a suggestion for appointment to this type of board.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, are we talking about the panel that was set up, I think two or three years back? Dr. Hattenhauer, Professor Hattenhauer was instrumental in setting up a panel of people who sort of stood by on tap. Am I on the right sort of wave length? I wonder how that is coming on and I wonder also one of the great conundrums in labour relations, there are a number and we touched on some when we began this at what amounted to the crack of dawn and now the sun is

coming up. The honourable members will be delighted to know, Mr. Chairman, that the morning weather forecast have featured the House of Assembly. The morning weather forecast have said that St. John's is in for fog -

MR. MURPHY: Speak to the subject.

MR. ROBERTS: I am speaking to the subject, as the honourable gentleman will realize, that St. John's is in for fog but for the cloud of hot air that has been seen over Confederation Building. So the DOT forecaster in Gander, conciliatory as he is -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: It is pretty hard to take him for real, is it not? The sad thing is he is a Minister of the Crown, it just shows something or other.

Mr. Chairman, to come back to one of the great conundrums of labour policy and everybody says the strike is outmoded but nobody has found a better way to resolve a labour management dispute than a strike. A strike is a normal part of the collective bargaining process.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I should hope the honourable gentleman never succeeds in lowering himself that way, to be the answer to that man. The strike is a normal part of a collective bargaining process. The minister who has been involved in a labour movement in years past and maybe in the future, I think would agree with that - a strike or a lockout, which is merely an employer's strike, is a way to resolve a situation. If it cannot be resolved across a bargaining table, then one hits the bricks. Now part of the process which must be followed in this jurisdiction and in every jurisdiction that I know of in Canada, before there can be a strike one goes through a conciliation officer who is an official of the minister's department and who I would assume inevitably and invariably is assigned to any dispute. He may or may not be invited in and he may or may not have anything to do but if there is a dispute that the parties cannot resolve

AN HON. MEMBER: He does not have to be invited.

MR. ROBERTS: No, he is there anyway. He does not have to be invited. They may not listen to him. There are situations, I submit, where people just say they are going to go on strike and they are just waiting for the time to run out. The conciliation boards, as I understand the legislation, are discretionary, the minister has it within his power whether or not he appoints them. I wonder if he could give us his views on two aspects of this, Mr. Chairman. First of all, what does he think about the suggestion which has been made, and I am not endorsing it, I am not contradicting it, I do not know enough one way or the other to be able to speak on it, that the conciliation board process be eliminated. In other words we would then have the situation that negotiations would be open, they would carry on. If they were not resolved, the conciliation officer would sit in and if he were not able to succeed in bringing the parties to agreement, as of that point a strike or a lockout would be lawful. Now a strike or a lockout is not lawful until either the minister has refused the conciliation board report and a number of days have lapsed or if there has been a board appointed by the minister, he has filed this report and again a number of days have lapsed. The conciliation board stage must be gone through.

But there is a school of thought, as Your Honour being a jurisprudence scholar, this type of thing, is aware. There is a school of thought which says we do not need conciliation boards, that they are an interference with the normal collective bargaining process. I would like to hear the minister's views on it, what he thinks. It is not the most urgent part of labour policy but it is an important part. Along those lines, maybe he could tell us as well how many conciliation boards there were in Newfoundland last year and again, as a matter of interest, did they succeed in the sense of how many disputes that got

to the conciliation board stage were resolved by the boards report or negotiations which arose out of the report and how many went through the conciliation board stage and led to a strike and were resolved following strike action or for that matter a lockout but more normally a strike.

Secondly, could the minister give the committee some indication of the guide lines he uses in employing the discretion granted to him by legislation, and I think wisely granted to him, as to whether or not he appoints a conciliation board? The minister will probably say at least in part that the largest, I think the largest factor, but if not, a large factor in his decision will be the recommendation of his officials. That is well but I would like to know what type of reasoning the officials follow in making recommendations. As I understand it, they always do make a recommendation, "minister, we recommend that in this case a board be appointed" or they say, "minister, in our view at this point there is no point in appointing a board." But I would like to know the sort of reasoning that goes on and just as a brief follow up to that how many requests were made for boards last year? How many were granted and how many were turned down? Is the question clear? I am interested in it and I think it is important.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr Chairman, I am afraid that right off the cuff I cannot give you the number of boards who were requested and the number that were granted. I will try to get it at a later date, if the honourable member will bear with me. The strike, to comment on the honourable member's first comments first, I suppose the strike is no doubt, as he says, a normal part of the bargaining process and I would imagine the legal strike

MR. MAYNARD:

It is here to stay and quite possibly the illegal strike is here to stay. The suggestion has been made that the conciliation board be eliminated. It is a very, very difficult one. There is no concise and real proof that the conciliation boards or conciliation officers are really effective. There is no evidence that they are ineffective. How do you measure the effectiveness or the ineffectiveness of conciliation officers or conciliation boards?

Since I became Minister of Labour, I think one of my first acts as Minister of Labour was to appoint a conciliation board on very controversial issues such as the Baie Verte Mines -

MR. ROBERTS: The steel workers.

MR. MAYNARD: Yes, the steel workers. Everybody was crawling down my neck.

MR. ROBERTS: It is not a comfortable feeling, is it?

MR. MAYNARD: They were piling on top of my desk saying that you are one so and so. You just appointed a conciliation board where no one else wants it.

MR. ROBERTS: Nothing succeeds like success.

MR. MAYNARD: Yes, it worked. I appointed a conciliation board since that and it has not worked. How do you measure whether a conciliation board or a conciliation officer is good or bad or successful or unsuccessful? That is something I do not know. Until we can get concrete evidence that a conciliation board is any good, then we are certainly going to have to retain that particular option as the minister may use at his discretion. As to how many were there in 1971 and how many succeeded, I would have to get the answers from the Labour Relations Board or the officials in the department. You ask me what are the guide lines for appointing conciliation boards. Again it is very, very difficult to define what the guide lines are. You have to take, first of all, I think that a conciliation board would normally be appointed where the possibility of a strike has a major effect on the local or regional economy of the area. Secondly, you would have to take into consideration whether or not the parties had agreed to negotiate or try to negotiate with the services of the conciliation officer. Normally, you appoint an officer first and then you wait

Mr. Maynard.

the required amount of time and then if there is nothing on the go or if the officer has met a certain period of time and he has not achieved anything, you either say yes or no to a conciliation board. If you say no, then you are giving leeway to a strike. If you say yes -

AN HON. MEMBER: Fourteen days.

MR. MAYNARD: Well there are time periods allowed but if you say no, you are giving them a certain period of time and either they strike or they have the legal right to strike and this sort of thing. The guide lines that are set down are purely a personal assessment, I would say.

MR. ROBERTS: By the minister or by ..

MR. MAYNARD: By the minister and based on, of course, always based on (I think any minister has to base his assessment on the advice of his officials) the advice of his officials. There are certain times I am sure and the hon. Leader of the Opposition is quite well aware of this, when the minister says, "I have the advice of my officials but -

MR. ROBERTS: It is the mark of a good minister, when you will do that. There are ministers who are prisoners of their officials.

MR. MAYNARD: Thank you very much! I have gone against the advice of my officials. Anyway, I have not always been right either.

MR. ROBERTS: Nobody is expecting a hundred per cent performance of any kind.

MR. MAYNARD: It is really a hard thing to define. I cannot really define it. The only specific answer that I can give to the honourable member's question is: How many were there? How many succeeded? I would have to go back and hunt up the records for it because I do not believe I have it here. As to whether conciliation boards should be eliminated or not, unless we can find something that can replace conciliation boards and do a better job, it is very, very unlikely that we will replace them or eliminate them. I would say that.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister should not be in such a hurry. His colleague is doing very well down there. I bet he would know how many cars the police have.

On motion 1611-04 carried.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I asked the minister earlier this morning about the industrial enquiry for the ERCO Phosphorous Plant at Long Harbour. I do not recall the minister commenting on that. Could he comment on that now?

MR. MAYNARD: The hon. member for Bell Island is determined to make me make a statement on this particular thing. Since he is so persistent (What time is it anyway? I have my watch strap broken) -

MR. ROBERTS: We have less than four hours.

MR. MAYNARD: Is it work time?

AN HON. MEMBER: Well I do not know. We are working.

MR. MAYNARD: That is fine. We will work all night. I do not have the exact dates here but I submit, Mr. Chairman, that since the question was asked I should answer it. It is a very serious question. This is something which has puzzled me for some time and the solution I am sure is going to puzzle me and my staff and other honourable members of this honourable House for a long time to come. Since some time in February, my staff (I am talking specifically about the Workmen's Compensation Board, Safety Division) devoted a considerable amount of time to dealing or trying to deal with the problems existing actually at the Electric Reduction Company of Canada Phosphorous Plant at Long Harbour. It is a famous name, ERCO and if I say ERCO, I can say no more. The problems there, as we have seen them, have been mostly safety and health hazards related to the industry and as well the state or the condition of labour management relations. We have tried in every way we knew how to solve the problems by using our own staff, by investigations by the safety division, the whole bit. I would like to point out that at this specific time I consider that as far as physical safety hazards are concerned a great deal of progress was made in eliminating these hazards. But by no means were all the problems cleared up. I think this is quite evident in the fact that in the last three weeks we have had or we have seen two major accidents related to the ERCO Plant. We have tried in every way, Mr. Chairman, to handle the thing with our own forces but it has come to the point now where it is (I am sure

MR. MAYNARD.

the hon. member for Bell Island realizes this because he has been involved in practically this type of situation) taking up more of my time and more of my staff's time than any other single issue in Newfoundland. I think the public of Newfoundland finally and I do it reluctantly - I think the public of Newfoundland require an answer as to what is going on. I am not saying that I do it reluctantly because I do not want to supply the information to the public of Newfoundland. I am saying that I am reluctant to appoint or conduct or instigate any sort of an investigation because I do not like investigations. They are things that are only a last resort. We have at this time reached the final position as far as ERCO is concerned. I, therefore, Mr. Chairman, say that we are today (I say, we, as a government)

appointing an industrial Enquiry commission under Section 54 of the Labour Relations Act. The commissioner will be asked to inquire into all aspects of labour relations as well as safety and health hazards existing at the ERCO Plant and to make appropriate recommendations related to the problem.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I thank the honourable minister for giving me the answer to that question. I am been pressing for sometime in this House, as honourable members know, to determine whether or not the government were going to accede to the request of the union in Long Harbour to have an industrial inquiry set up to investigate the safety and health hazards at the ERCO Phosphorous Plant. The honourable minister might have felt at times that I was bugging him. One day I asked a question in the House about the enquiry. The honourable minister gave his answer. I think he was very honest and frank and sincere. It was an honest answer, Sir, but sometimes your luck runs out. The minister, although he perhaps did not give the Phosphorous Plant a clean bill of health that day, came pretty close to it. Low and behold! Sir, that evening three employees of ERCO were sent to hospital in a serious accident. It was inside the plant. Then about two and a-half weeks later, Sir, three more employees were sent to hospital and in between that time I had asked at least on two or three occasions

Mr. Neary.

about the industrial enquiry. So, Sir, I am very, very pleased to learn that the minister in his wisdom -

MR. ROBERTS: I think we could ask - a quorum?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Clerk count the members?

MR. MURPHY: There are lots of members. What do you want?

It is spoiled again. It is spoiled again, Too bad.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Clerk inform the Chair that there is a quorum.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Chairman, it comes as good news, Sir -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is the honourable gentleman who wanted to carry on, look.

MR. NEARY: It comes as good news to me, Sir, that the minister has decided to set up this industrial enquiry. Of course, I kept pressing the minister, Sir, because I realized that this is a most serious situation. It is probably more serious than the minister or myself imagines. I think that in the terms of reference in that inquiry, Sir, that the underlining fact should be

health hazards. Because I have heard some strange stories about the health hazard in that plant, Sir. Mr. Chairman, I would hate to see a repeat of the St. Lawrence situation in Newfoundland. This could happen, Sir. I am not saying that it will. Maybe the plant will get a clean bill of health, I hope it does. I would hate to see a repeat performance of what happened in St. Lawrence. It took so long to determine what was causing the miners to die in St. Lawrence, and I am not trying to be an alarmist, Sir, I am not trying to frighten people, but it could happen. We have to find out now or it could be a worse situation.

I am told that the employees of the ERCO plant, when they go home in the evening, have to leave their coveralls and their work clothes outdoors. They have to leave them outdoors, Sir, otherwise, they would catch fire in the house. I am told, Sir, that some of the employees who have had occasion to visit doctors in Conception Bay, spitting blood, most cases when they are sent back to work are sent back with a note from the doctor that they are not to work in the plant, not to be exposed to phosphorous and they should be given an outside job for at least six months. I am told that they have to keep a dentist on the job twenty-four hours a day in Long Harbour. The moment an employee gets a cavity in his tooth, he has to be taken off the job and it has to be fixed right away because, (I do not know what they call it)

AN HON. MEMBER: Phossy jaw.

MR. NEARY: That is right, phossy jaw. The phosphorous gets down and eats away at the bone, Sir, and they call it phossy jaw. So, Sir, I welcome this news. If we accomplish nothing else by keeping this House open all night, we got this news twenty-five past eight this morning, that the industrial enquiry would be set up. I would hope that the minister will proceed with the selection of the board of enquiry at the earliest date possible.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I must say that I am also delighted that

the honourable minister has decided to set up this or conduct this enquiry into the plant at Long Harbour. It is just another example, in my estimation. I have the highest esteem for this honourable minister. In everything that he has put his hand to in the government, as far as I am concerned, he has taken a serious view of everything that has gone on. He has now taken this step in order to try to come to grips with the problems which are gnawing at everybody who has anything to do with that plant, the problems of safety in that particular industrial effort.

I am glad, not only for the reason mentioned by the honourable member for Bell Island, but for another reason. Some days ago, the honourable minister came into the House and stated that an accident which had taken place at that time was attributable to human error or human negligence rather than mechanical fault or lack of some safety feature. At that time, I nearly rose to make a comment but I did not. I think I will make it now, because, my mind harkens, back as I am sure Your Honour's mind harkens back, to some of the case law that developed during the development of industries in Great Britain during the Industrial Revolution, where there was always complaints against industries as to whether accidents were a result of the negligence of the employee or the negligence of the employer or because of an act of God, so-called, or because there was no safety feature involved or whatever.

It took a long time for the concept to develop that working men, men working in plants, are all not as careful as a perfect man would be in that situation. Gradually and gradually the laws became firmer and firmer where companies were forced by law, on pain of being found guilty of negligence or even of a criminal act, companies were forced to put in more and more safety features to protect workmen, from themselves in many cases. For example; I remember a legal case where an open fan or something going around caused a man to lose his hand when he stuck it in there, and they tried to paint the

picture, paint that man as being guilty of negligence because he had put his hand in the revolving fan and had lost it. Today, Sir, no one would even think of that. No one would say a man who puts his hand into a revolving fan, by accident or by negligence or otherwise, is the guilty party. The party who would be guilty in such an incident today would be the employer or the industry who fails to have adequate safety precautions, enclosures around such moving parts and this sort of thing. That is why I was a little alarmed myself the other day (The minister obviously sees a long siege coming on) I was a little put out the other day, Sir, when this particular accident of these particular men at ERCO was attributed to human error or negligence on the part of the men involved rather than from the lack of some safety device, or some mechanical defect.

I am sure that if it is enquired into a little more deeply, it will be found that perhaps the blame does not lie completely with the men themselves who were injured. Perhaps there were some mechanical defects or if not mechanical defects, then the lack of some safety feature which common sense would probably ask that it be put into operation in the plant.

I hope that this industrial enquiry turns up this sort of thing, not only the phosphorous problem itself but the lack of some safety features in other respects that may be lacking at the plant. I am delighted that this enquiry is taking place.

There is another point that I would like to mention very briefly, and that is not unrelated to the ERCO one, by the way. This whole idea of men working in places where mineralization or fibres and this sort of thing are floating around in the air, and it comes to my mind the case of Baie Verte, for example, and the advocate mines.

MR. MAYNARD: Respiratory problems.

MR. ROWE: Respiratory problems and that sort of situation. I do not know,

I have not looked into it too much. They have a very active union in Baie Verte as the honourable minister knows. Martin Saunders is well known to Your Honour I think and other members of this House. He is very active, very conscientious, a good man. A good N.D.P'er too, by the way. His union has been making inquiries about this too, I understand...

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROWE: No, he went Liberal last election when he did not run N.D.P.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right. Well, I have his word for it, and he is an honest man. Mr. Chairman, the point I am getting at is this, that I do not think there has been any delving into this problem at all. I am just wondering if in a situation like Advocate Mines at Baie Verte, if there is any danger (and I do not want to be an alarmist, because there may be no danger at all) if there is any danger of asbestosis I think it is called, respiratory disease caused by fibres going around in the air, if the honourable minister might take it into consideration at some time in the near future, I hasten to add that it does not seem to be a matter of drastic urgency at the moment. There is just this nagging thought that sometimes crops up when I am talking to Mr. Saunders or other members of the union or the employees, that this may possibly be a problem. I raise the point now, with the hope that the minister might think about it sometime in the future and perhaps, when his other priorities are taken care of, he might institute some enquiries in that regard.

Maybe by relying on the experience of Asbestos Quebec, I do not know what they have done there. Certainly they would have had a similar problem and maybe they have rectified it. Perhaps the minister might have a comment on that matter.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, on that particular problem, I would like to make a comment. First of all, I think it is quite obvious to all

honourable members that we do not in Newfoundland have any people who will term themselves as experts in environment at all. We do not have any medical people who will take on the job of determining environmental health hazards. Sometime ago I requested that the Minister of Health in Newfoundland, (Dr. Rowe is not here tonight) to get in contact with Dr. Ernest Mastromatteo, who is Director of The Environmental Health Section of the Department of Health of Ontario. He is a world-renowned expert in environmental matters.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. MURPHY: He could have the phosy jaw.

MR. MAYNARD: Dr. Mastromatteo will be here on Monday. He will at that time do a complete inspection of the ERCO facilities. He is supposed to be a world-renowned expert in environmental health hazards and ways to overcome them. I am hoping that we can acquire someone like this, at least on a call-in basis, for other industries in the province. Obviously, we do not have the number of industries that would warrant a full-time environmental health expert. At least, the Department of Health does not feel - although that may very well be. I think it is very necessary in the province, because as you say, this sort of thing that happened in St. Lawrence; about ten years ago, people would have laughed at it. Today it is a very real situation. I agree with the honourable member. We should find out now, and this is why I would like to - I must say, that Dr. Rowe, the Minister of Health, is in agreement with me - he would like to get an environmental health expert for Newfoundland. We do not have one at the present time so we are going to use, as much as we can, the services of Dr. Mastromatteo

On motion, 1611-05 carried.

On motion, 1612-01 through 1612-02-05, carried.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I suppose the Department of Labour owns more cars for employees than any other department. Would the honourable minister tell us just how many cars they have now? Who they are assigned to? What branches they are assigned to and if this is

for the purchase of new vehicles? What will be the total number of cars the department will have then?

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, I have to confess ignorance. I have no knowledge. Well, presumably they must have one car, because they are going to trade one here. I know nothing about the Department of Labour cars. I have never driven one, I have never ridden in one and, as a matter of fact, I have never been with anyone who has driven in one.

We have seven cars he says and this is a replacement of one. If you do not believe him, I cannot speak up for him.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I believe the honourable gentleman. I had the pleasure of working with the honourable gentleman for about I suppose almost a year. I found him to be very congenial and honest and frank, as I found all the employees of the Department of Labour. I do not think there was an assignment that I enjoyed more, Sir, than being Acting Minister of Labour.

One thing that concerned me when I was there, and I have discussed this with the officials and I suggested that they take a good, hard look at it: This was the matter of vehicles, because you have inspectors going outside St. John's, sometimes going in the same direction and taking separate cars and driving off. Just driving the car off themselves and two or three other inspectors - another inspector taking another car, another inspector flying out, another one, you know - I came to the conclusion myself that it would cost the department far less if the inspectors, instead of the department having its own cars, if they paid the employees on a mileage basis the same as is done in other government departments, and that the Department of Labour not own cars at all. I think it would cost far less, Sir, and it would be worth the minister's while to take a look at that.

MR. MAYNARD: Preferably, from a very personal point of view, I would rather see a central government car pool so that no particular department has any cars.

On motion items 1612-04 through 1612-05 carried.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, 1612-03 - Boards and Committees. Is this per diem or what, On these Boards and Committees? Are we on Boards and Committees?

MR. MAYNARD: Board of examiners for the engineering of technical services. The Board of Examiners.

MR. ROWE, W.N. What do they get per diem rates?

MR. MAYNARD: Yes they get a per diem rate? But what is the per diem rate?

AN HON. MEMBER: Thirty-five dollars for members.

MR. MAYNARD: Thirty-five dollars for members. What is it for the Chairman?

AN HON. MEMBER: The Chairman is on staff.

MR. MAYNARD: Thirty-five dollars per day per member, the Chairman is on staff.

MR. ROWE, W.N. That is a lot of money. Is Mr. McLean on the Board?

MR. MAYNARD: Who?

MR. ROWE, W.N. Carry it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MAYNARD: Never heard of him.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Hogwash! How come he missed it? There has been a lot of stuff going on for years that he has not missed.

MR. MAYNARD: How come Goldfarb is not on it, or Martin Goldfarb?

MR. ROWE, W.N. Goldfinger?

On motion 1612-03 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 1613-01 carry?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, before this carries, could the minister give us a brief report of the activities of the apprenticeship board for the last year or so?

MR. MAYNARD: Hold with me for a couple of seconds - 1613-01. Do you want the travelling schedule? You mean you want me to read through all this? May I table it?

MR. NEARY: Give it to me. I will read it. Send it over to me.

MR. MAYNARD: Do you want the chairman's salary? It is \$1,500 per annum.

MR. MAYNARD: the members \$5 per day. The members are so and so and so and so. The remuneration, \$5 per hour to a maximum of \$15 per sitting. Over seventy trades are designated, carpenter-joiners, plumbers, auto body, auto mechanic, machinist, sheet metal workers so on and so forth.

MR. ROBERTS: MR. Chairman, I submit the minister's heart is not in this, I do not think he is putting his full effort into it. He may be just a little tired, but I do not mind him sitting down. That is fair enough.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, I submit that the heart of the honourable Leader of the Opposition is not in it either.

MR. ROBERTS: My heart is on my sleeve for the minister.

MR. MAYNARD: The member is just raising out of a very deep sleep, I submit that he would not have wanted this. Maybe he wants to go back to sleep again.

MR. ROBERTS: The way the minister is doing it, I wish I had been asleep. If he wishes, I will go back.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has put his heart in it for the last five hours.

MR. ROWE, W.N. He is doing a great job too.

MR. ROBERTS: Bang your head with it now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Carried.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, do not be in any rush now.

MR. ROWE, W.N. It was the government House Leader's idea. You know who pulled this stunt. So the minister will just have to live with it, that is all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: While the minister is getting himself ready there, is it the consent of the committee that the CBC cameraman come in to do some work? Is it the consent of the committee that the CBC cameraman -

MR. NEARY: The honourable members down in that corner of the House will look half intelligent when they come in.

MR. ROWE, W.N. On the question, the honourable minister's House Leader has already agreed with the CBC to do it and now we have agreed. My understanding was this was just going to be the formal courtesy of getting unanimous consent.

MR. ROBERTS: We have already had one other television tonight,

MR. ROWE, W.N. I do not mind.

MR. ROBERTS: -when there were even fewer here.

Motion agreed.

MR. MAYNARD: You want to go through apprenticeship and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we should be a little bit more specific because I can start reading here and I can read for the next hour. But I submit that it is not going to make much sense to anyone. Let me see that is the personnel -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend for the minister to read that full report. All I wanted to really know was how many apprentices have passed through the hands of the apprenticeship board in the last, say, twelve months? What trades? When I was Acting Minister of Labour, Sir, I signed an agreement with the Government of Canada for apprenticeship training. I forget what the amount is. But I want to know if this is being used at the maximum amount allowable? What trades are the students taking in the various schools? You know the Department of Labour is paying for this grant. This is in addition to what Canada Manpower does, by the way.

MR. ROBERTS: You are down again boys.

MR. NEARY: Just a sort of a review for the highlights of the Apprenticeship Branch of the Department of Labour for the last twelve months.

AN HON. MEMBER: Even your colleagues thinks it is foolish. Come back!

MR. NEARY: Bring him in. Let us have him. Bring him in.

MR. ROBERTS: We are okay again now.

MR. ROBERTS: Where is the whip?

MR. NEARY: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I could ask the minister some specific questions; How many apprentices have been placed since the vocational schools closed in June? How many apprentices have been placed both from the vocational schools and from the College of Trades this past June? Because I understand that the Director of Apprenticeship Training has done a fantastic job in placing students in the various industry, business industry throughout the province. I do not know if he would have that figure at his finger tips there, Mr. Chairman. But throw a few figures at us anyway, because we do not know the difference.

MR. MAYNARD: I am afraid I would not have that figure at my finger tips and possibly even the Director of Apprenticeship would not be able to give it off hand, He is not here tonight, He is in Halifax, I believe.

MR. ROWE, W.N. This is the morning, it is not night any more.

MR. MAYNARD: Tonight! Tomorrow Okay! This morning! It does not matter. Well anyway I just had my morning coffee. Tonight's coffee? I do not have that figure available but this type of information, if the honourable members want it, I will certainly obtain it from my officials and table it in the House at an appropriate time. As a matter of fact I can table this whole document.

MR. NEARY: Send it over and we will read it. Mr. Chairman, before this vote carries again I have to go back to the time that I was Acting Minister in that department; there was a move on foot to standardize the journeymen's certificates and licences so that they would be treated the same in all the provinces of Canada. Some of the provinces already recognized certificates from Newfoundland, We recognize certificates from other provinces. I think the minister will agree that this is a very, very important matter for journeymen who are going outside of the province. I would like to ask the minister if he could bring us up to date on what is happening in the matter of

MR. NEARY: standardizing the certificates and the journeymen's licences and so on. It is quite important, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MAYNARD: The standardization thing, as I understand it, is going quite well. Now at the last seminar I had a conversation about this with the Directors of Apprenticeship. There was one province I believe that had to come into the picture. Now I believe my Director of Apprenticeship is here in the building somewhere - you know I could tell you, if he has finally ironed out that last little loophole, when he is available. That is how I understand it, there is one province who is - That is a Canada-wide standard you are talking about.

MR. NEARY: Could the honourable minister name the province?

MR. MAYNARD: I believe it was the Province of Quebec, but I would rather not be quoted on that, because you know -

MR. ROWE, W.N. records of the House.

MR. MAYNARD: No, but it may or may not be, but as I understand it, it was the Province of Quebec.

On motion 1613-01 carried.

On motion 1613-02-01 through 1613-02-02 carried.

MR. ROBERTS: 1613-02-03 - why is that up by thirty-three percent? That is a thirty-three percent increase \$4,300.

MR. MAYNARD: I am in no hurry, Mr. Chairman, I was thinking that the Director of Apprenticeship figures there is going to be more money needed this year.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the minister said he has no idea, That is a little nonchalant. Could he make some effort to find out?

MR. ROWE, W.N. By turning to his left say about ninety degrees.

MR. ROBERTS: I spy the Director of Apprenticeship Training, with my little eye.

MR. MAYNARD: Okay, the number of Trade Advisory Committees, I am informed, have been increased.

MR. ROBERTS: By how many?

MR. MAYNARD: Well by an appropriate amount to increase the total

MR. MAYNARD: amount by \$4,000.

MR. ROBERTS: How much does each committee get?

MR. MAYNARD: The committees are paid on a per diem rate, I do not really delve myself into that situation, in realization.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not expect the minister to delve into it everyday, every other day or every other week, but he is responsible. How many committees are there? How many were there last year? What is the increase? How much do they get a day? Who is on them? I mean there is nothing wrong with that information. It is not secret. The minister is being casual. The minister is tired. He is not the only one who is tired. The government House Leader has collapsed. In other words, he has gone away. It is too bad, we were getting used to his smiling face. But all is well, the executive assistant to the Minister of Provincial Affairs has appeared. Well sure anytime they ask, I will be delighted to have it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Listen to the honourable member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. ROBERTS: Put down your head. It is your turn now.

MR. MAYNARD: Thank you. Advisory and Examining Committees.

Mr. Chairman, appointed by the Board, This is the Apprenticeship Board, in case we have forgotten the vote we are under. There were seventeen committees, advisory committees, last year. There are twenty-one this year. Examining committees of employers and employees, there were seventeen last year, there are twenty this year. Remuneration \$5.00 per hour to a maximum of \$15.00.

per. sitting, a sitting morning, afternoon or evening, it does not matter and over seventy trades are designated within those committees.

MR. ROBERTS: How do people get chosen for these boards?

MR. MAYNARD: I am damned if I know, I did not chose them.

MR. ROBERTS: Again, Mr. Chairman, the minister is being a little too casual to stand in the committee and say, "damned if he knows." Even if it is in order, it is a little too casual.

I would like to know how these people are chosen? They may be chosen by the industry but the minister, you know he is doing so very, very well over there, to stand and say, "damned if he knows," well I do not care if he knows or not, let him find out, Mr. Chairman, how are members chosen for these boards? His officials are there to speak quietly with him and advise him. It is not unreasonable.

MR. ROWE: The minister should not throw away a brilliant career like this. He is really on the right track.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, remember what happened to C. D. Howe with "What is a million," Old Boy! Damned if I care Maynard, Boy! It is some good to be in opposition, Four years to go.

AN HON. MEMBER: Another fifteen to go, at least.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman can go back to writing letters in the Telegram", they have more use for them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Apparently they used to bother you.

MR. ROBERTS: I used to read them.

Watching the Minister of Provincial Affairs is like watching a state entrance. Every entrance he makes is a state entrance. He has his executive assistant sweeping before him with tom-toms.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, I am advised and I shall in turn advise the honourable members of the House, Advisory and Examining Committees, people appointed to these advisory and examining committees are nominated by employers and employee organizations and the Chairman is normally a member

of the Department of Labour or the Trades College, who is representative of the Department of Labour, I suppose you may be able to call him neutral, if you would. The names and addresses and phone numbers of the various members I do not have.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I thank the honourable gentleman. I guess we really do not need the names and addresses. I think he took that like a man, considering his condition. I guess he is doing very well indeed down there. He does know after all. He is not damned for knowing. I congratulate him and next year maybe he will have the list ready and he will have it tabled and we will just rattle on with it.

MR. MAYNARD: Never do it.

On motion total subhead 1613, carried.

MR. NEARY: (1614-01) Mr. Chairman, before this vote carries, I would like to ask the minister if any prior consultations evolved with the Minimum Wage Board before the Speech from the Throne delivered at the First Session of the Thirty-Fourth General Assembly of the Province of Newfoundland, on Wednesday, March 1.

Before this Speech was written announcing changes in the minimum wages in the province, if there were any prior consultations with the Minimum Wage Board. Could the minister tell us how many meetings the Minimum Wage Board had last year? Who the members of the Board are? I might just point out, Mr. Chairman, when I was Acting Minister of Labour, I do not think the Board had held a single meeting over a twelve month period. I could be wrong, maybe they did have a meeting or two but I think they sort of felt like an unwanted stepchild, Sir, and they came to me, The Chairman of the Board came to me and put a proposal to me to send the secretary and the chairman of the board over to a minimum wage conference in Prince Edward Island. I managed to influence Treasury Board to allow me to send one representative of the Minimum Wage Board to Prince Edward Island, to that conference.

I believe, Sir, that was the first time in recent years that the Board had been recognized. They felt as if they were at last going to get somewhere.

But in all seriousness, Mr. Chairman, I think the board could serve a very useful purpose. I think that they could be carrying on continuous research throughout the province to see when necessary steps have to be taken to change the minimum wage being paid to all workers, both male and female, in the province. I was a little bit dubious myself, Sir, about granting minimum wage increases to both male and female straight across the board because we were always led to believe that it would upset the economy of certain regions. Apparently it has not. Perhaps the minister could tell us if there were any repercussions to the last change that was made in the minimum wage. I understand that there will be a further change in the minimum wage as of July 1. I would like to know if any employers in the province have elected to opt out. I think they can do this in certain industries.

I would like just for the minister to let us know, Sir, if before they implemented the most recent changes in the minimum wage and the ones that will take place as of July 1, I think it is, if there was any prior consultation with the Minimum Wage Board or did the Government take a unilateral decision?

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, the answer to the honourable member's question; whether or not there was prior consultation with the Minimum Wage Board, I could very honestly say no, because I have to confess I was in the department at least two months before I even knew a minimum wage board existed. They were so obscure and so relaxed in their efforts that there was no evidence of any kind of any such animal, vegetable or mineral existing.

So therefore I took a very quick look at the minimum wages, and I very quickly convinced government that minimum wages were at an

all time low in Newfoundland and they should be increased. We, I might say, brought the Human Rights Legislation or at least that appropriate part of it, into its true context, because previous to that the Human Rights Legislation said, "there shall be no discrimination - male or female," but at the same time, the Minimum Wage Act said that males would be paid \$1.25 an hour and females \$1.00 an hour. So it was very hard to determine which was which and who had priority over whom. So, in order to clear up the situation, we would not go into long court battles, we just made two of them one and brought the Human Rights Legislation into context in that regards.

As far as the Minimum Wage Board serving a purpose, yes I think they can serve a purpose, Mr. Chairman. I think any board that is appointed should not be the responsibility of the minister or the government, to try to every day or every week or every month keep on their tails, try to make them meet, try to convene meetings and try to suggest things to them. If people want or they accept positions on any board, then they should accept the responsibility of that board.

So far, in my view the present Minimum Wage Board has not done that and therefore, unless they make some moves immediately to make some reports, I will certainly be suggesting some very drastic changes in the Minimum Wage Board as it now exists.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister one question, Is it permissible for a person, a group of persons or a registered company to hire on teenagers and by teenagers I mean boys or girls ages twelve, thirteen, fourteen and fifteen, to hire them on and to pay them seventy-five cents per hour?

MR. MAYNARD: Yes, under the present rules and regulations, I am afraid it is, because our minimum wages states: "... sixteen to eighteen shall be, at this particular time \$1.00 per hour" and from eighteen over - \$1.40 per hour.

Unfortunately it does not say anything about the people under sixteen. There was an Employment Of Children Act passed in the Legislature, I believe it was last year, but I think the honourable member for Bell Island will agree with this, that after it was passed it was looked at and considered to be a little bit too restrictive. Even a newspaper boy would not be allowed to operate. We have been looking at the thing and I think we have, we are not doing it on our own, we have had expert opinion on this. I think we have come up with the necessary revision to make the Act more applicable to the situation as it exists whereby newspaper boys can operate but people are not allowed to have light labour as far as the under sixteen is concerned and this sort of thing. I am hoping that that draft legislation or the draft amendment will be ready for the present session (the 1972 session I am talking about now of the Legislature) plus about a dozen other pieces of legislation for the honourable members.

MR. THOMS: I gather from the minister that it is possible that a company who is engaged in business in our province, if it normally hires on men, say sixteen years and older, during the winter months and when school is out, they can somehow get rid of the men and hire on boys who are below the age of sixteen and pay them seventy-five cents an hour. This is possible?.

MR. MAYNARD: Well it is certainly unethical.

MR. THOMS: It is unethical but it is happening.

MR. MAYNARD: Under our present situation it is not illegal.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister would not condone anybody doing this?

MR. MAYNARD: No, not by any means, But until we have an appropriate Act passed regarding employment of children, well then it is...

MR. THOMS: There is nothing in the labour laws to say that if a company is set up it must employ people sixteen years and older.

June 29, 1972

Tape No. 1196

NM - 6

MR. MAYNARD: Now let me clarify this. There is nothing in the Acts administered by the Department of Labour. I am not quite sure or quite clear about the Acts administered by the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation. I understand they do have some

MR. MAYNARD: sort of legislation that applies to the employment of children or in some way or another. I am not quite clear on what it is.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Does the minister agree that it would be highly unethical for anybody to pay up to seventy-five cents an hour?

MR. MAYNARD: Oh, certainly!

MR. ROWE (W.N.): (Inaudible).

MR. MAYNARD: I would be very distributed although right at this particular time there is very little I can do under law. I will certainly try and find some way to do something about the people who employ children for seventy-five cents an hour. I have a feeling that somewhere along the line I would search up a law to get at them.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister may get the opportunity.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): We may meet privately a little later.

MR. MAYNARD: I would only be too glad.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Chairman, is this the place to talk about the equality of wages for equal work? Let me finish my brief remark by saying that it is good to have equal pay for equal work for men and women doing the same job. As far as that goes it is - the boss of the House after a sound nights sleep, comes in again. The problem with it.

the way our system of employment works at the moment, women, by a process of brainwashing, and men, by a process of brainwashing or by pressure or something within that society, women are screened into one type of employment and men are screened into another type of employment. It is not necessarily based on any physical difference. Women are channelled by cultural influences or something.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you sure there is no physical difference.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): What I am saying, Sir, is this, the point I am trying to make, in all seriousness, is that it is basically meaningless because of pressures of different types, women are forced, girls are forced into one type of employment in which there are no men and men are forced into another type of employment in which there are no women. By and large these pressures do not depend on any physical difference, i.e., strength. There might be a man a bit stronger than a woman. Women are channelled under our

Mr. Rowe (W.N.).

system into secretarial work. There is no reason why a man should not go into secretarial work. Women are channelled into this and therefore by and large women who take jobs, often jobs which if a man had them would be considered an executive position, i.e., private secretaries and this sort of thing. If a man were doing exactly the same work, he would be in an executive position with the company or government and he would probably be paid fifty per cent more because of the name of the job he holds. The point I am trying to make, Sir, is that there is still a very basic inequality and inequity in it. I am wondering again - when the honourable minister changes the name - I do not know if he is going to change it to Manpower or what, Manpower and Womanpower or something, I do not know.

AN HON. MEMBER: Person Power.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Person Power, that is it or Mr./ Mrs. Power.

I am serious in what I am saying. We cover up the situation by saying that if a man or woman are doing equal work, that is called the same type of work, then they will be paid equal rates. But that does not get to the root of the problem at all. Men and women are now doing the same types of work but are called different things and the man is paid away more than a woman for the same job. What I am wondering is if the honourable minister is cognizant of this. I am sure he is. He has shown a great amount of knowledge in everything else and I am sure he is cognizant of it. I am wondering if he is going to try to take these types of things into consideration when he develops the policy and position of his new department. I realize it is hard for little Newfoundland to break new ground in many of these fields. Sometimes controversy is seen. Often it is easier for the federal government or a larger province or a larger state in the United States to present it. To break new ground in this field is to make sure that there is fundamental equity and quality and not just superficial equity and quality. I would commend to the honourable minister a serious suggestion that he do inquire into this kind of thing and try to rectify it. Maybe on a classification plan, when functions

Mr. Rowe (W.N.)

of certain jobs are looked at that a woman is in and close to a certain job that a man is working at, are compared and are found to be the same, therefore the man and the woman should get the same pay even though they may be called something different. I would commend that to the honourable minister for his consideration. I would also ask the honourable minister if he did get any questionnaires, in the mail the other day, in which he was asked certain things about women's liberation and that sort of thing. Did the honourable minister get a questionnaire? Did he fill it in? When he gets around to it, maybe he can do it publicly or at least .. (Inaudible). My own mind would be satisfied if he will go in the right direction in the field that I am talking about now and get the answers to these questions that I presented to him. These are some very important questions. I would like the honourable minister to comment on them.

MR. MAYNARD: I would just like to make one comment on the questionnaire that was circulated. It is a very odd thing, the questionnaire and the answers would both be anonymous. Honourable members will note that their initials were at the top of the sheet, which, therefore, prevented the questionnaires from being announced or the answers. Therefore, I did not fill them in because, if I am going to be anonymous, I am going to be anonymous, I am not going to write my name at the top of the sheet. When the society or the group or whoever it is that decides that they are going to send out a questionnaire to me, with my initials eliminated from the top, then I will fill it in and I will return it. However, until they do that, I am not going to do it. That is the questionnaire.

As far as equal rights for equal work are concerned, I think we can do so much. We can equalize the minimum wage. We are going to introduce an amendment to the Human Rights Legislation to eliminate a little loophole that is there, which employers have been using constantly over the past year or so, very unscrupulous employers and people with whom (I say this quite candidly) I would not like to be associated with but they are there and we have to live with them and make laws to prevent that type of person from going outside the law. We are trying to fill it in. We are not going

Mr. Maynard

to be able to pass laws, Mr. Chairman, to change the thinking of society. That is only going to come over a long period of time. I think the hon. member for White Bay South realizes that very well. The attitude of society is something that I cannot change nor can government change it. It is going to have to go.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, under that legislation, Newfoundland Human Rights Code, would the honourable minister tell us how many complaints have been received by the Director of Human Rights, under the equal pay for equal work clause? How many hearings have been held by the Human Rights Commissioner? If any, were they public? What was the result? Could the honourable minister give us a sort of a progress report?

MR. MAYNARD: Right now?

MR. NEARY: Yes, sure. I do not see any other subhead we could do it under.

MR. MAYNARD: I cannot, Mr. Chairman, give it right now. All I can say is that under the Human Rights Legislation, both the Director of Human Rights and the Human Rights Commissioner, Mrs. Keough, have been extremely busy since I came into the department. I do not know how many cases they have handled but they have handled as many as they could in that particular time. If the honourable member wants the exact breakdown, I would attempt to get it for him and table it in this honourable House. I have done a good job, the Opposition have done a poor job.

On motion 1614-01, carried.

On motion total subhead 1614, carried.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): On the subhead, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister what is the reason for the doubling or the more than doubling of the amount in salaries? Has someone else been taken on?

MR. MAYNARD: I think I have that clear from my officials. Last year the amount for industrial standards, the office was charged to a couple of different

Mr. Maynard.

votes because (the hon. member for Bell Island knows this) Industrial Standards was handled by various numbers of people within the department. But this year it is charged to the one vote which should show as an increase, I would say, in that one and probably somewhat of a decrease in some other vote on the salaries.

On motion total subhead 1615, carried.

MR. NEARY: You know, Mr. Chairman, talking about elevators, the honourable minister needs an elevator to himself. His head is so swelled since they formed the administration that he needs an elevator himself to bring him up to the ninth floor.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: His chest is stuck out, Mr. Chairman, about --

MR. MURPHY: What a statement!

MR. ROBERTS: He cannot get in.

MR. NEARY: You almost need another elevator to bring up his swelled head, Sir. Seriously, Mr. Chairman, this is quite an important matter because it was only about a year ago (I think it was during my term of office as Acting Minister of Labour) that we really started to clamp down on the elevator owners in the province. There was a great howl from some of the business people for a while. I would like to have an up to date report on the condition of the elevators in the province at the present time.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, we still have only one elevator inspector in the province. That is unfortunate because there is quite a work load, as the hon. member for Bell Island can appreciate. The Elevator Inspection Division, on the advice of Mr. Blackwood, of course, has closed down a number of elevating devices. Is that the right name for them, elevating devices? Anyway we are going up and down, yes.

MR. NEARY: It seems like the minister has been going up and down for the last five hours.

June 29, 1972

Tape no. 1197

Page 6

MR. MAYNARD. Well you have been dragging me up and down, I cannot help it. If there are some elevators in certain places that do not have valid inspection certificates, I hope that the

3983

honourable members will bear with us because we only have one man for all Newfoundland. I might say by the way that a couple of weeks ago I got stuck in an elevator that had a valid certificate. It was quite embarrassing to the elevator inspector. Anyway we do only have one person. We are hoping with the good graces of some of the people opposite or some of the people on this side that we will get another one, because we really need one. The work load is getting too large and we are finding that we just cannot keep up with the work or that person cannot keep up with the work.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, there is another matter I would like to ask the minister about also. I think the Workman's Compensation Board, the Industrial Safety Branch of the Workman's Compensation Board inspect hoists and so forth. If my memory serves me correctly, the Workman's Compensation Board were trying to unload the inspection of hoists and so forth on to the elevator inspector. Did this ever come about, Sir? Because I resisted it while I was there. while I was minister. I do not know if the elevator inspector is doing this work now. If he is, I certainly agree with the minister that he must be overworked.

MR. MAYNARD: These are the things that the elevator inspector handles now, passenger elevators, freight elevators, dumb-waiters, escalators, man-lifts and ski-tows. So they must have unloaded. They are a sneaky bunch are they not?

MR. ROWE (W.N.): What is wrong with the Minister of Justice, the Deputy Premier?

MR. ROBERTS: He was not here all night.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): He had a great nights sleep. We are the ones who are supposed to be tired and falling down on our feet, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE (W.N.): No, we know how many dumb-waiters there are.

Mr. Chairman, thirty-three. I got it first now. Mr. Chairman, why are elevators, the sub-head, the vote for elevators carried under the Department of Labour? Why do we not hand it over to the capable hands of the Minister of Provincial Affairs and allow him to do the job?

MR. ROBERTS: Does he get a uniform cap with it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Can we pass an act in the House right now to do that?

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Yes, if you want to.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: No we can only pass that act, Mr. Chairman, if we get an assurance that the Minister of Provincial Affairs will get a little cap that he can wear when he drives the elevator.

On motion, sub-head 1616, carried.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, before you carry the total I would like to compliment the honourable Minister of Labour for his labour that took place here in the wee hours of the morning. He is looking a little bit drowsy. He did an excellent job, Sir. I think he helped the committee and brought a lot of very great information to this House. But there is a question before the House that is still unanswered and maybe now that the honourable minister have become refreshed and has the support of his capable officials on the back of him, so ably supported by those officials of his, Sir, maybe in his wisdom the honourable minister can see fit now to explain to the House the question that was asked by my colleague, the honourable member for Twillingate, if he would explain his views on productivity.

MR. MAYNARD: I will have to do a considerable amount of research before I could say anything because I would have to produce myself first and then analyse how well it went and that is going to take some time. I am sorry I really cannot answer that with intelligence and I would rather not comment.

MR. WOODWARD: I appreciate the honourable minister's views. I think, Sir, it is a big question to ask and again I want to thank the honourable minister for doing such an able job.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Chairman, let me second the sentiments expressed by my friend and colleague, the member for Labrador North. I must say that the more I see the honourable, not necessarily physically at the moment, but the more I see of the honourable member's work in this House and work as a minister -

MR. ROBERTS: He put all his spirit into it.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): That is right. I am convinced that he is, it is invidious to make comparisons, I know, but I am convinced that he is one of the, if not the best then one of the best ministers that the Premier has at his command in his administration today. He has grown in his job, Sir, and he shows complete dedication to what he is doing, complete seriousness and genuine feeling for everything that he puts his hand to. I must say that I am personally extremely impressed. I also noticed a certain progression during the course of tonight's activities, the honourable member started off in a fairly high and ebullient state and he found his estimates to be a very sobering experience. Anybody who has had a sobering experience, awake -

MR. ROBERTS: Speaking of that -

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Behold! The apparition is back.

MR. ROBERTS: Back from the ashes. How did they sober him up inside?

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Anyway, Sir, my serious remarks about the honourable minister are meant seriously and I must say he is to be congratulated for his work in this House.

On motion, Block Provision: Canada Pension Plan, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

On motion, Block Provision: Unemployment Insurance, carried.

On motion, Department of Labour - Heading XVI, carried.

Heading XX -- Community and Social Development:

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Chairman, before we get into the detail of the estimates, Sir, a few comments that I would like to make. I have not taken up too much time in this House so far with speech making but I think now the time has come for me to say just a few words, some general comments and also some comments in relation to the operation of our department. Some of the subjects that I would like to talk about generally are planning and programme development which our department is responsible for particularly as planning relates to the Federal-Provincial agreements. I would also like to talk about rural development and when these headings come up for debate I would like to talk about resettlement and the water amenities programme or the community amenities programme. Also at this time I would like to speak briefly on the regional development programme or the various DREE agreements, various DREE programmes as they relate to the Province of Newfoundland.

There may be some reference to the past. I do not think we should live in the past but I think on occasions we should look back, especially when we are planning for the future, because in this way we can evaluate what has already taken place and I think this can give us a clear direction of where we should go in the future.

First of all let me outline some general areas and some problems that I have seen in our department since I have been appointed there as minister, a short while ago. As an ordinary citizen on the outside, I had very little knowledge of what went on in the Department of Community and Social Development. After having spent three or four months there, I feel I have learned a few things but I still feel that there is a lot that goes on in that department which I am not fully conversant with. I am sure my honourable friend on the other side of the House, my predecessor, will agree that it is quite an involved department, very sophisticated, particularly as our work relates to the Federal Government. But I think a problem that has existed is the

lack of communication between our department and other government departments and the general public. I shall not try to apportion blame for this but I feel that the previous administration should probably have told the people more details in a realistic way instead of vague references to the many DREE programmes and making them look like some kind of a magic panacea. Even a long standing programme such as resettlement has been referred to in very general terms, when I feel that in many instances it should have been referred to in specific terms.

So one of the things that I have dedicated myself to doing in this department is closing this communications gap, particularly with the public of Newfoundland. I feel that anything that affects the -
AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SENIOR: I feel, Mr. Chairman, that there should be better communications on matters that are of vital importance to the people of Newfoundland, particularly in the rural areas, and how it affects also their families. This communications gap is so extensive and we wish to reach people in every corner of this province. I am sure my colleagues feel the same way. As well I expect to receive the co-operation of civil servants in this great task.

Now in the past we have had a tradition of a few politicians making most of the speeches and I think that the complicated and extensive task before us should cause us to rethink this question. I think in the past, particularly in relation to Federal-Provincial programmes, there has been too much of federal civil servants explaining to our people what is involved in these programmes. I think there is a much greater role for our public servants to play in helping to communicate with the people on basic issues, and a new responsible attitude should be developed.

The second general point I wish to make is that in the short time

I have been in this department I was struck by the number of issues that I feel had good solutions for them but were not acted upon or were aborted by the previous administration. One of these was a cabinet committee on planning which the present administration has implemented. Another was the short-lived inter-departmental advisory committee on regional development. The basic need for that is recognized in the new planning task force. The need for planning received very little recognition by the previous administration, which I feel concentrated power unduly and did not provide adequately for the creative contribution that could be made by its servants, working in new forms and structures of co-ordination.

Furthermore there seemed to be a resistance to true joint planning efforts in fields where federal financial participation was expected. While we must always establish our provincial goals and programmes we cannot expect the Federal Government to support these programmes uncritically. Apart from the expertise that they can contribute to our planning process, the fact

MR. SENIOR: that they do participate may help them to accept the resulting projects as truly worthy of financial assistance. Our new administration has provided for early federal participation in our planning. We hope that the new attitude will help to solve some of the problems that were blocked by the previous attitude.

Let me talk for just a few moments about planning: Someone has said that "something which is good in theory but poor in practice is not really very good in relative theory." Relative theory then would be the application of a theoretical concept to an applied approach. To put it another way, development planning must be subjective as well as objective. And knowing what to do must also balance with knowing why it must be done and how it must be done. The concept that Newfoundland must have development planning is good theory and the concept of an integrated approach to development planning is good theory. But how to introduce these concepts into the social and economic institutional structures of Newfoundland is relevant theory. I think this is one of the problems that we have experienced in Newfoundland, in that we have had theory coming out of our ears but we have not been able to apply it to the social and economic structure in Newfoundland.

Now previous attempts at comprehensive development planning have failed not because the theories were not sound but because policies fail to recognize that the existing institutional environment was hostile and opposed to efforts to create centralized planning. No procedural methodology or strategic measures were taken to overcome the established inertia and resistance to change. Within the civil service, that was inherited from the Commission of Government.

In fact the whole situation may be summed up by saying that since the early 1960's the factors resisting the application of good development theory had been greater than the factors that have supported it. There have been at least five attempts under five different deputy ministers

MR. SENIOR: to introduce development planning in this province. Each attempt has been basically a duplication of previous attempts. Each attempt has made with resistance and/or failure. Because of this, it would appear to me that the factors resisting the introduction of planning concepts exist outside of our department and bringing in new personnel and restructuring the department once more will not change this situation.

For example, what use are highly trained planners, if our government are not willing to accept planning? I believe this is the problem that we have experienced in the past. It is somewhat paradoxical that a department created to make comprehensive development plans must first of all overcome the factors that preclude planning. It cannot assume its planning role until the environment for planning is more favourable.

My purpose now is to identify some of the factors that I believe exist outside of our department, that resist planning. I would also like to outline how these developed and how they might be approached. In addition, by examining certain programmes of rural development, it can be shown how these programmes relate to various social, economic factors in rural Newfoundland. Hopefully, this analysis will show how critics have misinterpreted the overall aims and methods of that programme.

Let me go back in history just a little way: At the time of Confederation the level of social services that existed in this province and the economic base that supported these services can only be described as a subsistence one. After 1949, the government embarked upon a general policy of balanced growth in both the economic base and in the public services. I believe more emphasis was placed on the economic base than was placed on the social services.

A policy of small industry development was introduced and financed by the cash surplus which the province had at the time of Confederation. The rationale of this first development programme was that growth could be achieved by manufacturing goods to supply the local market. However,

MR. SENIOR: it should be pointed out that economic union with Canada ensured the failure of this development by import substitution policy, because Confederation had removed all import controls and without these controls local industries could not compete with more efficient mainland industries.

So when it became evident that industrial development could not raise living standards rapidly, greater emphasis were placed on the provision of public services. This policy has as its objective the elimination of these disparities which existed in public services between Newfoundland and the rest of Canada. Road construction, expansion of educational facilities, provision of electrical services and medical facilities were expanded at a rate which has been called fantastic.

One of the most important facts of this programme was the financial support it gave to rural Newfoundlanders, in the form of short-term employment through these public works programmes. This aspect cannot be stressed too strongly because of the way this has affected the attitudes of many rural people towards both public works programmes and economic development programmes generally.

The massive public works programmes required only one planning input and that was: How do we get the money without the cost of this policy increase beyond the ability of the province? Ottawa was approached for assistance, such as in the Trans Canada Highway Agreement. When this source could not satisfy the growing demand, borrowing in the world markets took place. This second development effort continued on well into the sixties, when the ever-increasing demand for services made it obvious that even borrowing had its limits.

It was agreed that new attempts would have to be made to expand the revenue base of the economy. Once again the policy turned to industrial expansion and all we could hear was jobs, jobs, jobs. The experience of import substitution as the basis for economic development and the slowness of return from resource development forced new

MR. SENIOR: efforts of major industrial expansion such as Churchill Falls, Come by Chance, ERCO, and the Linerboard operation at Stephenville.

So now that I have outlined very briefly the development policy since 1949, it is possible to show how the policy was influenced by certain institutional and social economic factors within the province. I feel the major importance is the civil service. Prior to Confederation the Government of Newfoundland consisted of a Commission, appointed by the British Foreign Office, to administer the affairs of the country. The British appointment consisted of British civil servants who were seconded from British Government departments. These people were trained administrators, skilled in the operation of the departments from which they came. These people were appointed to head up similar departments in Newfoundland, on a pay as you go basis. Thus revenue from the previous years operation was distributed on a pro rata basis. Each department then devised their own programmes within the extent of the available revenue. The departments, therefore, operated as independent governing units with little or no inter-action. Control was maintained by the British Foreign Office and there was little movement towards centralized planning within Newfoundland. Also departments were operationally as well as physically separated.

Now the civil service existing at the time of Confederation was trained in this system. Because the incoming political structure in 1949 was inexperienced, the operations of the old style civil service continued to dominate. So the post Confederation programme of Economic Development failed mainly because the existing structure had no development planning expertise.

The administrative arm of the new government was not oriented towards expansion and could only continue its holding operation function. So since there were no local planning capability, it was necessary to import development experts. More familiar operations, such as the provision of public services, could be left in the hands of the civil services. But little or no interchange took place between

MR. SENIOR: these two functions, that is, the planning and actual implementation. There was very little need for planning because the provision of services were so necessary, there was such a scarcity of them, almost every road and school etc. was necessary.

However, when development policy began to emphasize social services, following the failure of the economic programme, the importance of the line departments in government was increased. This provision of services was the great vote getter for the politicians and a prime means of obtaining new staff and funds for operations of departments. So the new development policy created large empires of these departments, which were primarily concerned with providing services such as education, highways, health and welfare. The planning department and those that were concerned with economic growth, remain very small and of very little consequence. As a matter of fact some of them could hardly be called departments.

In the meantime the input of Public Works types of programmes by both the federal and the provincial governments provided wage incomes to a very large number of Newfoundlanders who, up to this time, a great many of them had worked in logging or in the fishing industry. So the use of public works to provide employment activity became the accepted thing. Requests for infrastructure, that fancy work, were made for the wage benefits they offered rather than for the long term benefits of the infrastructure itself.

In fact the construction of public works became the prime economic base in a very large number of areas. As a result, the pressure for public works became a self-sustaining operation and grew rather than lessened. Roads which were constructed to end isolation were later paved as make-work programmes, with very little justification for the paving except maybe to create temporary employment.

MR. SENIOR: So this lack of economic and social justification led to the recognition that there was a need for planning and the establishment of priorities in the expenditure of funds. So in 1962 the province signed an agreement with the federal government, which was called the ARDA Agreement. This agreement conceived of an integrated and comprehensive approach to developing income and employment opportunities through social programmes and resource adjustment. It was a different approach, because it conceived of an operation that could plan and direct programmes that were the responsibility of other departments of government.

The ARDA Agreement was an enabling agreement, it was not a programme but it enabled the provincial government to negotiate a programme development with the federal government which would relate particularly to rural Newfoundland.

But the line departments of government were not about to relinquish their operational and planning control. Their reaction was to insist that if ARDA were to be economic planning, they were going to have no part of it, that the traditional role of planning was going to be enforced. Since the traditional role of planning was merely to obtain the money, then ARDA would exist to provide funds and only the relevant departments would control the programming.

So what happened was they set up a committee of departmental officials whose function, in theory at least, was to co-ordinate government operations. But in actual fact all they did was screen the ARDA activities. This meant that the integrated planning function, which ARDA was designed to encourage, was lost, and this ensured the failure of the whole programme.

ARDA was followed by the Fund for Rural Economic Development or FRED. It followed basically the same concept as ARDA, but it covered a smaller area of the province. The FRED programme was later replaced by the Special Areas Agreement which further reduced

MR. SENIOR: the size of the development area and related almost exclusively to the provision of public services or infrastructure.

It may be too early to assess the overall development impact of the Special Areas Programme. However, some indication, as to the direction the whole DREE programme is taking, is noticeable. Thus we can say that the departmental section dealing with public services has expanded and continued to expand under pressure, while other sections dealing with planning and social development have tended to stagnate. So it would appear then that in the past the concept of integrated planning was not really accepted whereas the independent and unplanned provision of services by various departments was condoned and encouraged. The only planning function thought to be required was for somebody to obtain the necessary money.

So the combination then of departmental resistance and public pressure for services, are the basic factors militating against the introduction of planning. But planning is considered now to be more and more essential, especially by politicians who have the responsibility to get funds. However, it is going to be difficult to change the situation as long as public services remain the prime vote getters.

Unfortunately, it is my opinion that the administrative section of government or the civil service will also resist change, because they fear loss of control. So once the interactions between the institutional and social economic structure of the province has been more clearly understood, then we can take some action to remedy the situation. It must be realized that the key factors maintaining this system are the public pressure for social capital investment, the reason why these facilities are demanded and the effects these demands have upon the functioning of government departments and also on the political system.

Pressure for government programmes to raise income levels show up in the form of demand for public services. This pressure will not cease while the need for income and short-term employment is great.

MR. SENIOR: It can at this time only be charged or directed into other channels that will provide income. Thus if the pressure can be made to apply for economic rather than for social facilities, then I feel that we are making some progress.

Now this pressure for economic facilities must necessarily lead to a demand for comprehensive planning. Since the traditional civil service structure has no background in economic development planning, competition then between the line departments and the planning agency can be avoided.

This rationale has already been tried and it has already been suggested in an new approach, which I spoke about sometime ago, when I spoke to the Rural Development Council in Gander. This is basically the same rationale as was used in Fogc and in Eastport programmes which were undertaken by the Rural Development Division of our department. To ensure that projects in these programmes did not cater to the make-work act aspect, a policy was created stating that labour in construction and so on would be supplied by the people. In other words, the government would only get involved when they felt that the people could not do this for themselves.

Thus the concept of deferred return was introduced, since people were forced to develop a stake in the project in order to be paid for their input. In this respect the Rural Development Programme was a transitional programme between the traditional concept of free government assistance and the requirement for planning and integration of approaches.

It is very interesting to note that this Rural Development Policy did not find favour with the previous administration. The reason for this is quite simple I believe, because this policy tended to reduce pressure upon the line departments and this was immediately seen as an attempt to reduce their power position. However the concept of government co-operation was quite acceptable to the people who were involved in

MR. SENIOR: this. For example, in Eastport the people began to accept the concept of planning and the necessity to avoid indiscriminate pressure in order to just get a few dollars. In fact the concept of an integrated plan for the area is now quite acceptable. It is also evident from this pilot project or this experiment that there are considerable economic benefits being derived. Also in Fogo the introduction of a shipyard, under this programme, has made that area of the province the only one that has shown an increase in production this year.

One of the principal reasons I believe why planning has not been affective in the past is because the centralized planning unit, located in the Department of Community and Social Development, was not really recognized by the government as the centralized planning unit for the government.

It is my opinion that if our government in the future is to have a centralized planning unit which is engaged in planning for the development of the whole province, well then, first of all they have to be recognized by the government, then in turn by the various line departments. They must be accepted as the planning unit that will plan for the development of Newfoundland. I believe that our government is taking a step in the right direction by creating a planning task force and in fact setting up planning outside any government department. I feel that it is only in this way that we can have co-ordinated approach to planning and development in Newfoundland and it is only in this way that a proper rapport can be established between the various government departments so that we are all working together, assuming our own individual roles but at the same time all working for the overall development of Newfoundland.

The third general point which I would like to comment on is concerning some other things which go on in our department. I believe, regardless of what name you put on our department or what we perform, certain very key special functions must be carried out. These are of two types: One is the general function of planning which I just referred to and the other is planning and implementation of the federal-provincial joint programmes which are administered by the DREE Department in Ottawa.

With respect to the first, as I have already pointed out, our government is emphasising the general planning process required by the province as a whole in all of its activities. I believe this will help to facilitate the specific portion of planning which is involved in negotiating the joint development programmes. The general planning is designed for general purposes, to give a total perspective to what this government can do with its resources and particularly with respect to solely provincial programmes. The special planning in our department is directed to meeting the special requirements involved in the joint programmes with the federal government. This is very critical in the

negotiation of the various agreements, particularly the special areas agreement where we have negotiations for particular projects in the agreement itself.

Then there is the special machinery of implementation through the Federal-Provincial Liaison Committees which is carried out in accordance with the agreements. In addition, our department has specific operating functions in some highly sensitive programmes such as rural development, water supplies in unorganized communities and resettlement. Also of course, we get involved in the various special Federal-Provincial Employment Loans Programmes.

So much for these general observations. I would like now to have some brief comments on the general estimates in our department. Maybe this would eliminate the possibility of questions coming later.

The gross expenditures of the department are \$53,959,000. Of this, \$52,200,00 is for expenses voted in other departments and \$53,906 is voted under this department. Of this amount \$37 million approximately or 68.7 percent, is expected to be recovered by contributions from Canada under the various joint programmes. Under the DREE special areas, special highways and resettlement agreement, the recovery rate is about seventy percent. Under the ARDA agreement there is about fifty percent. There is a further expected recovery on community amenities, of \$30,000, leaving a net expenditure by the province of \$16,919,600.

Maybe I can simplify this by breaking it down a little simpler and putting it this way: For every dollar that our department spends, sixty-nine cents comes back to the treasury. Of the remaining thirty-one cents that would be spent by the province, out of every dollar one cent goes to salaries, one-half cent goes to consultants, travelling and other expenses, twenty-nine and a-half cents goes to the province's share of the DREE projects, in rural development grants, resettlement grants and in the grants to community amenities.

The reason for the low overhead of one and a-half percent is partly because most of the actual designing and construction of DREE projects is carried out by the various responsible government departments. The departmental functions of planning, negotiating and supervision of implementation are carried out by a relatively small staff of people who are quite capable of this important type of work.

The present administration is, as I said before, bolstering the planning effort through the inter-departmental task force. I think at this time it is timely to give credit to the great contribution of the various federal officials who represent that government on the joint planning committees, on the liaison committees, on the joint ARDA committee and the resettlement committee, because of the cooperation that they have shown towards us in recent talks.

Getting into more specific areas such as the DREE special areas and special highways agreements, the largest vote for the department is under subhead 2010 where \$49.6 million is voted to implement the DREE special areas and special highways agreements. This accounts for about ninety-two percent of the total funds. There is a further breakdown of this amount. About \$100,000 for salaries of staff and for research contracts supporting this implementation. The rest is for the projects themselves. There are one hundred and fifty-seven projects and seven feasibility and preliminary design studies for possible inclusion of projects at a later date.

Group (1) shows \$31 million for transportation development projects. I think it should be explained that when the DREE programme was set up, it took over from the previous federal Trans-Canada Highway and trunk roads agreement, developed to bring our road system closer to what was required. This accounts for the high road content in the initial DREE agreements. A fair amount of that, of course, was spent on the Burin Peninsula, to complete that highway and many others as well, \$6 million is going to industrial parks and necessary residential development in the rapidly growing special areas. A further critical aid in the initial

phase was to assist in meeting urgent needs in vocational and other school capacities, and we have \$12 million being spent on that this year.

I think there is something significant in those figures which should be pointed out and that is this; that out of the forty-nine and one half million dollars, which will be the cash flow from DREE this year, only \$500,000 or approximately one percent is being spent on resource development. I think that if we look at development in our province, we will see that much of the long-term employment that has been created is directly related to resource based industries. While I believe that a provision of infra-structure is certainly necessary, I think also that more emphasis has to be placed on resource development.

Then the ARDA agreement was supposed to relate to the rural part of our province, and in addition to that, (I will have more to say about that later) there are other joint programmes with the Federal Government which are not voted in our department. Maybe I could just mention those for the record. There is the Canada Land Inventory, the Forest Inventory Programme, Survey of Crown Lands and the \$1 million contribution for DREE for this year's Mineral Development Programme.

At the time that the DREE special areas agreement was negotiated, apparently that time a need was seen to develop various other primary sectors of the economy of Newfoundland, but no real programmes were developed to include the primary sectors. In recent days, in discussions with the DREE officials, we have discussed with them the possibility of developing various sectoral programmes which would relate particularly to resource development, and we believe it will be instrumental in developing rural Newfoundland.

I would like to comment very briefly on the rural development vote of \$1.5 million. This amount of money is voted for the provincial cost-sharing in any ARDA projects that would be developed. We feel this year that there will be some ARDA projects developed and \$1.5 million

does not necessarily mean that this is all the money that will be spent on rural development. Because, if we do develop sectoral programmes, then many of these will be funded by the various line departments where they are developed and then our department will subsequently recover fifty percent of the cost from the Federal Government.

There are a couple of other areas which are included in the estimates which I may comment on later, as questions may flow from the honourable members of the opposite side.

MR. MURPHY: There is no need for any discussion.

MR. SENIOR: If there are any questions, I will be very pleased to answer them, but I thought it was right and proper to outline the things which I did. At this time I would hope that if there are any questions, I will be happy to answer them if I can. If not, I will find the answers for you and leave it at that.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. W.N. ROWE: I wish it were. You will soon have to carry me out of here if I have to listen to any more of that.

Mr. Chairman, I must say I struggled manfully for some dozen hours or so now and I very nearly reached the point where I had to admit defeat, Give it up and go on home out of it. An hour of that, Mr. Chairman. I do not wish to be unkind to the honourable Minister of the Department of Community and Social Development, but I fear, Sir, that he has fallen right into the clutches of the high-ranking officials of that department and they have filled his head and his speeches with the same old gobbledygook that we have been so used to getting from certain types of people like that, but more prevalently on the federal scene.

The so-called planners, some of them are very good planners, but their terminology, the way they express themselves, their own little in-group jargon, I am afraid is not designed to stimulate but to put honourable members to sleep. However, be that as it may.

MR. A.J. MURPHY: Now the honourable members, what we had to put up with

the last couple of years when he was talking about his infra-structure and outfra-structure and all the rest.

MR. ROWE: Now you are on to something. I will be very frank about that. I recognize the honourable member's speech, because I gave it myself. The first speech I made in the House when I was Minister of Community and Social Development.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is why you were so bored.

MR. ROWE: That is right.

MR. MURPHY: I had to go through it twice.

MR. ROWE: You may have to go through it again because, if the Premier moves another minister into that department, he will come out with the same stuff again. Mr. Chairman, "we are going to examine the parameters" he will say, but we will not go into that.

There are one or two matters that the honourable minister mentioned at the beginning of his speech before, I must admit quite candidly, I lost track. Maybe we can get into some of the other matters as the estimates go on. It is perhaps unfair to the honourable minister that his department came up for scrutiny by the committee at this late stage, after an all-night sitting. Perhaps we would have appreciated some of his remarks more, and I say this seriously, we would have appreciated some of his remarks more if we had been a little fresher mentally and physically.

I was being facetious, I assure the honourable minister, in my original remarks. We would have appreciated them more if we had been a little fresher, undoubtedly.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROWE: Well, not word for word. I gave the same speech, the same words, the same terms, the same convoluted gobbledygook as put on paper for me by some of my friends in the department and elsewhere. I do not mean to say that the honourable minister plagiarized a speech of mine. All I mean to say is that the form and the substance are well nigh identical. It is the type of stuff that is a little hard to

listen to, but it is very useful to know, because planners use that kind of stuff all the time when they are talking back and forth. If the honourable minister does not know the jargon and the gobbledeygook, he is going to be at a loss when he goes to Ottawa and starts negotiating with fifteen hundred high-powered, long-haired DREE planners. When he takes his four or five officials with him, he is going to be at a loss unless he can talk the common language, the jargon, the in-group gobbledeygook. I am glad to see the honourable minister learned it so well.

Sir, I think think the honourable minister made quite a number of excellent points in his remarks. He talked about the Department of Community and Social Development and how it grew up and of its inadequacy when it comes to being a planning unit for the government. The Department of Community and Social Development was the orphan of the government, the orphan child. There is no doubt about that. Taken in out of the cold, almost. It was set up originally as the honourable minister has already alluded, to try to take advantage of the ARDA programme, the ARDA programme which was developed by the Diefenbaker Government, a very good programme for just about every part of Canada except Newfoundland. The ARDA programme was developed to help the farmers of the west and the farmers of Ontario, with very little of utility as far as Newfoundland was concerned. Even under the ARDA programme, until it was finally amended. When I happened to be the minister of the department in 1970, the Government of Newfoundland found itself constrained to use every type of persiflage, subterfuge and had to bend every rule and regulation to try to get a few programmes that might fit this province's needs under an overall programme which was developed for the Western Provinces and Ontario and provinces like that.

What are you shaking your head for?

Where is our wild rice in Newfoundland? Would the honourable gentleman care to tell me about the wild rice we grow in Newfoundland under the ARDA agreement, paragraph after paragraph devoted to that. Agriculture - there is a great future for agriculture in Newfoundland. But there is a greater future in many other developments - the fisheries for example, the mineral resources, the forestry resources, which it was very difficult to get under or subceil under the ARDA programme as originally propounded, the old ARDA programme.

Anyway the ARDA programme comes into effect and the Department of Community and Social Development was set up to try to administer, for the Government of Newfoundland, the ARDA programme. At that time all the assorted flotsam and jetsam of the various government departments seemed for some reason or other to congregate in that particular department. Then the ARDA programme was not superceded, it was pushed aside like an unwanted child, cast aside and the FRED programme comes into existence under the aegis of the Government of Canada.

The Department of Community and Social Development, then under the Deputy Minister, Mr. Sametz, commenced, in consultation with a firm of consultants and people from Ottawa, and that commenced to put together several large tomes so that we could take advantage of the FRED programme. A change of government in Ottawa, a change of approach by the mandarins and the politicians in Ottawa, the FRED programme is jettisoned out the window once more.

Then the just society comes upon us, we are going to get from Ottawa, under a new programme, regional economic expansion. We are going to get money for infrastructure and resource development, provided that these public service developments did not come within any existing federal-provincial programme, which is an important point and it was a difficulty which we found when we were negotiating the ARDA, the second ARDA agreement as well, trying to find the gaps that we could fit

the ARDA agreement into.

Anyway, this DREE programme suddenly developed a good concept or so it was thought to be a good concept by some people in Ottawa, the DREE programme is finally developed and thrust upon the province who had been gearing, for a couple of years up to that time, for the FRED programme. The FRED programme was a diffuse sort of buck-shot programme where money was going to go into everything, scattered far and wide across the province. The DREE programme suddenly becomes overnight the absolute reverse of that and becomes sort of the gun-shot programme where you are going to have a special area or a special sector or a special function and you are going to aim right directly for that and put financial input into that and develop the province. The FRED plans serve very little purpose for that.

The DREE programme comes into existence and suddenly we found ourselves with lack of planning as far as the DREE programme was concerned, not lack of planning generally. Various line departments have all kinds of plans on their shelves, perhaps not integrated, certainly not integrated into an overall programme. The FRED planning had been done but that was very difficult to integrate or to put into the DREE programme. So we suddenly find ourselves with DREE, set up with a fairly sizeable budget, because Mr. Marchand was a very powerful man in Ottawa and was determined to do something under DREE, the best of intentions and still the best of intentions, and I think he is accomplishing under DREE- suddenly we find ourselves having to avail ourselves of the DREE money in very short order.

The DREE programme was set up in 1968, I believe June of 1968 or somewhere around there. The special areas are outlined, are promulgated with consultation with the province, they say. The consultation with the provinces consisted of a phone call or letter, I forget which,

saying, "these are the special areas." That is the consultation with the provinces and I understand the same thing obtained right across the board.

We did manage, as a result of some special efforts and I give Don Jamieson most of the credit for this, we managed to get one-third, eight out of twenty-four. One-third of the special areas throughout Canada, we managed to get here in Newfoundland for infrastructure development and that sort of development.

AN NON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Yes, part of Montreal is one special area, I think. I am not sure about that. My memory is failing me on it now. It has been a couple of years since I looked at it.

But in any event, we are forced with the necessity of availing ourselves of these federal funds and so we develop a crash programme and we are successful in the first two years of the DREE agreement in getting a firm commitment from Ottawa, signed, sealed, and delivered, as I am sure the minister will admit, of \$150 million under the DREE special areas programme. 130 million, that is right. The honourable minister is absolutely right. \$82 million in the first agreement, \$30 million in the second agreement, and \$20 million in the road programme of the second agreement.

We were successful in two years in getting \$130 million under the DREE programme. More money, not relatively, I am not talking in relative terms, absolutely more money under the infrastructure programme the special area, public services programme, than any other province in Canada. Now that is not as good as it sounds because obviously our needs were that much greater, and it was easy to persuade Ottawa of some of the needs which we had. But the fact remains that we were able to get \$130 million, far more than any other province

in Canada. The first agreement of \$82 million was the highest in Canada and next to that I think was Quebec with \$60 million and then New Brunswick with \$50 million, Those are round figures, something or other, but we managed to get the highest in all of Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: This year as well.

MR. ROWE: Oh yes, that is right. The money was committed under the first DREE programme signed in 1969 I think and the second one in 1971 or something. There was a full two years there and the money was committed in the first two years. As a matter of fact it was committed in the first eighteen months or something, the two DREE programmes - \$130 million, far more than any other province in Canada, in spite of the fact that we had a smaller population than any other province in Canada except Prince Edward Island, which has had a FRED programme.

So we managed to get this money and I say here now, Mr. Chairman, without talking about the application of the funds, without talking about the application of that money, I say now that if the honourable minister come even close to getting \$130 million of federal funds from Ottawa committed over a two year period, then I will take off my hat to him, I will even eat my hat.

I do not think this is the honourable member's fault. I do take some credit myself and on the part of the previous administration, for wrangling that money out of Ottawa. But I do think that there is probably in Ottawa now certain disenchantment with the DREE programme, just as there was a disenchantment with the FRED programme, the ARDA programme, the ADB body that was set up, disenchantment goes all the way along the line.

Politicians get fed up with these programmes because they come in promising tremendous results. Tremendous results are not obtained and then politicians get fed up with them and planners

are forced to do something else, dramatic.

So I do not blame the honourable minister but if he is able to weedle out of Ottawa, to conjole or weedle out of Ottawa, \$130 million, in the next three years or four years, under the DREE programme, then I will take off my hat to him. I do not think he will be able to do it, not for want of trying, not for any lack of ability or capability or effort but because times have changed, I think, somewhat.

That is the general history of the programme and of the department and how the DREE programme came into effect. Now the honourable minister mentioned communications between the departments, and I agree entirely with him on it.

As long as the planning function is done by one department of the government then it will be a dismal failure. If the honourable minister has had talks along these lines with Mr. Van Ea, the present Deputy Minister, he will know that he and I had talks, over a course of a year or so, on the matter, that he, I think, drew up a scheme of a planning unit within the government and how it will operate and we were going in that direction.

I am glad to see that the honourable minister is tending in that direction as well and the reason he will be unsuccessful in his efforts, if the planning function is done by one department, is because one department is only as good as another department and there are all kinds of, it is not jealousies but all kinds of fears of toes being tread upon and difficulty in getting things from other departments, fears of encroachments on various programmes and all this sort of thing. The same thing would exist on the other side of the coin if, for example, the expenditure function of the government were in the Department of Finance alone. You would have one department which is trying to control the expenditure of all the other departments and this would not be successful, this would give rise to bad feeling

and distastefulness all along the line.

Therefore, a Treasury Board was set up , as in other provinces and elsewhere, to look after the expenditure side of government activities. Treasury Board is a committee of Cabinet, an official committee of Cabinet, with powers to override all departmental decision.

To say; "Do this or else," or "Do not do this or else," because it is a Committee of Cabinet and Treasury Board has certain powers in its own right and it can recommend certain things to the government, as a committee, and the cabinet, the government, will pass it and of course that overrides any department.

The Treasury Board has its own secretariat of professional help, professional assistants to assist the Treasury Board in its deliberations. Exactly the same sort of function has to be set up, in my estimation, with regard to planning. There has to be a committee of cabinet, not a loose, ad hoc committee of cabinet, I do not know what the Premier has in mind, I am willing to wait and see what happens with it, not a loose, ad hoc committee of cabinet but a formalized committee of cabinet, consisting of a president of a planning board, for example, that is what it is called, planning and development board or something like that, a president of it which would probably be the - What is wrong with the honourable House Leader? He cannot take it, is that it? It is interesting or not, I mean, I can knock off if you want. I can knock it off but I thought - maybe if I sit down I will go to sleep you see, so I might as well stand up and put everybody else to sleep.

Somebody said in the House of Commons; he fell asleep in the House of Commons and dreamed he was making a speech. Lo and Behold! so he was standing on his feet, making a speech, I feel something like that. But the planning committee has to be a committee of cabinet, a formalized committee of cabinet, with the power to direct departments with regards

to planning input, to override departmental policy or decisions or positions and to get together and to integrate all the departments under the one planning committee and to have under it the highest powered professional planning help that is in the government. There is no doubt of that in my mind.

MR. MARSHALL: Would the honourable member like to inform the committee; what was the composition of the planning committee of the government of which the honourable member was a member and how in actual fact that committee functioned?

MR. ROWE: The committee functioned in a very poor fashion, This is why I have been stressing some of these points about formalizing it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: No, it did not function at all as a committee. You are absolutely right. It was not a formalized thing. It was a committee which was supposed to really assist the Minister of Community and Social Development, that is what it amounted to, under the DREE programme. That is absolutely useless, That is the type of thing which is going to be disastrous. This is my experience. Now I am trying to give the committee the benefit of my experience, as immature and stupid as it might be. But my experience in living with the department for three years, trying to develop some plans and some directions and this sort of thing, my experience is that it has to be a formalized, an established committee with its own established secretariate of high powered professional assistants, which can co-ordinate and integrate all the planning functions of the government. It is, as I say, a cabinet committee which has certain powers of its own and can make recommendations to cabinet which are then passed by the government.

This is how the planning function, in my estimation, should work. There are all kinds of variations on this general theme, there is no doubt about that. I think this is generally what they do in Ottawa, for example. Some people have not found this idea that I propounded too

successful but other things have not been so successful as well. I think that it is the only real way to try to attack the problem of planning in the department.

Now the general advisory committee of the senior advisory committee of top civil servants was another idea which was set up twice or revived twice in my memory. One was a committee which was a hang over from before the time when I got in the department and it did not function at all as far as I know. The other one was another one which I set up and it did not function, well it did function, that is wrong, it was a very useful committee when we were drafting up the first DREE agreement but it sort of fell apart after that. The reason it fell apart, this is why I stress the point about having this committee have its own secretariate, its own professional help, the reason it fell apart is that the deputy ministers who make the most input, gives the most input, gives the most information, gives the most experience and

expertise to the planning committee or to the general advisory committee, were those deputy ministers who were completely bogged down in their own line departmental duties. By and large they had their own committee meetings.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Yes, right. This is why it is useless. This is why I think that the one that the Premier has set up now is useless. I think it is a useless sort of thing but you will learn, undoubtedly. You will learn that it will be useless. It is no good to take the Duke of the Department of Education and the Duke of the Department of Public Works and the Duke of the Department of Economic Development, by that I mean to say the deputy ministers, and try to bring them all together and think that there is going to be an integrated planning from that. I do not think there is going to be. Certainly they can have an advisory capacity and all this sort of thing, but they are so interested in their own domains, they are professionally trained to be interested in their own domains. They are interested in their own departments and their own programmes and this sort of thing and they often, I do not say this unkindly or unfairly, as they can, lose sight of the wood for the trees or the trees for the - however it goes. There is that danger and this is why the planning committee, the planning board, the planning committee of cabinet has to have its own professional secretariat with as much professional assistance as it can have. Now I will not belabour any more, I will just throw it out.

Now the minister spoke about the communication gap that exist between the department and the people of the province, which may or may not exist but we will just assume that his word on it is right. If it do exist, one of the main reasons is that the programmes that the department has administered by and large, with some exceptions, the programmes like the DREE programme - No quorum, is there? One of the reasons that I was cognizant of as well, for the communications

gap between the Department of Community and Social Development and the general public, is not because of want of effort on my part or on the part of the deputy minister or anyone else involved. It was largely because of the fact that the programmes that we were administering were complex and complicated types of programmes like the DREE programme, for example, trying to explain so that people can bear in mind the complexities of the total DREE package involving the infra-structure, the special areas, the incentives, for example, that could go to industry and how much and where and how and where these industries could go, what types of industries, manufacturing industries, secondary industries and this sort of thing. I gave a number of speeches on it and probably the total over-all package was in people's minds for the duration of my speech but it is not the type of thing that sinks in and stays there. It is not sort of an issue type of thing that sinks into people's minds. It is sort of a complex, complicated thing that is drawn up by civil servants and administered by the civil servants and they have all their avenues and all that sort of thing open and they administer it and it is sometimes difficult for the ordinary layman to be fully cognizant of what exactly is going on.

I made on the resettlement programme I suppose, I counted up some speeches, I had in the files out there, I made. In one year I made seventeen speeches on the resettlement programme, different types of speeches, different aspects of it: Rotary Club, St. John's and Corner Brook, various places around and down in Marystown, I think on one occasion, and around in my own district and elsewhere like that. Again, as the honourable minister knows, the variety of information, the variety of complexity in the resettlement programme was such that it was difficult to grasp at one hearing unless you studied the thing. Now certainly the basic issues, there was no communication gap with regard to the basic issues affecting the resettlement programme, more or less the

philosophical issues as to whether there should be a resettlement programme or not, whether the Government of Newfoundland and Canada should actually be involved in assisting financially those who desire to move from one point to another and whether the programme is administered properly or not and this sort of thing. People in Newfoundland, I would submit, have had as many opinions on that subject as they had say on the subject of the fisheries on which every Newfoundlander is a self-proclaimed expert, as the honourable minister probably knows, and several other things like that.

There was no communication gap there. There might have been misunderstanding and there was certainly an attempt on my part and on Mr. Sametz's part to -

MR. SENIOR: You did not have the facts.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Did not have the facts. Well I will let the honourable minister have some of my speeches now later on, and he can read them over.

MR. SENIOR: Read some facts.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Read some facts. What is the honourable minister implying now? The honourable minister should say now what he is implying. "Read some facts," he says. I mean, are you implying that I am not being factual or I am being factual?

MR. SENIOR: No, I am not saying that you are not being factual now but when you presented the programme in the past the facts were not presented to the people.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): You are saying the facts were not presented to the people. We will hear the honourable minister on that, at some length I hope, because I do not intend to let that particular one drop. We are going to be here until Labour Day after all, by the look of it. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, be that as it may, we will go into that at some later date.

One of the things that I was genuinely proudest of during my tenure of office occurred about a year and a-half or so before I got out of office and that was the formulation of the concept of the rural development association on a geographical basis whereby the Government of Newfoundland would make a small modest grant, \$10,000 to each rural development association that met certain criteria and \$25,000 to the Newfoundland and Labrador Rural Development Council. We hoped that this money would be given to these rural development associations without any strings attached, that they could do what they wanted to with them, as long as they were not involved in political purposes or involved in -

AN HON. MEMBER: No quorum.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): No quorum again. Count the House, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The clerk informs the Chair that there is a quorum.

MR. MURPHY: What is wrong? Can they not count over there?

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Bad, bad at counting. Cannot count moving targets, you see. When you see someone scurrying through the door, it is hard to count them.

The rural development associations, now we did not go far enough with it. We did not proceed in some of the directions we wanted to but the basic concept of getting rural development associations together, getting people in a certain area, which had a community of interest, together into a rural development association, provide them with enough starter funds annually to, say, hire a rural development worker and allow them to raise other funds if they wanted to for other purposes and try to get some two-way, back-and-forth, a dialogue going between the rural development associations and the Department of Community and Social Development or any other line department in the government, concerning programmes. It tried to come up with programmes which were not imposed, just imposed on an area, by the high and mighty

government but hopefully would be programmes which would be tailor-made to fit the unique circumstances of a particular area, and we hope to get some funding for this under the ARDA programme.

Now under the new ARDA agreement, which was signed in 1971, a year after the old one expired. The old one, by the way, was supposed to be the last of the ARDA agreements, the last of them and DREE was convinced that it should be carried on, the one that expired in 1970, and DREE was convinced, not by us, although we put in representation, but by other provinces in Canada, that they should carry on and they did carry on. They drafted up an agreement which was basically the same for all the provinces in Canada and we went through about eighteen or twenty drafts and finally, hopefully, got some things included in it, for example, respecting the fisheries and other items like that which might be of some benefit to Newfoundland. Now up to the time that I retired from office, I do not think that one programme had been formulated under the ARDA agreement. That is not to cast any reflection at all on the planning group, the rural development planners who were trying to come up with programmes on that. The reason for that, Sir, was that the agreement was so late being signed and then the insistence of the Federal Government, rightly or wrongly, maybe rightly on programmes which were not sort of on a piecemeal basis but which would cover a whole area, a region I think was the way it was termed in the agreement. The result was that there was no programmes actually funded during my tenure of office. Perhaps the honourable minister can tell me whether now in fact some programmes have availed themselves of the ARDA funds since he became Minister of Community and Social Development. He might make a note of that and give us some information when he gets up to speak again.

That, Sir, is about all I want to say at this particular juncture. Other things will spring to mind as time goes on, I am sure, and as we go down through the rest of the estimates.

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Chairman, I just have a few brief comments in reply to the honourable member from the other side of the House. I am not particularly opposed to the special areas agreement as it was set up. I think it was basically a good programme and I think the fact that \$130. million was committed in the last two years under the special areas programme certainly is something that the honourable minister should be commended for, if in fact he had anything to do with that. Again I am not opposed to that. I am not opposed to development in special areas but what I am opposed to is this: Apparently, as a result of all this development in the special areas, the rest of Newfoundland was neglected to a great extent. What I would like to say is that we did have an agreement with the Federal Government which I believe could have related to the rest of Newfoundland, which was the ARDA agreement. I am of the opinion that the province just did not have the planning capabilities or if they did have the planning capabilities did not use them to the extent where they developed a programme to be submitted to Ottawa for funding under the ARDA agreement. That is what is wrong. There is nothing wrong with the special areas or special areas agreement.

MR. ROWE (N.N.): How much money is available under the ARDA agreement, to Newfoundland?

MR. SENIOR: Under the ARDA agreement there is no limit.

MR. ROWE (N.N.): No limit. But if there was no limit, you would not have gotten any more than a million dollars for a year.

MR. SENIOR: Well, I cannot say we could not have gotten a million, I cannot say we could not have gotten \$50 million. That is a hypothetical situation which I cannot possibly answer.

MR. ROWE (N.N.): Well it is not hypothetical because -

MR. SENIOR: Well if that is the case, I am not aware of it but my information is that there is no actual limit contained in the ARDA

agreement as such. The province -

MR. ROWE(W.N.): The estimates, like the DREE agreement, the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion -

MR. SENIOR: It is subject to approval by the Federal Treasury Board, I think that is what the honourable member was saying.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Sure and there is a five year budget and these estimates, the estimates for 1975, are already more or less approved up in Ottawa with a limit on the DREE programme and ARDA and everything else.

MR. SENIOR: Right. I think in relation to the \$130. million committed in the first two years of the special areas agreement, I think there are some facts which are contained in the budget which may bear repeating because I think this programme, at the time it was presented to the people of Newfoundland, was blown out of all proportions because, although in fact in the first special areas agreement in 1970 there was some \$18 million committed, that amount was supposed to be expended over a period of two years but when approximately one year had expired the agreement was renegotiated and projects that were in fact in the first agreement were rewritten into the second agreement and a total amount was rewritten as \$130. million.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): The total is the same, \$130. million.

MR. SENIOR: That is right but there are some very significant facts that should be pointed out. One is this, that up to 1972, that is from 1969, 1970, 1971 and 1972, out of \$124,000 that was contained in the estimates of previous budgets in fact only \$50,480,000 were actually expended. Now this raises a big question in my mind as to why the provincial government were in such a hurry, when they had so much work under the first DREE agreement, why did they go back to Ottawa within a year without, in my opinion, the necessary planning and without the necessary preparations and with still plenty of work to do in the province which they could not possibly complete? Why did they go back

to Ottawa and commit a further amount of money which they could not possibly expended in that period of time?

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Can I just answer that point now or reply to it?

MR. SENIOR: I would like to have the answer to that, yes.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Yes.

MR. SENIOR: I wonder if the honourable member would wait for just a minute for I have some other comments which I would like to make. The honourable member referred to rural development associations. I think this is a good programme. I subscribe to it and believe in it myself but what was lacking in the previous administration was this, although they did in fact form, were instrumental in forming such rural development associations and provide them with a grant of \$10,000, there was actually no programme developed where projects that were developed by the rural development associations could be funded unless they were located in special areas. But many of the rural development associations were located in rural parts of Newfoundland which -

MR. ROWE (W.N.): He has missed the point completely.

MR. SENIOR: I am making the point now. Which if the ARDA agreement had been developed, these development associations could have developed projects which in my opinion could have been funded under the ARDA agreement, if the proper programmes had been developed. The honourable member also asked me a question, if any programmes or any projects had been approved under the ARDA agreement since our government assumed office. The answer to that question is no, but we have -

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Why is that, Mr. Chairman? Any reason for that?

MR. SENIOR: I will explain that in just a moment, if I may. We have had meetings with DREE officials in Ottawa, approximately five or six weeks ago, and subsequent to that meeting we had meetings with the DREE officials here in St. John's. I cannot give full details of these meetings at the present time because I feel it would prejudice negotiations

June 29, 1972

Tape 1202

JM a

which are going on. As the honourable member knows when he was minister that any announcements pertaining to Federal-Provincial projects or programmes are announced as joint announcements by the federal minister and the provincial minister. I think it would be improper for me to give information on negotiations which are in fact in progress right now until these negotiations are completed and some commitments are made. I am quite pleased with the direction in which things have gone in recent days and I feel quite confident that we will see some worthwhile developments in the near future.

MR. ROWE (N.N.): Well unfortunately that last point did not answer my question.

Mr. Rowe (W.N.):

I am not interested - I am interested but I do not want the answer to what kind of negotiations are going on now but I am wondering why - I know why we were not successful in getting any ARDA Programmes done. I think I have given an indication of that. I am wondering why since January 18 to the present time the present administration have not been successful in getting some ARDA Programmes underway. I suppose it is for the same reason that we had; namely, the new programme is brought into effect and your planning is not geared to a new programme which is more or less superimposed on you by Ottawa. Then you have to do the necessary planning to get under that programme. That has not been accomplished to date.

MR. SENIOR: I would like to answer the honourable member's question and in fact I can answer it but I do not think it would be proper for me to answer it at this particular time.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): The minister has missed the point completely with regard to these development associations. These development associations were not supposed to be married to ARDA or anything like that. These development associations were associations which were set up on a broad spectrum to take advantage of any government programme, be it provincial, be it federal or be it federal/provincial, a joint programme. If these development associations, i.e., could come up with a good reason why they should have some sort of an integrated fishery unit of some sort, shelling units, freezing units, slipways and all this sort of thing, in a given area and negotiations to place with the Department of Fisheries, the hope was that they would be able to get something tailored to their needs because they would be involved in the planning. It could be a provincial programme, a joint federal/provincial programme, under a fisheries programme or it could be under ARDA or it could be under anything. I mean it was not ARDA or the lack of programmes under ARDA that was stymieing these.

MR. SENIOR: You are missing my point.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Anyway, Mr. Chairman, why was not the money spent under DREE? If the honourable minister has not come to a conclusion on that yet, then he has some fast learning to catch up on. You see we are not under our own control at all here when it comes to the federal government, in this province. We are always forced, like under the Local Incentives Programmes, As the hon. Minister of Finance has said on several occasions, a great programme - right? What are you shaking your head for? Are you listening to what I am saying or not? The Local Incentives Programme comes into effect. We do not have any say whether it comes into effect or not. They just come out of the blue with a local incentives programme or an opportunity for youth programme and they go into communities - now I am repeating, parroting the hon. Minister of Finance who I happen to agree with on this particular point. If you have any dispute, you better take it up with him as well. But what happens is that there is not enough money for a particular programme that is approved by the Local Incentives Programme. If someone wants to cut some trails through the woods or something, it could cost \$10,000 to do and the Local Incentives Programme approves it for \$6,000. They come after the provincial government, as the hon. Minister of Finance has said on a number of occasions, looking for the money. We are here in this province put behind the eighth ball on many occasions on that type of a federal programme.

Now there is another type of federal programme; namely, the Joint Federal/Provincial Programme which again, like medicare - how much choice did this province have really now (The Minister of Justice would know) as to whether we would go into medicare or not? How much choice? There was no choice. Ontario was holding out bravely. How long did they last? Mr. Trudeau, the Prime Minister, said, there a year or two ago, well five years from now we will have a look at the medicare programme, it will be a provincial responsibility then. We had no choice but to get into the medicare programme. It turned out that it was to our advantage financially for a number of years. That is only a fluke. If we were another province, it could have been to our severe financial detriment and here would we

Mr. Rowe (W.N.)

have been forced into a programme, into a great brilliant programme, (I happen to agree with it wholeheartedly) forced into a programme, forced to reorder our priorities, our provincial priorities to suit the needs of a superimposed federal programme.

Now come back to the DREE Programme again: The practical aspect of the DREE Programme is that there is a certain amount of money cut out every year for the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion. The advice that I got back informally, by some very high ranking civil servants and ministers of the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion, was that we had to get our grimy little hands on the money that was in the estimates of the department for the succeeding year as well. Now we had the planning done, joint planning done so we could convince them that certain projects needed the money, could use the money. As the honourable minister has pointed out, our capability here in the province included construction, in getting specifications detailed which we did not have to do, from the time that the DREE Programme was first announced and the time we got the money and all that sort of thing. The time necessary was not sufficient for us to expend the money under the first year's programme. Here we were, as the honourable minister says, quite correctly, (I agree with him, correctly one hundred per cent) getting more money from Ottawa, from the DREE Programme when we have not expended the earlier money. We did not even have the tenders called, I think. On much of it we did not have tenders called. What are we going to do? Now put yourself in the position of this poor little province. Are we going to say that we do not have last year's money spent. What we will do is spend up this year's DREE estimates and hope that we will get it next year.

Now practical experience leads you to certain conclusions. If a federal programme is going, you get it on it as soon as possible because it might not last for any more than two years, as the honourable minister, the hon. Minister of Justice has pointed out with respect to the medicare programme.

Mr. Rowe (W.N.).

That might not even last. How long is DREE going to last in its present form? (2) The money is actually allocated year by year for regional and economic expansion. There was a great possibility that if you did miss out on one year that you would not be able to pick up that balance, that amount that you missed out on, in subsequent years. You might just not be able to do it because the money, the pie, the allocation in that year was going to be all expended. There is no department in Ottawa like there is no department in Newfoundland that is going to turn money back to the Consolidated Revenue Fund. So what do they do? They would expend it over the programmes which were available to them, from New Brunswick, say, Nova Scotia or Manitoba or Quebec. We (I say this proudly, frankly and honestly) are proud of the fact that we were able in our second year, without having expended the money in our first year or even having called tenders on a lot of it in our first year, to get firm commitments from Ottawa, agreements, signed, sealed and delivered of additional money to come into this province. Now whether it was spent this year or next year or the year after is of very little concern to me really, although you would like to see it spent as quickly as possible, as long as we had it. We worked out a deal with DREE (You could show how much connivance there was in there between myself and Tom Kent more than anyone else who wanted very much to help us down in this province) whereby we did not have contracts called (I think the honourable minister is aware of this) we could still get seventy-five per cent of the committed amount of money down into our provincial coffers here even though it may not be spent for six months or a year. We could have it here in our provincial coffers and use it for on-going expenses of the province, gathering interest on it, on the grant side of it, and paying some interest on the loan aspect of it.

So I saw it as my bounded duty (I make no apologies for this at all) that if there were federal money going and if we had had some good rational programmes for them, even though the first programme had not been all completed and tied up and expended most of them were rational and some of them I have my doubts about - this arterial road we are involved in,

Mr. Rowe (W.N.).

I had my doubts about that from the start. We negotiated back and forth very hard with Ottawa, back and forth, back and forth. I am not sure it is a bad thing and I am not sure it is a particularly good thing. The money was available. Ottawa was agreeable to it. Ottawa wanted to do it. There was no overriding reason, from advice from my officials or from the cabinet, why we should not do it. It was thought to be a necessary engineering feat for the future of St. John's and the same thing in Corner Brook - to be clear and simple, to lay my hands, on behalf of the people of Newfoundland, on the money that was going under the DREE Programme and to get it down here. I saw that.

There was another problem too with regard to the estimates and this is the point made by the hon. Minister of Finance in the budget. The estimate which were put into 1969/1970 was a genuine and sincere estimate by the officials of my department. I had no more to do with that estimate than the honourable minister has to do with that estimate. That estimate had been come up with by the officials of the department, in conjunction with the other departments, as to how much they thought they could spend on roads, bridges, this, that and the other thing, treasury board and what not and all this sort of thing. Put that money in there, and they make a genuine guess as to how much money is going to be spent during that year. I, and the honourable minister are like babes in arms in respect of that. How can he dispute that? This is the estimates of officials, engineers, planners and this sort of thing. Now it turned out that the liaison committee, as the honourable minister knows and as the hon. Minister of Justice certainly knows, the liaison committee which was set up ran into one snag after another. The federal people on the liaison committee apparently, for some reason or other, did not see fit to make any decisions here in Newfoundland and funnelled them all up to Ottawa. There was a huge delay after delay in that liaison committee. These delays were finally ironed out, following a trip from here to Ottawa by the Premier of the Province, myself, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, up to see the Prime Minister of the Province to say that we thought that we were being badly used as far as the liaison committee was concerned and the

Mr. Rowe (W.N.).

Department of Regional and Economic Expansion was concerned, because were not getting things through very quickly at all. These snags were subsequently ironed out, much to the satisfaction of all concerned. That is the reason why the money as put in the estimates was not spent. There was no desire, as suggested by the hon. Minister of Finance, of us or the government or anyone trying to fool anybody. Who reads the estimates, Mr. Chairman, except the members in this House and the officials? These were genuine estimates made by officials of the government as to what they thought they could expend in a given year. It is as simple as that. There was no desire to fool anybody whatsoever.

There is one more point that I would like to ask the honourable minister. When does he think now that an additional DREE Agreement will be signed between his department and Ottawa or between whatever planning body there might be and Ottawa? I realize that he has his work cut out for him. We got, you would not call them firm commitments, studies commissioned by Ottawa which it was estimated encompassed about \$30 million extra work that Ottawa would, if the studies showed them to be feasible and this sort of thing, look very seriously at. I am wondering how far we have come along the lines in those particular studies. I will be finished now in a second. Have we approached the point where this \$30 million more or less can now probably be committed by Ottawa? How are they approaching it? Does the honourable minister see, as I experienced in my declining days of the administration, disenchantment by Ottawa with the DREE Programme, probably in an attempt to squirm out or some other new programme coming in or maybe they are not going to fund it as lavishly as they have in the past. I would like to hear the honourable minister's comments on the future, as he sees it, of the DREE Programme and when he expects to be able to lay his grimy little hands on more federal money which is going and which I submit

Mr. Rowe (W.N.).

he has no choice but to take or he is violating his trust to the Newfoundland people. There is one last final point and that is The theory behind this the DREE Programme, the Special Areas Programme, rightly or wrongly, is that if DREE concentrated its efforts in certain larger, populous areas in the province, for infrastructure, high roads, municipal services, schools and this sort of thing, that this would have the affect of freeing certain provincial monies which would ordinarily have been spent on those projects as a first priority, high schools, etc. which the money would go to the D.E.C.'s in respect of municipal services that the province would have to look after on a higher priority basis, certain road paving and this sort of thing. The idea was that this would be a relieving of the burden by Ottawa from the shoulders of the provincial government and the provincial government with whatever sources of money that it might have at its disposal, capital money, could use it in other areas that were not affected by DREE. That is the theory. The theory falls down when you look at the practical side of the picture; namely, that this province would probably have had very little money to spend on any programmes whatsoever over the next few years, of a capital nature. Therefore, you cannot say that the saving benefited the areas which were not in the DREE special areas. I would like to hear the honourable minister comment on what he thinks the prospects of the DREE Programme are.

MR. SENIOR: Well there are several options opened to us at the present time. Two of them are already written into the second Special Area Agreement. (1) The Agreement can be amended to include new projects from funds which could be available as a result of some projects not being completed on time and they could very well be replaced by new projects.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable minister would yield a moment, I would like to announce that I have had a caucus with my new-found friends on the other side and they have agreed to pass this subhead in its entirety.

MR. THOMS: The honourable member is dreaming, of course.

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer the question, it would only take a minute. I just finished saying that the Special Areas Agreement could be amended to include new projects from funds available, as a result of projects not being completed or to be completed at a later date, now being substituted by new projects. We are aware of a saving in our department under the Special Areas Agreement. It would appear to be in excess of \$2 million although it would take some time before this is finalized. It is possible that the agreement could be amended to that extent. Also written in the Special Areas Agreement is the possibility of having the agreement expanded to include new projects particularly those which could be recommended as the result of the seventeen studies which the honourable member referred to and which I referred to in my opening remarks.

Some of these studies are already completed, I understand. Others are well in hand. No doubt some projects will develop as a result of these. Of course there is again the possibility of a whole new agreement. Without going into details, I can say that all these possibilities were explored during the recent meetings with the DREE officials.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, before the minister's salary - this vote passes - just a couple of questions I would like to direct to the honourable minister. His philosophy of developing community and social development I suppose is so general and we have heard so much about it that hopefully it does not blow away in the wind. But the questions I would like to ask the honourable minister is: In rural Newfoundland there have been a number of people getting involved in Community and Social Development. One in particular has been the extension services of the University. I would like to

ask the honourable minister if he would explain to the House the - if there was any connection between his department or any co-ordination between his department and the extension services of the University. I would also like to direct the question in this manner; How many field workers is it planned to put into the field when we think in terms of regional government and all the other department heads who have expressed the desire to get down on the level of the people, and some of them have tried to establish regional offices throughout the province. I think there is wishful thinking in a lot of respects where someone sits here in Confederation Building and does some great planning and has a great philosophy. All of a sudden you arrive in an outport community and the extension services of the university is doing the exact thing that the Community and Social Services Development plan to do. So I was wondering if there is any co-ordination in that respect. If the honourable minister could tell us if he planned to have regional officers throughout the province and if there is a programme to revitalize the regional development associations?

MR. SENIOR: It is a very simple answer to these questions, Mr. Chairman. The answer to the first question regarding the extension service, there is no connection in the sense that they are working for us or we are working for them. We like to think that they compliment what we are doing, particularly in the field of training. I think they are very qualified in the field of training people on the local scene especially in rural Newfoundland. I would like to see a better rapport between the extension service and our department. I feel that this can be developed.

As far as the field workers are concerned, the honourable member may know we provide a grant of \$10,000 a year to the development associations. The primary purpose of this grant is that they may

hire a field worker. So in that sense each regional development association would in fact have their own field worker.

MR. WOODWARD: Another question, Mr. Chairman, if I may, maybe the honourable minister can explain to the House the number of active development associations there are in - throughout the province now. The Great Northern Peninsula had a very active one going back and maybe set the pace for development associations in the province. How many active associations there are in the province, if there are any?

MR. SENIOR: I would not want to say something that was not correct. If I recall there would be approximately eighteen active at the moment. These are associations that have qualified to receive grants from our department. I think the figure is eighteen. It is around that figure anyway.

Shall 2001-01 carry?

On motion total subhead 2001 carried.

Shall 2002-01 carry?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, before this carries I would like to know under this subhead if Mr. McLean or McLean's Advertising - it says information services in parenthesis there, Mr. Chairman. Does Mr. McLean have a contract with the department of Community and Social Development or has he had or will he have? The Premier is nodding his approval there.

MR. SENIOR: Well the answer to the first two questions is no. The answer to the last question: "will he have?" I would not be able to say. That would depend on how far into the future you are talking about. I do not see any reasons for it at the moment.

MR. NEARY: Would the honourable minister then explain to the House what he means by information services under this subhead? What is it all about? I would like to get the answer.

MR. SENIOR: I can answer that question. We have an information service

located in our department which supplies the materials to development associations. They also print inter-departmental publications like - we have a publication in our department. These are internal publications only.

On motion total subhead 2002 carried.

On motion total subhead 2003 carried.

Shall 2004-01 carry?

On motion total subhead 2004 carried.

Shall 2005-01 carry?

MR.W.ROWE: Mr. Chairman, \$1,5 million, Grant-in-aid Rural, Development. Appropriations-in-Aid, \$750,000, which is one half recovered apparently, from Ottawa. Included in this grant is the grants to the - one-half of the \$1.5 million recoverable from Ottawa. Are the grants to the rural development associations contained in that vote? If so, does the honourable minister anticipate getting Ottawa to pay for half the grant to the rural development associations? I must say any approaches that I made on that did not meet with much success. I do not think they were too prepared to do it. Maybe they have come around now under the ARDA Agreement or something.

MR.SENIOR: No it is not included. The \$1.5 million is an amount which is a sort of reserved fund in the event that projects are approved under the ARDA agreement which the provinces must share on a fifty-fifty basis with Ottawa. As I mentioned before, the total expenditure could very well be more than that. But in any event the expenditure would be expended in line departments but would subsequently be recovered from Ottawa by -

MR.W.ROWE: Where are the grants of rural development associations?

MR.SENIOR: I would have to refer to my notes.

On motion total subhead 2005 carried.

Shall 2006-01 carry?

MR.WINSOR: Mr. Chairman, before we pass that item. Can the honourable minister inform the House how many communities he plans to resettle? If so, what are the places he has in mind? Communities, as resettlement.

MR.SENIOR: Mr. Chairman, I plan to table a list of the sending and receiving communities as part of the idea of providing as much information to the people of Newfoundland as possible. I have searched myself to find out why this information should not be released to the public, particularly since it affects so many people in this province. For the life of me I cannot see any reason why the people of Newfoundland cannot be aware of situations that affect our lives. So, I would like at this time to table the list of sending communities and receiving communities and also the communities which have been designated as outports, which means that these communities will be evacuated or they are designated for the category. If that would answer the honourable member's question, I would table the information.

MR.WINSOR: In the list of communities we are now to receive, has the request come from the communities themselves to be resettled or is it the government policy? We of the previous administration took an awful lot of criticism from certain politicians, leaving the inference that many settlements were just moved because of government's action rather than community interest. What I mean is the inference was left by a few politicians that it was the government who were resettling those communities. But the policy of the previous government was, as I recall, that no settlement, no settlement was ever resettled without the request of the majority, a vast majority of the residents of that community.

So, the ones that you are now tabling would you have a special request to have the settlements resettled or is it a new policy of government to resettle them anyhow?

MR. MOORES: I would like to make one comment, that is that the official policy of this government is that we do not have any resettlement programme without the wish of the people in an area wanting to be resettled. The sending and receiving communities, this basically that was prepared in Ottawa, we are not in complete agreement with. As a matter of fact there will be no one in this province resettled who does not want to for valid reasons.

MR. W. ROWE: That was always the policy. Now, here is the problem that arises with this. A sending community is a misnomer and the most stupid description of any community that I have ever heard. I think it was a word developed in Ottawa, "sending community," because it can be so readily misunderstood. The Premier knows what I am talking about. A sending community is a community from which it is agreed between Ottawa and Newfoundland, if people desire, by sending an application, of their own volition, to the government here, the resettlement committee, they may get resettlement assistance.

MR. ROWE, W.N. get resettlement assistance to go to a designated reception area, a receiving area.

The reason that it is subject to so much misunderstanding and misinterpretation and embarrassment for people concerned is that the term "sending community" gives the impression that these are communities which are to be closed out, This is completely false, as the Premier will be the first to agree.

MR. SENIOR: Not completely false.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Well, okay, if the Premier wants to get together with his colleague and discuss it, I have no objection. I am only trying to save him from what I consider an act of folly, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure the Premier will agree.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Chairman, as the honourable member for White Bay South has said, the word "sending" is a very, very bad word. It was an Ottawa invention. A lot of people do come to the conclusion that this automatically means that their town is going to be resettled.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Closed out.

MR. MOORES: I do not think Ottawa intended that and certainly this government will never intend it. The receiving towns mean that these are the areas that are eligible for resettlement in. It is a very rigid set of towns. It is something that we do not agree with. It is something that we will not put in force without the wishes of the people. I want to make that very clear.

AN HON. MEMBER: Absolutely.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, is the honourable minister going to supply the committee with the list? I noticed he passed it over to the usher, The honourable the Premier went down and whispered something in his ear, then he took it off the tray and put it back on his desk. Are we going to get the list, Mr. Chairman? Is the honourable minister going to let us have a copy of the list before we pass this subhead? Mr. Chairman, my honourable colleague here asked the honourable Minister of Community and Social Development if he were going to supply the committee

MR. NEARY: with a list? The minister said, yes, sent for the usher, who went over, reached out his tray, the minister put the list on the tray, then the honourable Premier apparently became a little bit shocked, left his seat in this honourable House and went up to the honourable minister, whispered something in the honourable minister's ear and he took the list back off the tray.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have ever seen this happening in this honourable House, to see a minister of the Crown embarrassed by the honourable the Premier. Embarrassed, Sir, openly and in front of everybody, embarrassed in front of the press, in front of the spectators in the galleries, Sir. I think the honourable Premier could have been a little more diplomatic and a little more tactful, But, Sir, that is not the point that I am trying to make. Be that as it may, that is a matter to have to be sorted out between the Premier and the minister. But, Sir, the point is this, that there is a list of communities in the minister's office -

AN HON. MEMBER: On his desk.

MR. NEARY: On his desk, Oh! on his desk here in this honourable House right now, that are going to get the axe, that are going to be wiped out. Mr. Chairman, this is true. I think that the people of this province have a right to know where these communities are. Where are they, Sir? Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge, to my knowledge there was no list. There is a list now. There is a list, Sir. The minister has it on his desk. Every man, woman and child, Sir, in rural Newfoundland today, when this news goes out would be wondering if their community is one of the ones that is going to get the axe. Is Bell Island on the list? Is it, Mr. Chairman? I would like to know?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The honourable member for Labrador West may be joking, but Bell Island may be on that list. Bell Island may be on the list because I do know, Mr. Chairman, that there are officials in the ministry

MR. NEARY: who think that the population of Bell Island should be moved, there should be a complete transplant. I will say, over my dead body there will, Sir, over my dead body, unless the transplant is compatible with the needs of the people. Sir, the people have a right to know what communities around this - what is the honourable member for St. John's East muttering there?

AN HON. MEMBER: We do not want any pollution up our way.

MR. NEARY: Sir, I think this is a very serious matter.

MR. MARSHALL: Why?

MR. NEARY: Ottawa and the Provincial Tory Government have agreed on a list of communities that will be annihilated in the next few months or in the next couple of years. We want to know what these communities are, Sir. Where are they located?

MR. SENIOR: I would like to point out at this time, I would not want anyone to be misled in this regard, that the list of communities that I have here is the list that has existed for sometime, Obviously, a programme of resettlement could not be carried out in Newfoundland unless communities were designated as sending or receiving communities. The fact that a community is designated as a sending community merely means that a person can receive assistance, Federal/Provincial Governments shared jointly to resettle from that community to a designated receiving community. It does not mean, it does not mean, and I emphasize that, does not mean that the community is to be wiped off the map. That is the furthestest thing from the truth. Obviously, if all the people were to move from the community, it would be eliminated. But that is not the purpose of the programme. It is to assist people to move from communities where they cannot find employment and so on to receiving communities where they can find employment and in agreement with other criteria. The list has existed since the Federal/Provincial Agreement was signed by the previous administration. I think it is unfair

MR. SENIOR: for the honourable member for Bell Island to point out that this is an agreement that was entered into by the present administration and the federal government.

MR. ROWE. W.N. I would like to say something before the honourable member speaks again, The honourable minister is absolutely right in just about every respect except one and that is, it is not a list that has existed since the signing of the resettlement agreement, it is a list which has developed up to the present time, I would assume since the signing of the resettlement agreement.

Mr. Chairman, this is the very point that I was trying to get at a little earlier when I was talking about revelation of facts and everything with the honourable minister, remember I said, "we will not let this one go, because I wanted to know what this concealment of facts was all about." You see, this is where the thing gives rise to all kinds of political high feelings and this sort of thing. Mainly, because now, and I am not saying anything about anyone here in the House. but certain federal gentlemen, federal members, some federal members and other people in the province, both proponents of my own party and other parties have seen fit to use the resettlement programme as a political football.

Now that is probably fair game, although it is a little unfair to the people concerned. The problem is that this sending community thing is subject to misunderstanding and I am not saying that my honourable friend has misunderstood it at all. He can only go by the interpretation that is put on it by certain people and by the words, this term "sending community." What has to be stressed in this and the honourable minister can make up his own mind as to what he does with the list - what has to be stressed in this is that sending communities are not communities which had any special status at all compared to any other community in the Province of Newfoundland or Labrador. A sending community is not a community which has been

MR. ROWE, W.N. designated for abandonment. A sending community is not a community concerning which the government or any other body will put any pressure on the people of that community to move. A sending community is a community which because of geographical isolation, because of smallness of population, because of lack of amenities nearby or in the community, because of the improbability of good amenities, social amenities, ever coming near that community or being in the community, because of lack of employment opportunities, because of a host of factors has been put on the list for the use of the joint resettlement committee. The use that it is put to is this; if a person applies to the government for resettlement from St. John's to Grand Falls, the resettlement committee says no, because St. John's is not a sending community. If a person applies from Stephenville to Grand Bank, the resettlement says no, Stephenville is not a sending community, it does not fulfill the criteria. If, on the other hand, a community such as for example I believe there is a community in my own district on the list there, Bear Cove I think which is now phased out, if the people of Bear Cove, they are all gone now as it happens anyway, if there is anyone living there, if they of their own volition and voluntarily decided to either petition the government or send individual applications to the government and if there has been expressed to the government already the fact that a substantial portion of the people desire resettlement (I think I am stating it substantially correctly) desire resettlement, then the government will allow a certain portion of financial assistance to that family to resettle to a receiving community. Now that is all it means.

There is no pressure, there is nothing, it does not have any special status, there is no desire to phase a community out whatsoever. All it means is that if families do want to move from that community because of certain factors, including the fact that a substantial proportion of the community have already expressed a desire to move, of their own volition, then the government will allow financial

MR. ROWE, W.N. assistance to an individual family or the whole place, for that matter, to move. I want to make that completely clear because I do not want, I do not care how much political hay can be made about the resettlement programme. Now that we are in the opposition, now that the government are carrying on with the same resettlement programme, the estimates are larger than they were last year in respect of resettlement programme, a carrying on, they may try to renegotiate with Ottawa a different resettlement programme, that is their prerogative.

But I do not want, as a citizen of the province, I do not want communities in which people in this province are living to become political footballs, I do not want it to happen. I do not want people to feel that they have anything to fear. I do not want people to get the wrong impression. I do not want wrong or bad information disseminated. Now what the honourable minister does about the list, I could not care less. It is a list which is for the use of the resettlement committee, for the reasons which I have already given. He can suit himself.

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Chairman, just another brief word, if I may. My idea in saying that information would be supplied to the people - obviously, if someone writes to me and asks me if there community is a sending community and they request to be resettled, I am obligated or someone in my department is obligated to answer their request and tell them if they are eligible for resettlement. If they are, obviously, their community is a sending community. So really it is no great secret. By the same token, if someone requests to be moved to a particular community, then we have to advise them in fact if this community is a receiving community. So on second thought, there is no real point in tabling the list because anyone who wants this information, who is interested in resettlement, can certainly get it from our department. There is nothing hidden in that respect.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thank the honourable minister for his explanation. I would like to have a copy of the list. I am requesting - the minister said that anybody who was interested in resettlement could have a copy. I am interested in resettlement, Sir. Could I have a copy? Could I have it delivered to me now, Sir?

AN HON. MEMBER: He did not say a copy of the list.

MR. NEARY: The minister said that anybody interested in resettlement could have a copy of the list.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where do you want to move?

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Chairman, could I have a copy of the - I am requesting a copy now.

MR. SENIOR: The information that I just gave, Mr. Chairman, was that anybody requesting information on communities, if they want to know if they are designated or sending communities or receiving communities, can receive this information from our office, if they are interested in resettlement.

MR. NEARY: Well I am interested in resettlement, Mr. Chairman. I am interested in resettlement, so I am requesting a copy of the list. Mr. Chairman, what does the honourable minister have to hide? Sir, this is going to create an awful lot of doubt and suspicion in the minds of our Newfoundland people, they will want to know if their communities are on the list? Are they sending or receiving? They want to know that, Sir.

Mr. Chairman, you know, when we were sitting on that side of the House and the honourable the member for Gander, the honourable the member for St. John's East, the honourable member for St. John's Centre were sitting on this side of the House, Sir, I do not suppose there was a programme that they were more critical of than the resettlement programme. Sir, they created an image in this province of the Department of Community and Social Development as a barge going across a bay, going across a harbour with a house in tow. This was the image they created, Sir, Community and Social

MR. NEARY: Development. Criticized us, crucified the administration and here we find, Mr. Chairman, that the vote under Community and Social Development Resettlement has increased this year. On top of that the minister comes into the honourable House of Assembly and says he has a list. We ask him for a copy of the list and he will not give it to us.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what the honourable minister has to hide?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, if I may just have a few words, because the honourable the member for Bell Island made a few observations and also the honourable member for White Bay South, that perhaps ought to be touched upon. First of all, the honourable member for Bell Island is quite correct in the fact that we - when we were the members of the opposition we were very critical of the resettlement programme. I would like to allay the statement made by the honourable member for White Bay South with respect to this estimate of Community and Social Development.

The fact of the matter is that since we have come into government, all, pretty well all of our efforts have been geared towards various heavy problems in industrial and economic development. The situation with respect to the Community and Social Development Department, as the honourable the member for White Bay South correctly indicated, is to a large extent the creature of the federal government and the federal participation and the federal government's determining which community should be, in conjunction - albeit in quotation marks - with the provincial government, sending and receiving communities. "In consultation with."

I fear myself sometimes, Mr. Chairman, that we are coming to a stage in this province where, because of the fact that the central government pays the money that unless we watch it, we will have traded one kind of colonialism for another. I do not think Newfoundlanders will really want to accept the colonialism from Ottawa any more than they would accept the colonialism from

London, at this stage of our development. But the fact of the matter remains is this, we never condemned resettlement out of hand but we condemned the manner in which resettlement was carried out by the previous administration albeit and maybe as a result of pressures from Ottawa but we condemned the method and mode of carrying it out. There is nothing wrong with resettlement when people being resettled come to a better type of life, Here the receiving communities - that terminology does not particularly hit me too well because it smacks of bureaucracy and bureaucracy from Ottawa, "Receiving Communities" you almost feel like you are sending animals to a certain place. But the receiving communities that we would look upon as receiving communities would be viable communities where people can enjoy life in a much better fashion than they have. Of course, you can have a variation of opinion on this but what we mean is this, that a receiving community will be one worthy to go to, where jobs are provided, schools are better but most of all where the community itself being resettled or the person in the community makes a voluntary choice.

Now I know there will be people on the other side who will say it was always voluntary, but the fact of the matter is that with Ottawa playing the tune we did not have a complete say with respect to community and social development. As a matter of fact, with Ottawa paying the large amounts of money it does, there are many areas in which we have not had the say which we ought have as a sovereign power. When we entered Confederation, which was a great event, we did not give up our government completely and we retained many aspects of it and we are determined in this government to exercise the powers which are available to us and we are also determined in this government - with reasonableness - with Ottawa to enter into discussions, as we already have, to be sure that the policies affecting Newfoundlanders are not set down by the bureaucrats in the offices at Ottawa but the policies are the policies of the individuals themselves in the communities. That is why, Mr. Chairman,

the honourable the member for White Bay South made the observation that the policy is the same. Perhaps the honourable the member for White Bay South could turn and with some reasons say, "Well, why do you bring these estimates in?" But I think the reason has already been given. I think I can assure the honourable member for White Bay South that the matter of resettlement as being looked into and being properly directed in this province, was a commitment which we made as a political party in opposition and is a commitment which we are determined to carry out in government regardless of what the estimates show.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): If I may say a further word on it, Mr. Chairman. I think that perhaps many of the criticisms that were directed at the resettlement programme by the Progressive Conservative Opposition at the time and people who were non-partisans in politics, were to some large extent worthy of merit and consideration at a certain time during the resettlement programmes career, under the old resettlement programme, I think the minister will agree with this, under the old resettlement programme, which was signed by the Newfoundland Government and the Government in Ottawa, again the Newfoundland Government with a gun in the back of its head, let us face it, because the Ottawa Government paying eighty per-cent of the shot and therefore calling the tune - "he who pays the piper, calls the tune." Now in 1970 and leading up to 1970 I was minister of the department at that time and the honourable Leader of the Opposition was with me on many of my treks to Ottawa when I met with DREE, Tom Kent especially, Mr. Marchand and others in the department and renegotiated the resettlement programme to make it a much more rigid, a much more strictly adhered to or a programme with rules that had to be strictly adhered to, much more rational in its approaches, much more sensible in the economic determinates, the things that determine whether a person should move from here to here if he wanted to move from here to here on an economic basis. I think

that when the present administration gets around, on its list of priorities, gets around to examining the present resettlement programme they will find then many of the doubts which they had about it three or four years ago and which I had about it when I got into the department to start off with, not so much the agreement with Ottawa but the way that it could be mishandled not by the officials or anything but by people who wish to go places. For example I know of one instance, a couple of instances, as a matter of fact, where whole communities of their own volition, without getting any resettlement grant whatsoever, without contacting anyone whatsoever, moved to another place which nobody would designate as a receiving community by any stretch of the imagination. Then we, under the old agreement, were faced with certain real practical problems.

What do you do? Do you say to these people who have in fact moved: "No, you will not get any financial help to allow you to put in some water and sewer systems or a septic tank or to build a little road or to improve the community that you have moved to. We will just leave you there to cling to the rock in a worse situation in many cases than you did leave nor will we in fact help you." Sometimes we were driven, I will not name any places as they have already been mentioned in this House, we were driven by humane considerations and nothing else to hand out money, under the old resettlement programme, to a couple of communities who did that. Now one community is in my honourable friend's district, I will not mention the name. He knows about it. There was a certain looseness under the programme which permitted that and certain precedence were able to be set under the old programme which permitted this sort of thing to go on.

It was not the programme itself, not the philosophy behind the programme, not the agreement but in some cases the methodology, the methods that were used not sort of positive methods but sometimes the

lack of method that was used that permitted not abuse but some things arose which could be validly criticized by any objective observer. I think that most of these things have been removed from the new resettlement agreement, most of them. I think perhaps we did not get our whole way completely when we negotiated with Ottawa. We had other things which, maybe Mr. Sametz or Mr. Harnum in the department can inform the honourable minister about, some positions which we took, concerning for example certain community capital, churches, other buildings and things which we thought should be salvaged and used and a resettlement grant given and they could be moved and churches or schools or public buildings could be moved and assistance given for that. Ottawa never did agree with that. We tried to insist on it but finally we came to what amounted to a reasonable compromise and I think the second agreement, when perused by my honourable friend, the House Leader, and certainly after having been perused by my friend, the Minister of Community and Social Development, I think that they will agree that the programme is very substantially improved over what it was five or six years ago.

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Chairman, this is a very good point that has been made, probably. I am in agreement with the resettlement programme in principle, I have always been in agreement with it in principle but as my honourable colleague has pointed out I am in disagreement with some of the ways it has been implemented in the past. In all fairness to the honourable member for White Bay South, because of the changing criteria in the new agreement there are, these criteria are more stringent than they were formally. As a result, in our department right now we have approximately a backlog of 1,000 applications on file. Now some of these applications would not qualify for reasons for example that the community where they live is probably a receiving community and they want to move out of it, for example they could live in a large

community like St. John's or Grand Falls, but we do have a backlog of about 1,000 applications.

Another point, which was raised just a moment ago, which I may clarify when I am on my feet was that the resettlement grant for this year has been increased. It may appear that way in the estimates but actually what happened was this, that is more or less a standing vote each year but last year an amount of \$150,000 was transferred from that vote to another vote, which accounts for the decrease of last year.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if the page had only been about ten seconds faster we would have had the list. Obviously the minister has no intention now of tabling the list. I cannot force him to do it. Mr. Chairman. I will keep pressing to try and get the list so that the people of Newfoundland will know if their community is on the list. Mr. Chairman, I want to move to another matter under resettlement. The honourable Premier and his administration, in two elections, in October and in March, Sir, went around this province ranting and raving that when they formed the new administration that nobody, but nobody, not a single family in Newfoundland in the future, following their formation of the administration, would be asked to move from one community to another, unless they were given a home for a home. This is the principle, Sir, that I approve of, I agree with it because I brought the matter up in this honourable House about, oh I would say about seven or eight years ago, some idea that the Premier sold them for me, but nevertheless I am glad to let him have it.

MR. MURPHY: 1964.

MR. NEARY: Glad to let him have it, Sir. Not a new idea, not a new concept but I am glad that the Premier and his colleagues adopted that principle, Sir. I would like to know now if in future when people

resettle, if they will be given a home for a home. I would like to hear the honourable Premier comment on that, if he will. If the honourable Premier does not comment on it, perhaps the honourable minister would care to comment on it.

MR. SENIOR: Yes, I would, Mr. Chairman. We are in the process now of reviewing the resettlement programme although I am not in a position at this time to indicate any new policies that have been formulated. But, like I say, we are in the process of evaluating the programme. I think it is fair to say that any government that would start to evaluate the resettlement programme would have to ask itself some questions. I think, before any policy was formulated that we must think about certain underlying principles which would be involved. I have made a note here of some principles which I think should be considered and maybe I can read them as they are here. I feel that people affected by a relocation scheme have the right to a full and meaningful involvement in the determination of all policies relating to their relocation. This principle ensures that the people to be relocated are adequately represented in the determination of policies, regulations and criteria which will affect their lives and communities. People who help formula the criteria for resettlement will not be in a position to criticize the government for implementing it. I feel that people have the right to enjoy equal or improved circumstances, subsequent to their relocation. I believe that people have a right to support services to assist them in achieving a style of life equivalent to that enjoyed prior to resettlement. Many people have no previous experience in purchasing properties etc. and would need considerable counselling, technical support to make house purchases. Social case workers, assessors and other professional people should be made available and a housing location service should be required in assisting to provide suitable property.

I believe that people have the right to prompt payment of claims. I believe that communities receiving relocatees have the right to a just compensation for the additional load placed on their services and for the provision of additional services required as a result of the programme. These, Mr. Chairman, are some of the principles that I think should be involved in assessing the present resettlement programme.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I notice that the principle of the home for a home was not mentioned in the ten commandments or whatever it was that the honourable minister just read out,

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Chairman, maybe if I could have the floor I could read it again, just the case it was misunderstood, People have the right to enjoy equal or improved circumstances subsequent to their relocation.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, members on the opposite side of the House were elected on a platform and a part of that platform was the principle of giving people who had to resettle a home for a home. Are we going to renege on this promise, Sir, this commitment the same as they have reneged on insurance on fishermen's gear? Is this going to be another broken promise, Sir? Why does the Premier not stand up, stand up, Sir, and be a man. Stand up and say, "Yes, yes I made a commitment to the people of Newfoundland that in future, when we have urban renewal schemes when people have to resettle, when people have to leave their homes for a legitimate reason that we will give them a home for a home, Sir. The Premier went around this province ranting and raving, beating his gums that this is what the administration was going to do. "

Now, Sir, they are apparently renegeing on this. Is this going to be another broken promise of the Tory Administration? How many more broken promises are we going to have, Sir?

MR. A.J.MURPHY: Mr. Chairman,

AN HON. MEMBER: I have one.

MR. MURPHY: I have one.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is pretty good.

MR. MURPHY: But I do not have a cast-iron gut. In 1964, in this House of Assembly, there was an Act put through, the Family Expropriation Act, designed to assist the people of St. John's Centre, by one Anthony J. Murphy with the assistance of the Honourable Leslie R. Curtis. Three years afterwards, this - (one of these is a party to it) destroyed that Act for the people of the Blackhead Road and many others. Now they have the gall to come and say: "What about a home for a home?"

MR. NEARY: Yes, what about it?

MR. MURPHY: White as sepulchres, white as sepulchres that is all you are. Two faced...

MR. W.N. ROWE: Now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MURPHY: Cannot tell the truth. Sorry!

MR. NEARY: Quite amusing, Mr. Chairman, indeed.

MR. MURPHY: There is nothing amusing about it.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, the whole question of resettlement, I submit, goes back, really back beyond Confederation days. In my own district I can trace it back eighty years...

MR. MURPHY: I did not know you were that old.

MR. THOMS: When small communities resettled to the larger communities. I submit the same is true in other districts of our province. Only twenty-five years ago, maybe it is twenty-seven or twenty-eight, but within thirty years, the Island of Greenspond (my friend from St. John's South knows the area) it resettled. It was not under any resettlement programme. Conditions on the island were just too hard for them to bear, so they up stakes and left. A lot of them went to Middle Brook.

MR. MURPHY: (First part inaudible) resettlement programme?

MR. THOMS: No, It was not under resettlement, but what I am getting at is the criticism of the opposition to the past administration, that made it look as though resettlement was a Liberal programme. It was not. It was a people's programme. It started way before Confederation came in, way before the last administration came in. The last administration took pity on these people who were moving and some of them moved on their own since Confederation, without any government assistance whatsoever. So the past administration tried to make the burden more bearable for the people who were moving. This is all that happened.

Grant you there may be some loopholes in it and no programme is perfect. This administration will not put forward any programme that is perfect, the same as the past administration, the same as when we get in, in three or four years time.

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. THOMS: You should have caught it the first time, because it is worth noting.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable minister apparently came into this House today with a list. I do not see why we should not get or at least the members should not have knowledge of this list. I note that the Acting Minister of Highways, when he brought forward the estimates for the Department of Highways, he submitted and gave us a copy of the road programme that was to be carried out this year. The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing stated for us last night the programme in his department for this year. I do not see why the Minister of Community and Social Development cannot let the members of this House have a look at the list that he has in his department. I am sure, that if there is any community on that list that is in my district, I should definitely know it. Because any of the people within that community, if they want resettlement, the first person they are going to come to is their member. Therefore, the member should have the knowledge. I cannot see why the minister cannot

supply each of the members of this House with at least a copy of the list of the names in his particular district.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a few remarks to those of the honourable member for Bonavista North. I think that the honourable Minister of Community and Social Development is doing a great injustice to this House today by hiding a piece of information that is so vital to the people of this province.

Sir, there are two ways and means whereby you can move to and fro, from one centre to another, in this province. If you are living in a sending area and going to a receiving area, and I will cite one of the particular areas as being Happy Valley, Labrador, because of the development there. I have dealt with a number of people who have resettled. I can name a number of sending areas in this province for you. People have come to me and asked this question: "Do I get a resettlement grant? Because I have obtained a job in your community, do I go to manpower to get a mobility move grant?"

There are two ways by which people can move. Which one do they take first? Do they take the manpower mobility move grant or do they take the resettlement programme grant? This is important. We will have depending on my community and I will probably have to be dealing with one hundred or one hundred and fifty people this year who are going to move into this community from all over the island. A person will come to me and will say; "Do I qualify for a resettlement grant?" Naturally, if they are not from a sending area and going into a receiving area, although I know that Happy Valley is a receiving area, I cannot answer that question. By the time the negotiations transpire, and in the event that they do not know anything about the manpower mobility move grant, a person has probably picked up his family and moved into the area. He is not qualified for the resettlement grant and manpower turns around and says; "You have already moved your family, tough-titty." Then they will not give the mobility move grant. This is the way the thing works.

It is important. We are dealing with a lot of people. The

honourable minister has the list right before him and it can be distributed to every member of this House. Not only to us, Sir, but to the members on the government side of the House too. No doubt there will be a lot of people looking for that information. It is criminal, Sir, to refuse to give us that information.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, on this matter of the list, I suppose there always has been a list of sorts in the minds of the previous administration and I am not criticizing them for that. If you are dealing as a government with the matter of resettlement, in the mind of the minister responsible, in the minds of the government and in the minds of the civil servants dealing with it, there has to be a list whether it is on paper or not. Under the previous administration, there was a list, and the member for White Bay South will correct me if I am wrong, I saw such a list a couple of years ago, but I believe it emanated from Ottawa and not from Newfoundland. Is that correct?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Yes, if the honourable gentleman will yield. Ottawa, the great studiers that they are, Ottawa is always going around, not only in Newfoundland but in other parts of Canada as well, applying certain criteria to communities. They have isolation factors, they have this and they have that. They have distance from this facility, distance from that facility and they assign numbers to that. This does not only apply to Newfoundland, that applies - all of that information is taken from the census and from maps. It applies to Saskatchewan, British Columbia all the provinces in Canada.

Then, someone will come and take one of these list and they will see that Bumble Bight has an isolation factor of twenty-five. Well, if the people want to move from that place, they should be permitted to do so with government assistance. That is the type of list that the honourable member is talking about. They are not formalized lists. This list here, that the honourable minister has now, is what you might call some sort of a formal list. It is established between Ottawa and the Government of Newfoundland that from these particular communities, people, if they want

to move, can be assisted. If they want to move to these other communities, they can be assisted to move there.

There are other lists and there have been lists which are not formal lists at all. They have no legal status, no legal basis. They are just lists which assist officials and ministers in trying to make up their minds on certain practical problems. That is what it amounts to.

MR. WELLS: The honourable member has confirmed what I thought was the case. There is one danger that I see in such a list and I think I can best illustrate it by using a practical example of a particular community, of which I am very fond, in Bonavista Bay. That is St. Brendan's. St. Brendan's, I believe, several years ago - if there was a list at the time, it was probably on it. I feel that people in all walks of life, connected with St. Brendan's, not only government, felt that that community was going to go. It proved the planners wrong, Mr. Chairman, because, by the efforts of a very energetic man named Father Shallow, who was sent there, and with several other people in the community who were energetic and showed great leadership, that community was saved. Today it is one of the more progressive I think and advanced communities in the Bonavista Bay area.

It just shows that sometimes the spirit of people can overcome what the planners in Ottawa or elsewhere might think. I think St. Brendan's is an excellent example. I think the member for Bonavista North will agree with me on that. When you come to distributing lists which are after all not formal government policy but really thoughts in the minds of planners, I think you can do some damage.

Were I, for example, the Minister of Community and Social Development, I would not have any objection to the honourable member for Bell Island seeing the list. It would be his responsibility though if he were going to blazen that list all over Newfoundland and give people in communities like St. Brendan's or elsewhere, communities that may well live, that may well be there after we are dead and gone, give them the feeling that government at any level felt that their demise was necessary

and was in the cards. I think that is a mistake. I think the idea of publicizing such a list could be a dangerous blow to the morale of a community that might otherwise remain viable and perhaps even become more viable than it is at present.

MR. MURPHY: (Partly inaudible) once it is tabled in this House.

MR. WELLS: That is right. I am sure that the honourable members across the way, I am sure that the honourable member for White Bay South has in his mind right now and knows from his experience as a minister in the previous administration what communities were slated by Ottawa or by the planners or at least considered in terms of resettlement. I am equally sure that he would not stand up in this House and name them.

MR. ROWE: I would not chance it.

MR. WELLS: No, and that is why I think it would be, it is wrong and unfair to publicize this sort of information. I think, for example, that it is the sort of information that a member of this House ought to be entitled to privately, but I think he ought to use it with very great discretion. Perhaps I have not the respect for the planners that I ought, but I think in a lot of cases planners can sit one thousand miles away from here and come up with conclusions that ignore the human spirit, ignore the desire and spirit of people who want to preserve and even resurrect the spirit and go in a community. I think that one should be very careful, members of this House should be very careful in giving communities the impression that they are doomed. That is all I would want to say on the subject, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, just to set the record straight. It was my honourable colleague, the member for Fogo, who rose in his place and rightly so in this honourable House, and put a question to the honourable Minister of Community and Social Development. It was a very innocent question. We put the question to all the ministers so far in their estimates. Will the minister table a list of this? Will the minister table a list of Highway projects? Will the minister of Municipal Affairs table a list of water and sewer projects? One after the other, Sir, we

asked them for a list. My colleague, the member for Fogo, asked the honourable Minister of Community and Social Development if he was going to let us have a copy of the list.

The Minister of Community and Social Development rose in his place and he said: "Yes, we would be glad to supply the members on the opposite side of the House with a copy of the list." He saw no reason why it should be private and confidential and secret. He called over the page to his desk, The page put out his little tray. The honourable minister laid the list on the silver tray and the honourable Premier, his blood pressure went up about one thousand percent, I thought he was going to burst a blood vessel, Mr. Chairman. His eyes rolled around in his head. Before the page had a chance to leave the minister's desk, to bring the list down to my colleague, the member for Fogo, the Premier got up out of his chair, went down to the minister, whispered something in his ear and the minister very politely reached out, took the list back and laid it on his desk.

Sir, these are the facts. The honourable minister can deny them if he wants to. These are the facts, but I submit, Mr. Chairman, I submit, that what the honourable Premier was concerned about was the politics of it. The honourable Premier knew full well that this would have exploded in the administration's face if this list were made public. The honourable minister felt it should be made public, because he said so. The honourable Premier said: "No, we are not going to make it public." He came back to his seat and said: "No, we are not going to make it public." I think this is wrong, Mr. Chairman. I do not think the Premier should have done that. I think he should have let the minister present the list, because I think the people of Newfoundland are entitled to know if their community is

communities on that list. Are they going to get the axe? The honourable Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources shakes his head and says, "no."

MR. COLLINS: Nobody is going to get the axe, you know that as well as we know that your honourable colleague just explained it to you fully.

MR. NEARY: I know what my honourable colleague said, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate what he said. But nevertheless there will always be that element of doubt, Sir, that element of suspicion.

MR. COLLINS: Fostered by people trying to—

MR. NEARY: No, not fostered by anybody, fostered by the administration. The administration said during two elections—

MR. WELLS: Would the honourable member, either on this side of the House or on that side of the House, if he has a list in his pocket now, would he make it public in Newfoundland, to the possible detriment of certain communities? This is a serious question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, any good lawyer knows that you never answer a hypothetical question. My honourable friend should know that. I will not even charge him for the legal advice.

No, Sir, I think the honourable minister should follow his conscience. I think he should let the members on the opposite side of the House have a copy of the list, and we will decide what we are going to do with it. If we feel it is in the best interest of the people in Newfoundland to have a copy of this list, then we will let them have it. If we do not think it is in their best interest, then we will not let them have it. I personally feel they should have it. I think they are entitled to have it.

Sir, the Premier and his colleagues went around this province saying, "we have nothing to hide. When we form the administration, nothing will be hidden from the people of Newfoundland." Sir, here is

a list in the Department of Community and Social Development being hidden from the people of Newfoundland, another broken promise. But, Sir, what is much worse, is the broken promise on a home for a home.

I tried to pin the minister down to find if the administration were going to live up to this commitment that they made to the people of Newfoundland, The minister so far has not answered the question directly, he has evaded the issue. I am going to ask him again. Will the honourable minister give me a yes or no answer?

AN HON. MEMBER: Does the honourable member want that put in baby talk?

MR. NEARY: No, I want a simple yes or no answer. Is the government going to adopt the principle of giving people who are forced to leave their homes, either through urban renewal schemes, through resettlement programmes, through any other legitimate reason, will government give these people a home for a home, a simple yes or no answer.

MR. SENIOR: I said it was my opinion that anyone who relocated should be entitled to equal or improved circumstances.

MR. NEARY: Never mind the jargon, never mind the mumbo jumbo, a simple yes or no answer. Will these people get a home for a home? Mr. Chairman, I am asking Your Honour, if in the future, Mr. Chairman, I am asking, Your Honour, if people who resettle will get a home for a home, and all I want Your Honour is a simple yes or no answer.

MR. SENIOR: Will the honourable member yield the floor, if he would like me to answer the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a Point of order, the honourable member is almost, I would say, to the point where the rule with respect to repetition comes into play.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, on that Point of order, I would suggest that we are all mentally stupid at the moment. We need to hear something

about twenty-five times before it sinks in. To your Point of order, I would have to say it is well founded.

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Chairman, a short while ago I was asked a question, if I would supply information on sending communities, and endeavouring to answer that question, I told the honourable member for Fogo that I would do that and I would still do that, if somebody should ask me if a particular area is designated as a sending or receiving community, I would give them that information. I do not know how I can be more explicit than that. Because if somebody should apply to our department for resettlement, we are obligated, as far as I see, to tell them if they are eligible and if they are eligible, then obviously their community is a sending community. I do not see, Mr. Chairman, how I can make it more explicit than that.

My vocabulary is not great but I fail to see how I can make it more explicit than that.

MR. THOMS: It is not carried yet. We have all day yet. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister, I am particularly interested in my own district, may I take a look at the list and find out which communities in my district are on that list? May I look at it now?

MR. SENIOR: Not now, no. I do not see any reason, Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member for Bonavista North, come to see me, why I can give him any information that he requires.

MR. THOMS: If it is as hard to see the minister, and I doubt if it is, as it is to see the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, I am going to be waiting a long time. But may I now make an appointment with the minister, so I can see that list. Will you now name the time when I can see you? Not over the weekend, I am going home for the weekend. I have to pin him down right here and now.

MR. SENIOR: Tuesday, 9:30 A.M.

MR. THOMS: Tuesday, 9:30 A.M., I will be there at you office here in Confederation Building.

MR. SENIOR: That is Tuesday next.

MR. THOMS: Tuesday of next week.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a few brief comments on the section 2006 on resettlement. I think that the point made by the honourable member for South John's South is very well taken, that if a list, such as we are referring to, is spread across this province, it is going to spread doom and gloom in these communities labelled "sending communities." But I am more concerned with respect to my district, whether the process or method used in deciding whether a community is a sending community or a receiving community, for example, I think the honourable minister explained, if I heard him right, that a sending community would be a community where residents of that community had made application to his department to relocate. Now if that is the method going to be used, I fully agree with that method.

However, if the method in the future would be similar to what has been in the past, where a planning committee or resettlement committee would decide if a community would be a sending community or a receiving community, and I assume now, even in the future, a receiving or a growth centre, a potential growth centre would have to be decided on the basis of some planning and a committee to scrutinize planning of such.

It is very important to have the people involved in the relocation. This the honourable minister has indicated will be done in the future. The people involved in possible or potential relocation will be involved in the planning of their future with regard to relocation. I must admit, even though we now have a list, and that list is not going out to the public of this province, that if a community is labelled as a sending community, I think that label would be an obstacle to that community in regards to receiving services from other departments within this government or

the federal government, on the basis it has been labelled as a sending community. I think both government levels would be considering or taking a second thought if a community were labelled a sending community, before adding additional services like marine facilities, etc. for that community.

So I think the most important aspect is the fact that it is not the method nor the list now involved but more important the method used in deciding what a community really is, a sending community or a receiving community. Thank you very much.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to belabour the debate, I wonder if the honourable minister could explain to the House what benefits they are giving to people, what aid is given in terms of dollars and cents, No doubt there is a scale drawn up of what a family of a certain number will receive when they are moving from a sending area into a receiving area. Then again, how do they know what publicity is given to the programme, how do they know if they are moving from a sending area into a receiving area? What publicity is the department giving this particular resettlement programme.

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Chairman, maybe I can start by answering the last part of the question first. It is like I have already said and this is the way it has always existed, when a person writes to our department for information on resettlement, he is told in no uncertain terms whether his community is a receiving community or a sending community. If he requests to go to a particular community, we have no hesitation in telling him that that community is a sending or receiving community. Because if we could not give him this information, there is no way he could know if he qualified to be resettled. So it is in this sense that I am presenting this information today, Sir, that it is no secret to people who want to resettle, because if it were they could never determine if they were qualified to resettle.

Now I would agree with the consensus of opinion in the honourable House today, that maybe if the list were made public in the news media, then maybe people would be concerned, maybe, if they saw all the communities together on one particular list. That was not my intention, My intention was to answer the question of the honourable member for Pogo, to supply to him the information that he requested, I see no reason now why he should not have this information nor do I see any reason why anyone else who is involved in resettlement, who wants the information, should not have it. If we cannot give him the information, Sir, I do not see how we can administrate the programme. It is as simple as that.

We can make a big issue out of it, we can make it a political football, we can make it anything that we want, but these are the facts, pure and simple. As far as assistance which is granted the families, I do not have the information here but I think I am accurate in stating that it is -

The compensation is \$1,200 per family and there is so much for each child. Off hand I do not recall what the amount is, I think it is between \$200 and \$300.

MR. WOODWARD: I thank the honourable minister for his remarks. What I am trying to point out, Sir, is the fact that I have been dealing with this in a number of cases and a number of people have been denied, After moving into a community for a period of a couple of years, neighbours move in from the same community, next door, and all of a sudden they discover that the new neighbours that have already moved in have gotten a resettlement grant. "Why did I not get the grant? The programme was into effect when I moved, I did not know of it," This is the point that I am trying to bring to this House today.

You have the records in your office where a number of people - I withdraw that, I will not refer to the honourable minister as "you!" Mr. Chairman, the honourable minister does have records in his

office showing that people were denied because of the fact that they did not have any knowledge of this particular programme.

MR. SENIOR: Well if that is the situation, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know about it in detail. However, there are instances where people may have moved from a community and at that particular time it did not meet the criteria of a sending community and so they were not eligible for assistance but subsequently this community could have been designated as a community which qualified for assistance. This has happened in a number of instances. Or they could have moved to a community that was not designated as a receiving community at the time that they were resettled but it was subsequently designated as a receiving community.

But if circumstances other than this existed at the time, I would certainly like to know about it, I would be happy to meet with the honourable member in my office and discuss it and supply him with any information that he requires.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister, does he have a list of the receiving communities? I expect there is no objection to tabling this list, receiving communities, because I understand that some communities and I know of one in particular which was a receiving community and then through some reason or other it was taken off the list. But pressure was put to bear, apparently in the right place, and it was put back on the list again.

MR. SENIOR: Is that recently?

MR. THOMS: Within the last eighteen months.

MR. THOMS: I asked the minister a question. Could he answer it please?

MR. MURPHY: Sure he told you that he is meeting you on Tuesday. Can you not get that at the same time?

MR. THOMS: I see no reason why we cannot have this list.

MR. MURPHY: I mean is the world waiting with baited breath to get this list now, this afternoon, now at 12:30 P.M.

MR. THOMS: There is no problem because he probably has it right there on his desk.

MR. MURPHY: What is so -

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Could the Chairman try to get control of the committee, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The hon. member for Bonavista North is becoming repetitious in his request. I think it is the Chair's ruling to carry on with the estimates.

MR. NEARY: We are not going to get the list because the minister has something to hide, so let us go on with the next item.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, 2006-07, the particular barges that were used for the movement of those homes, still available, are they operated by the Department of Community and Social Development or is this part of the Department of Transport, marine equipment?

MR. SENIOR: We have a total of six barges, Mr. Chairman, that are available. There are two sorts of large barges, DOT - 52 and CNSD - 1. There are several other smaller barges around the island which have been used on occasion for resettlement. These barges are still in operation.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Chairman, are both barges now occupied in transferring homes or is there just one? I think the minister will probably know what I am getting at. Is the other one available for rent, charter, hire..?

MR. SENIOR: At the moment, Mr. Chairman, both barges are engaged. One is engaged in the transporting of equipment to Fogo Island, for the paving of the roads down there. The other one is engaged in transporting machinery to Burgeo, for the construction of the road in Burgeo. In granting these barges

Mr. Senior

to the people who have them it was taken into consideration the time that they would be needed for other purposes.

On motion 2006-07, carried.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, before we carry 2006-08, I would like to ask the minister: Is there a formula for gearing assistance to a person moving from, say, Point A to Point B?

MR. SENIOR: I answered that question a moment ago - \$1,200.

MR. THOMS: Oh, \$1,200. It is just a straight \$1,200.

MR. SENIOR: Plus so much per child. I could get the exact information for the honourable member.

MR. THOMS: Yes, because I do not know a thing about it and a lot of people come to me and ask me for this.

MR. SENIOR: It is between \$200 and \$300 per child.

MR. THOMS: Could I get this from the minister on Tuesday morning?

MR. SENIOR: Also in addition to that if a family is moving to an area where there is a land assembly area, they can qualify for supplementary assistance up to \$3,000.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): It might be an idea, Mr. Chairman, if the minister got together some of the information on resettlement in his office (I know there is quite a lot. I notice Mr. Harnum is up in the gallery tonight) and distribute it to some - Oh! this is the afternoon, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry if I mislead the House.

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Chairman -

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Distribute it to members because it comes in quite useful you know.

MR. SENIOR: We have a pamphlet already printed which is available free of charge.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Yes, that is right. I authorized that.

On motion 2006-08, carried.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, before we pass the total subhead, there is an

Mr. Marshall.

amendment in 2006-10, Appropriations-in-Aid. The amount reading \$1,268,700 should be amended to read, \$997,500. The amount in the Revised Estimates of 1971-1972, reading \$1,237,500 should be amended to \$937,500. Consequently, the total of subhead 2006, as a result of these adjustments, should be amended to read \$563,600 and \$446,800 in the 1971-1972 estimates respectively. There will be an amendment, of course, then to the total on page seventy-two of Community and Social Development. The total current will be \$2,500,800. The total of the estimates 1972-1973 will be \$17,190,800 and the total of the revised 1971-1972 will be \$11,000,094. I so move that the estimates be amended accordingly.

On motion amendment, carried.

On motion total subhead 2006, carried.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, 2008-04, I take it that this is the subhead under which these water supply systems which are being installed in certain small communities. In St. Barbe North there are approximately fifteen to seventeen that started to install water services in their communities. I have met with some officials of the minister's department and I am told that accordingly to engineering standards none of these projects have been completed to the satisfaction of the engineers, that is the fifteen or seventeen water service projects that are on-going at the present time. I understand that there are seven to nine requests for the continuation of these projects and five new requests. I was wondering if the minister could give the committee a complete list of all the communities that are to receive grants under this particular subhead for the purposes of completing their water service this coming year.

MR. SENIOR: I do not think at this time, Mr. Chairman, I can answer the question as to which communities will receive completion of their water supply services this year. I think priorities will still have to be determined as will be indicated by the information which I will give. Last fall, during the election campaign, this particular programme of

Mr. Senior.

providing artesian wells was greatly increased. Our normal budget is somewhere in the vicinity of \$135,000 to \$150,000 per year. Last year the total expenditure was in excess of \$900,000. I am just giving the facts as they are, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Was there a demand for - it is a good thing we have elections, I would say.

MR. SENIOR: I am just giving the facts as they are, Mr. Chairman.

If the honourable member on the other side of the House wants to say that this was electioneering, well that is up to him. I did not say that, Sir. I am just giving the facts as they exist.

MR. NEARY: I did not say that. I said; "was this a demand for these artesian wells?"

MR. SENIOR: If the honourable member would give me a chance to finish, maybe he can determine from what I have to say whether the wells were needed or not.

Out of the \$900,000 that was spent, I could point out to the hon. member for St. Barbe North that last year there was \$142,000 approximately spent in St. Barbe North. I do not know if it is necessary to list all the communities but it was a rather unusual expenditure in that the total amount allocated by our department was approximately \$115,000. The total amount spent last year was \$142,000 in St. Barbe North. It is coincidental that I happened to pick this particular district as an example, but I happen to have all the information on this particular district. So far approximately \$200,000 has been spent and our department estimate that it will take another \$181,000 to finish those projects. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the original allocation was \$115,000, estimated cost for completion. We have spent already, last year, \$142,000 and it is going to take about \$181,000 to complete it in St. Barbe North. To give you some examples, Sir, in one particular community -

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Is there any danger of St. Barbe North deciding -

MR. SENIOR: It could very well be called the "Slush Fund". In one particular community, as an example, Sir, the original allocation approved by our department was \$3,000. The amount spent last year, 1971-1972 was \$11,462. It was originally allocated at \$3,000. The total spent to date is \$20,483.

MR. ROBERTS: Has the honourable gentleman not heard of the miracle of the loaves and the fish.

MR. SENIOR: It is going to take another \$2,500 to complete it. That will be a total expenditure of \$23,000 and there are six families living in that community.

MR. ROBERTS: What is \$4,000 a well?

MR. SENIOR: There is another one, Mr. Chairman, where the allocation approved by our department was \$25,000.

MR. ROBERTS: What was the name of the community?

MR. SENIOR: This was Shoal Cove West.

Last year we spent \$24,400 - I am sorry. The allocation was \$25,000 and we spent \$24,400. It is estimated that it will cost another \$79,000 to complete it. On the basis of these figures, Mr. Chairman, we have to take a very, very close look at the expenditure in this particular district last fall, because there is evidence in our department that there was considerable expenditure that was not authorized by our department and in fact many of the bills that were paid for this well drilling were authorized after the fact. I believe this is contrary to the regulations governing this particular programme. Now I am not, Mr. Chairman, trying to make a big issue of this. I am merely reading figures which have been supplied to me from our department, which I believe indicate what has happened in this particular district. I might say, speaking more generally, in view of the increase in expenditure in this particular subhead, I think it would have been very wise if the previous administration had formulated a particular policy or a better policy for implementation. It would certainly appear to me, unless

Mr. Senior.

I am misjudging the figures, Sir, that there was considerable abuse of the programme in this particular area. I have not yet had a chance to do an indepth study into this particular situation but I intend to do that and in fact I will be dispatching people to the field to look at the situation first hand. I might also point out, Sir, that last year when this programme was accelerated considerably and the expenditure was increased from well in the vicinity of \$150,000 over \$900,000, I felt, Sir, in reviewing the programme that it would have been wise to have had an inspector to inspect the wells that were dug because, although in some instances, not in all, committees were formed locally to sort of supervise this operation,

I believe in many cases there was no proof as to just how deep a well had been drilled and in fact it could very well be that we have paid for wells on the basis of a particular footage. We do not really have any proof of that. As a matter of fact, just this past week I drew out a policy and presented it to the cabinet whereby we think we can control this expenditure more realistically in future and not only that, Sir, we propose that there will be an inspector who will inspect these wells when they are drilled.

I might also point out and I think this is valuable information, that this year we have an allocation of \$275,000 in our vote, for this expenditure, this year. We have already committed \$154,889, carried over from last year, so it means that we have left to spend this year \$120,000. I would like to inform the honourable members of this House that we have a list here of requests on file, totalling approximately \$1 million. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, if that answers the question of the hon. member for St. Barbe North but I think it throws some light on what happened there last year.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): The minister at this time is suggesting abuse of the expenditure of funds in this particular district, Mr. Chairman. If the

June 29, 1972

Tape no. 1209

Page 7

Mr. Rowe (F.B.).

minister - I do not know whether he has visited St. Barbe North or not
but there are approximately twenty-five small communities in St. Barbe North -
there is not one single inch of pavement. They are missing out on an
awful lot of things. The installation of a

4071

water service to those communities represents a blessing to the people of these communities. There has been a heavy expenditure, as the minister suggested. In St. Barbe North there are fifteen to seventeen water service systems that have already been started and I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that this would represent a great waste of money, if in fact they were not continued and were not finished off within the very near future.

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order, Mr. Chairman. We might as well get a ruling on it. Is it in order to eat in the House? I am not jealous, our hamburgers are on the way in. Is it in order to eat in the House? I am not saying it is or is not. We have graduated from water to tea and coffee and there is some suspicion, even more interesting potatoes. That is water and there has been nothing but water there unfortunately. I keep hoping somebody will drop something in. But let us have a ruling on it. Honourable gentlemen opposite, I do not begrudge them their bite to eat but still and all let us have a ruling. Is it in order to sit in one's place and eat and if so, what? Are crunchy potato chips in order? I do not know, as I have never heard the point being raised before. Normally the House adjourns for meals. Normally it does not sit but we now, we are going up for seventeen hours straight now Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are on a sitathon.

MR. ROBERTS: We are on a sitathon but the honourable gentleman has obviously a softer sitathoner than I do. Could Your Honour give us a ruling on the point?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I personally do not know but I will confer with the clerk and let you know momentarily.

MR. ROBERTS: There was a case in India, Mr. Chairman, that may or may not be relevant, where the Speaker was killed when an inkwell was thrown at him by one of the honourable members.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well, it was a precedent. There are a number of cases about swords in the House but is there anything on sitting in one's place munching a sandwich as is the honourable gentleman from Ferryland- The honourable gentleman from Fortune Bay has his hid in under there.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Like a naughty school child.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable the Minister of Fisheries, he obviously is not having a fishwich but a sandwich. He is so much for fish he has - I saw him eating chicken and chips last night. Does Your Honour have a ruling?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I do not have a ruling on it but we will have one later in the day. In the meantime I suggest that you eat your sandwiches.

MR. ROBERTS: Could this be suspended until we have a ruling, Sir?

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Mr. Chairman, I am speaking to the point of order. I do not know if the House Leader wants to speak to it, but I do not know if it is necessary to look up a precedent on this. I think it is unbecoming to the dignity of the House to have honourable members in here munching away at vittles. When we were having breakfast this morning, we very scrupulously stayed outside the House. I think the House Leader probably can concur with me. It is not becoming of the dignity of the House, I do not think it is, Sir.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I have researched Beauchesne and the Standing Orders and I have not found anything that says one cannot eat in the House anymore than one cannot swallow in the House or one cannot breathe in the House, but not that two wrongs make a right or vice versa or whatever it is. It seems to me, and this might be getting into another realm, but it seems to me that I recall the honourable member for White Bay South drinking his orange juice this morning, Mr. Chairman, in the House itself.

MR. ROBERTS: If we go talking about honourable members drinking things, we are going to have quite a debate.

MR. MARSHALL: Orange juice, I would submit, Mr. Chairman, is also a food. However I do not see anyone eating right now.

MR. ROBERTS: But let us have a ruling on it one way or another.

MR. MARSHALL: The speaker will take it under advisement.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, but all the sandwiches will be gone by the time. The limit will be consumed. Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: No, our hamburgers are coming. We will be sitting here eating our hamburgers. I do not mind the hamburgers but the chinese food will get a little messy, Mr. Chairman, and when we start getting spaghetti.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let us get our teeth in the estimates.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman wants to get his teeth in the estimates. I know what the honourable gentleman would take a good swift bite out of if he wanted it, I assure you, Mr. Chairman. Anyway let us get on with it.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, all this talk of food and water reminds me that we are on the water vote. The honourable Leader of the Opposition mentioned miracles, I think he referred to the changing of loaves and fishes into an abundance of food, also water into wine might not be out of order under this vote, but I question very sincerely if the transformation of water into a television antenna would be classed as a modern miracle or not, but that is exactly what happened under this vote. Last year the new television antenna -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on the vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With talk on both sides of the House, I cannot hear the honourable member who is speaking on this side. I cannot hear the honourable member who is trying to make a point of order. I guess

if we were to be quiet when another member is speaking, then the Chair can rule whichever way it pleases, but under these circumstances it is impossible.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, I was being strictly relevant, as I was on the water vote.

AN HON. MEMBER: The honourable member had the floor -

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, to a point of order, I had the floor when the point of order was raised.

MR. EARLE: I thought the honourable member had finished.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, there was a point of order raised when I was speaking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable gentleman from Fortune had the floor.

MR. ROBERTS: No, the honourable gentleman from St. Barbe North was speaking when I rose to interrupt him to raise the sandwich point as it were. The honourable gentleman of course yielded and then we had a little chitter chatter and then in the enthusiasm of which Your Honour's ruling was greeted, the honourable member for Fortune Bay leaped to it. I think that is the sequence of events, so let us hear from the member for St. Barbe North and then we will have the member for Fortune Bay, by which time the hamburgers might be here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member of the opposition dropped the subject when the honourable member for Burin took the floor.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question of the -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Thank you! Mr. Chairman, while we were arguing about sandwiches, eating sandwiches in the House, the people from St. Barbe North are still lugging their water in by buckets and they still have frozen water lines in the few places where they have them installed. The point that I was trying to make to the honourable minister was this, that there are about fifteen communities that are in the process

of installing these water services to their homes at the present time and, as far as the engineers are concerned, these systems have not been completed to their satisfaction. All I am asking is, can the minister give some indication of the number of communities in St. Barbe North that will receive monies in this very short working season for the purposes of installing these water lines, because in a few more months the ground will be frozen again and they will not be able to go ahead and work on them. Sir, I am constantly getting phone calls from the district, asking what is going to be done with the requests that have been sent in to the honourable the minister's department, and these requests have been in for quite some months now. We are dealing with the estimates on this particular topic and I would like for him to indicate to the House what the plans are of his department in this regard.

Sir, it is no good for the minister to refer back to the past and talk about the gross expenditure of money in this district. If he saw what is going on in that district, he will fully understand the need for water services to the homes. Sir, I think the minister, I do not know whether he did this on purpose or not. Sir, I am not suggesting that but the House or the committee was misled when he referred to the water system being installed in Shoal Cove West, with the suggestion that there was a great expenditure of money, I cannot remember how much now, something like \$25,000, and there are six families in Shoal Cove West.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Sir, that is the information that I heard. Mr. Chairman, the water system being installed in Shoal Cove West is for both Shoal Cove West and Reefs Harbour, it is supplying both communities. Those two communities are very close together and there are 188 voters in those two communities and I cannot understand where the minister came up with six families.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, I should not be out of order now as I yielded to the honourable member. I will just repeat what I was saying. The fact that the honourable Leader of the Opposition mentioned miracles is perhaps appropriate to this vote because he did mention loaves and fishes. He might have mentioned changing water into wine, which would be just as appropriate but I think that only the former Liberal Government could create the supreme miracle of changing a water vote into a television antenna. This is exactly what happened in the Town of Terrenceville where the money they paid for the new television antenna was taken out of this vote. I think if there is any question of the propriety with which this vote was spent in the past, that would be a very good point to start from.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is improper to refer to that and it is improper -

MR. EARLE: It is nothing improper. It was improper when it was done.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): The minister is presumably going to answer one or two questions. I would like, just before he answers them, to say a short sentence. Is the statement made by the honourable member for Fortune Bay correct? I presume he was a minister of the department at the time and it is the first time I have ever heard of it in my life. If it did happen there must be, not culpability, but some misuse of funds along the line somewhere. The minister should obviously get to the bottom of it.

MR. ROBERTS: Just for a second. The honourable the member for Fortune Bay doubtless made the statement in good faith. He has made the statement several times over the course of this session but my friend who was the minister of the department has said that to his knowledge, now there may have been many things happened which he did not know about, of course there may be, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Irresponsible.

MR ROBERTS: Oh! I am not denying responsibility.

Sure, no argument there. But what we are asking is if the Minister of Community and Social Development would say what did happen.

Obviously, something did, if in fact the facts are as they are put forward by the gentleman from Fortune Bay. If the minister will get the information? He seems to be leafing through vast quantities of foolscap over there.

Let us have the information on this point. It is like a broken record he has next to him - and it is stuck in a groove.

MR. SENIOR: I have seen that information, Mr. Chairman, but I am sorry I do not have it with me right now.

MR. ROBERTS: You would supply the House with it at some point?

MR. SENIOR: I can get that information. It does exist and I thought I had it with me here but apparently I do not. I would like to comment briefly on the comments from the member for St. Barbe North when he said that St. Barbe North certainly was in need of the services that were provided. I would certainly agree with that and I would agree to say that St. Barbe North is probably in need of many other services which should be supplied to that particular district, but I do not think that justifies any abuse of a programme, if in fact that is what happened and that is what would appear to me on the basis of the estimates that were originally submitted to our department and then on the basis of the final expenditure and also the projected expenditure to completion. There is no doubt in my mind that these projects, undertaken in St. Barbe North, will receive every consideration, to be completed as soon as possible but certainly I may have to stand in this House at a later date and justify any expenditure that I authorize as minister for these projects that are already undertaken. Before I do that, in view of the figures that are presented to me now I am certainly going

to take a very long hard look at the programme in St. Barbe North not in the sense of being prejudiced but in the sense of wanting to justify what I do.

MR. ROVE(F.B.): Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the minister that we are really both adequately protected. The minister was not minister of the department at the time of which he speaks and neither was I member for the district nor minister of a department. My main concern, Sir, is that there has been a tremendous expenditure there. So far, nothing to my knowledge is completed and if this is left like this for any long period of time, we are going to have erosion and everything else going on and it is going to be even more expensive to finish of these particular projects. So the only thing I am suggesting is that the minister try to make a great effort to get these things that have already been started finished as quickly as possible or there is going to be a certain amount of damage and it is going to be even more costly than it would be at the present time.

The other thing that I would like the minister to refer to is what I consider to be a half-truth in this whole business of six families living in Shoal Cove West. I repeat again, Sir, that the water system that he is referring to supplies both Reefs Harbour and Shoal Cove West, with 188 voters, and added on to that all the kids and everything else you have more than six families.

MR. SENIOR: No, that was incorrect, Mr. Chairman. I would like to clarify that for the record. I was talking -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. SENIOR: No, it has not.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman gave the figures.

MR. SENIOR: Well, I think I would like to set it straight again in that case. I was talking about a particular community and at that particular time I was not naming the communities but merely giving information as examples and I said that in one

particular community we had authorized \$3,000. The expenditure last year was \$11,462. The expenditure to date is \$20,483, and we estimate it will cost \$25,000 to complete it. That particular community has six families. Then I started to talk about another example and someone on the other side asked me which community it was. I named it and the information for that community, which is Shoal Cove West, is that we authorized \$25,000 in expenditure, \$24,406 was spent last year, and we estimate it will cost \$79,000 to complete it.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, some general comments on that community water service vote, Sir. I am the guilty party you see. I was the minister of the department during the time...

MR. ROBERTS: Aha!

MR. ROWE: What, no quorum again?

MR. ROBERTS: No, I am backing away from this.

MR. ROWE: I was the minister of the department which spent this apparently, (according to the present minister) excessive amount of money to get some clean water to some households around the province. I stand condemned in the eyes of my fellow men for authorizing this. There are two points I would like to make; one of them is that if the honourable minister checks back he will find that the money that was spent on these particular projects came from the special loan fund from Ottawa, very kindly and familiarly referred to as the "slush fund" by the honourable members opposite. It might have been a "slush fund" and it might not have been.

My understanding at the time, if my memory serves me correctly, is that the money for the great majority of these came from Ottawa under the special programmes and these projects were authorized by Order in Council?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes and no.

MR. ROWE: Yes and no. My understanding at the time was that they came from

MR. SENIOR: I think I have the information.

MR. ROWE: Okay, then you can give the information when you get a chance to get up again. In any event, even if it were not, Mr. Chairman, I am not one bit ashamed of the fact that I, acting on my own behalf as minister, or acting on the instructions of the government, authorized \$900,000 for water in the province. Water to small, unincorporated communities either by artesian well, plastic hose or from brooks and this sort of thing, with plastic hoses leading into communities, which the houses could then hook up to. I am not one bit ashamed of it, Sir.

If it were an election that caused that, then I say, thank God for elections! The amount of money which was allocated to that particular subhead traditionally was one hundred thousand dollars or so -- one hundred and twenty-five thousand or one hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars. For some reason or other it was never possible to get more than that from the treasury board when the estimates were being prepared. If it were because of an election or if it were because of a 'slush fund' from Ottawa, or any other reason that enabled me as the minister of the department to spend \$900,000 to bring water into households in this province, well I am not ashamed of it, I am proud of it.

When you see some of the other expenditures being made around, based on someone's list of priorities, when I see things going on with federal expenditures, for example, billion dollar airports in Ste. Scholastique and another one I suppose in Toronto now to balance the..

AN HON. MEMBER: Federal loans for golf courses

MR. ROWE: Or federal loans for golf courses, I do not care what they are. When I see it I cannot bring myself to beat my breast and say 'mía culpa' and feel bad about it. If one million dollars is spent to bring water to some isolated communities, unorganized, unincorporated communities in the province, I only hope that the honourable minister in the future will be able to get a large amount of money as well, to try to complete this job. I understand from him that a million dollars now is needed to finish up these jobs and to do the other ones that are on

the list of requests. I sincerely hope that he does find it possible to find that million dollars, over the next two, three or four years whatever the case, to do that. It is not a luxury and it is hardly wasted when you spend money to bring some water to a household in this day and age.

I do not know if there were any abuses of the programme as such at the local community level. We stressed wherever possible that in all cases, or nearly all cases there be a water committee. We had a man, full-time, working on the water - this particular subhead during the period that we were spending that money. He did a lot of travelling around the province. We did our best to make sure that there were no abuses. I cannot remember any abuses brought to my attention at the time, but maybe some have arisen or came to life since the present minister took over. If so, I would like to know what they were. Was it just bad inspection in certain cases, or was a lot of money spent trying to find a good well? I know in one place in my own district, Brent's Cove, they have drilled four or five wells up there and each time they find brine water. They have drilled those wells on the advice of experts, so I do not know but maybe fifteen or twenty thousand dollars have been spent there so far trying to find water for that community. Maybe that is the type of misuse of public funds that the minister was talking about.

Broadly and generally, I make no apologies at all for this million dollar expenditure for water.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear! Hear! well told.

MR. SENIOR: I would agree, Mr. Chairman. I would like to deal with the questions, I would like to answer very briefly, because I think they should be clarified. I agree there should be a million dollar expenditure this year in that particular programme. It is certainly needed in Newfoundland, but before that kind of expenditure is carried out, I think there should be some studies done as to where priority should be set up and certain

criteria should be laid down for the particular community.

MR. ROBERTS: What criteria would the honourable gentleman suggest?

MR. SENIOR: I think there should be a maximum cost per foot. There is a maximum cost now which is considerably higher than in other provinces. We are paying something like twelve to fifteen dollars a foot.

MR. ROBERTS: That is the commercial rate. Maybe the government should buy a drill.

MR. SENIOR: This is the amount that we are paying per foot. In other provinces it ranges from, I understand, six to eight or nine dollars per foot.

MR. ROBERTS: Maybe the government should buy a drill rig.

MR. SENIOR: We are investigating why the cost is so much higher here in Newfoundland. We also think that when an amount is allocated to a particular community, it should not be increased by six or seven times without authority from our department.

MR. ROBERTS: That is a very reasonable thing, but that is hardly—

MR. SENIOR: I would call that an abuse of the programme.

MR. ROBERTS: Agreed, but that is hardly a criterion for determining the priorities and that is what we are after. What are the minister's criteria for determining his priorities?

MR. SENIOR: I think it has to be based on the need in the community, primarily.

MR. ROBERTS: How does one measure need for water? There is either a need or there is no need.

MR. SENIOR: Some communities may have a polluted water supply. Their need then may be greater than a community that has a well of sorts which has a healthy water supply.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, if the minister would yield for just a second. If he goes down to the Municipal Affairs Department, I know the minister will show him twenty-thousand cables, I suppose, and letters that have come in. Every water supply in Newfoundland that has ever been

tested by the Department of Health, to my knowledge, other than the municipal type systems, every water supply is condemned by the Department as being unfit unless it is boiled and distilled and malted and whatever else you do with it. Let him not get on with nonsense like this, Sir. It is sheer foolishness. Minds the equal of the honourable gentleman's, maybe no better, at least equal to the honourable gentleman's, over the years have tangled with this problem and have reeled back in horror. It happens to be a completely uncontrollable hodgepodge of a vote.

You go and drill a well. You do not know how deep it is going to go. You may have to go one foot or one hundred feet. There are all sorts of empty holes down on the Strait Shore, down in Lumsden and Dotting Cove. There are two hundred thousand dollars worth of holes there that were drilled on the advice of engineers, and they were abandoned. Out in Bishop's Falls were there big wells put down on the advice of engineers and they had to be abandoned? Half million dollars or something out there.

MR. CARTER: Shocking.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course it is shocking. Engineers make mistakes. The honourable Minister of Education might like to pretend it was something the government did wrong. They took engineering advice. There will be other such things. Let the Minister of Community and Social Development admit that. If he wants to say there was too much money spent last year, or there were improper controls, that is one thing -

MR. SENIOR: I did not say that.

MR. ROBERTS: No, but if he wants to say that, that is one thing.

MR. SENIOR: I am not going to say it.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not going to argue that. Maybe there were, I do not know, but when he talks about criteria and so forth, really! Either one needs water or one does not need water. If one does not have good water, one therefore has a need. It is just a matter of having to pay whatever has to be paid, Mr. Chairman, to drill for the stuff. But, if they can

get it drilled for less than the twelve or fifteen dollars, whatever the going rate is, more power to them. Maybe we should have a few government rigs going around, then "Information Newfoundland" could issue a press release, and George MacClean could do a slide presentation on it.

MR. SENIOR: All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that if criteria can be established, then it should be established. If it cannot be established, then we will accept that.

MR. ROBERTS: We will go after that one next year.

MR. SENIOR: There is one other point I would like to clear up and that is where the funds came from for this particular programme. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars was transferred from household resettlement grants...

MR. ROBERTS: Countervailing savings?

MR. SENIOR: This was done apparently under authority of a minute in council which authorized special expenditures during the particular period last year.

MR. W.N. ROWE: An election?

MR. SENIOR: I would expect.

MR. ROWE: I hope so. Thank God for elections, to get a drop of water.

MR. SENIOR: This particular transfer was authorized by four honourable gentlemen now sitting on the other side. That is one hundred and fifty thousand dollars, but they were not federal funds.

MR. ROBERTS: Huh?

MR. SENIOR: The comment was made that it was federal funds. Six hundred and thirty thousand dollars was transferred from rural development, subhead 2005-08. This money was allocated for rural development which would have been used to cost-share ARDA projects...

MR. ROWE: No, that is not right.

MR. SENIOR: Sure it is right.

MR. ROWE: How can you use money if the _

MR. SENIOR: I did not say use it, I said it was allocated for that purpose.

MR. ROWE: Well it was allocated, so it is a countervailing saving. It happens all the time.

MR. SENIOR: That is right, but the point I want to make is this, Sir, that if the ARDA programme had been developed like I said before, then the province would have been entitled to an equal amount from the Federal Government.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, and if my mother were the Queen of England I would be King.

MR. ROWE: What nonsense!

MR. F. ROWE: (First part inaudible) as to when these various requests will or will not be approved? I am interested in knowing when I will be able to inform the various communities involved of whether or not they are going to receive funds for the completion of these water systems this coming year? Can the minister inform the committee when he will be in a position to publicize or let me know when and how much money will be allocated for the various communities involved?

MR. SENIOR: Yes, Sir, I can answer that question, If I might give just one other example, in Shoal Cove West, and I am just taking this community as an example, I could take any community on the list -

MR. F. ROWE: I want to know when, not what went on in the past.

MR. SENIOR: The statement was made a moment ago which said I would not be responsible for any future expenditure, which I think is incorrect. Our department authorized twenty-five thousand dollars expenditure, which was spent. It is now estimated that it will cost seventy-nine thousand dollars to complete it, which I would have to authorize. As soon as I can justify authorizing that, if that should be Tuesday morning, then that is the day it will be. As soon as I can possibly justify doing it.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Again, what are the criteria on which he must submit or upon which will be based his justification? Justify it. I mean, the justification I suppose is to get potable drinking water for these people,

these residents, at the cheapest possible price and with some controls. Is that the justification or not? Or, does the honourable minister have other criteria, elaborate priority systems which he wants to apply to this particular programme?

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Chairman, I cannot tell what the criteria should be because if in fact wells were drilled down there and the amount of money that was allocated has been used up, and we have to spend seventy-nine thousand dollars to get water in that community, it could be that we would not drill any more wells there, we could change to a surface water supply. These are things that I do not know until people get on the site and determine in fact what has happened already. Then, possibly they can come back to me and make recommendations as to what should happen in the future.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, have there been people from his department on the site to investigate this particular project? Have there been people on the site to look at the expenditure of seventy-nine thousand dollars on that particular project?

MR. SENIOR: Arrangements have been made to send them there as soon as possible.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, that was one of the first requests that I received after election and this request has been in the minister's office now for some two or three months. The minister is now telling this committee that he has not yet sent anybody down to look at this particular project. Is that correct?

MR. SENIOR: I was not aware of the situation relative to St. Barbe until two or three days ago. When this information was brought to my attention, I stopped all activity in that area until an investigation is carried out.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, that request has been in the minister's office for quite some time, and I submit that he should have looked into the situation before now if he were questioning the expenditure of

these funds in that particular community.

MR. SENIOR: I think the answer to that is evident already. In view of the amount of money that was spent last year, there was no money left in the department to spend until a new vote had been received. As yet, that has not been passed by this honourable House.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, the other communities in the district, are they going to be subjected to the same kind of an investigation? Has the minister anything to say regarding these other communities? I have asked him to supply information as to when he will be able to announce approval of some of these projects for completion. The minister has referred to one particular case and

of course there are others, I was wondering if he could give some indication as to when the others will be announced or approved?

MR. SENIOR: I think, Mr. Chairman, the same thing applies to all of these particular projects there. Some of them have been fairly well in line with the amount of money that was allocated to them. However they do require a considerable amount to complete them and before we can authorize the expenditure we are going to find out why the money is needed. I cannot make it much more explicit than that. If I can do that by Tuesday afternoon, then I will make a decision at that time. If it should be Friday afternoon, if that is the earliest time I can get the information, that is when the decision will be made.

MR. WINSOR: I wonder if the honourable minister can give me a little information. I have presented one or two, one I am sure of, petitions from one community in Fogo district and the same petition could apply to scores of communities in Fogo district where they are screaming, crying for drinking water, a source of drinking water. Could the minister tell me that he is going to take action in Fogo district as far as drilling for wells?

Now, I cannot follow his reasoning as to the cost per yard because drilling for water is almost like drilling for oil. If every oil company drilling on the Grand Banks were sure of oil in every drill they put down they would have no problem. It is the same thing with water, they are not always sure they are going to get water and they can drill down ten, fifteen, twenty, thirty and forty feet. I know of wells that have been driven as deep as eighty feet and still no water. So that particular well had to be discontinued and try some other place. Is there any way that the minister, any engineers or whoever determines whether there is water under this building or whether there is water over in so and so's yard, to be sure that we do not have to spend that unnecessary money looking for water,

Have you any information you could give the House in this regard?

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Chairman, I do not know exactly what type of survey is carried out to determine where water is but when I mentioned the cost it was merely to point out that the cost per foot in this province is considerably higher than it is anywhere else and I was just wondering why that is. I do not know myself yet. I am trying to determine why that is. But as far as the projects on Fogo Island are concerned,

MR. WINSOR: Not Fogo Island, Fogo District.

MR. SENIOR: In Fogo District or any other district for that matter, we have \$1 million programme and we have \$120,000 to spend and the problem we are faced with right now is with setting up priorities. Just on what basis do you set up priorities with \$1 million programme, with \$120,000 to spend? I cannot answer that question at the moment.

We are trying now to set up priorities on a realistic basis, if that is possible, and when that is done we will spend the money where we think it should be spent.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the minister will either have to pull the loaves and the fishes or he will have to admit that \$125,000 is not going to do \$1 million worth of work. But let us just say that one year from now, assuming the honourable gentleman is still Minister of Community and Social Development, we will ask him what criteria has developed.

I find it interesting that he talks very nobly and very well about criteria and priorities and all that sort of thing when we press him a little. We are not pressing him very hard at this point but when we press him and ask what sort of criteria he would use, he very quickly retreats, and has to, I submit, I will be pleasantly surprised but I will be surprised a year from now or whenever we come to this vote next year, I will be interested to see how much actually is spent.

This being perhaps not being entirely an unelection year, I will be very interested to see if anything is spent, in connection with certain gentlemen who presently sit in the House of Commons in Ottawa. We will be watching very carefully. The holier than thou minister, I hope he would not let his halo slip. I am sure he would not.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, of course we will be watching with a great deal of interest the development of the criteria and the utilization of those criteria to determine priorities. I will not say it cannot be done but I will say I do not think it is going to be done. Maybe it cannot, I would go further and say almost certainly it cannot. There are some things the Minister of Labour, who is Acting Minister of Highways at the time, Mr. Chairman, on a similar matter, talks nobly and boldly on priorities but upon a little examination came down to agreement that it was a subjective matter. Somebody will have to determine where the \$125,000 is to be spent. Somebody will have to determine that, it will either be determined by the minister, as a political decision perhaps even a partisan decision.

There is nothing wrong with a political decision, Ministers are the political heads of departments and so they should be. They answer to the people's House, to the people, The permanent head of a department is the deputy minister. He answers to the minister and the executive council. But they should be political decisions. They may or may not be partisan.

I know nothing wrong with even partisan politicians. The system, after all Mr. Chairman, is a partisan system. You know we got them and good guys and bad guys, you know that is the way it works, in - out, that sort of thing.

The problem is though that these things may not be decided on any political basis, they might be decided by some clerk grade thirty-three, because too often that is where the decisions are taken,

too often. I fear rather they were taken at the ministerial level or under ministerial direction, with guide lines laid down by ministers.

I will be intrigued if the honourable gentleman can develop a set of criteria that are workable and feasible. Better minds than his, well maybe not better, minds at least equal to his have tangled with this. This vote used to be in Municipal Affairs. The minister could speak with his officials down there. They were driven to distraction over it. I remember back in the days when the honourable Mr. Beaton Abbott, a former member for Gander, was the Minister of Municipal Affairs, he was just about driven to distraction with this vote.

Ministers of Community and Social Development have been just about driven to distraction, their lives have been shortened. It is an impossible vote.

MR. ROWE: Thanks. Wistful thinking, you know.

MR. ROBERTS: I am speaking on behalf of my honourable friend's wife who asked me to make that remark. But the point remains that there are some things, Mr. Chairman, that it is almost impossible to determine on any objective basis.

One can lay down an objective set of criteria for school busses. One can say so many children at so much per mile. That can be worked out. One can say that we will only put water and sewerage in the communities of one thousand people or larger. That is an objective criteria. You go around and count the noses, and there you are. One can even say that one will put electricity, this administration have abandoned everybody who lives in a community of fewer than twenty people (They have just said, "no, no light,") cut them dead, they do not exist, so much for rural Newfoundland.

But I submit when it comes to something like water, where either if one has not got it, then one must have it. It is one of those things where there can be no deferrment. I mean without water, in the case of some honourable gentleman, no the honourable gentleman is away, but water and substances. You know without water one cannot live. You cannot defer that. One cannot have very objective criteria at all. It is a matter, if a community comes in and establishes need, then one must supply it somehow. That is all I want to say on it. If the minister can develop objective criteria and can use those criteria to determine priorities, I will look forward with extreme interest to his elucidation of that next year. He himself says that it may not be possible, I go further, I do not think it will be possible. I may be proven wrong. Indeed I hope I am proven wrong but I suspect, Sir, we will be back next year, we will see supplementary supply on this item.

MR. ROWE: I hope so.

MR. ROBERTS: I certainly hope so. \$125,000 is not going to meet the need and I suspect, when all is said and done, that the only criteria that there will be next year will be, in the long run, a subjective decision, hopefully by the minister, as the responsible person. If not, it will be by some official and officials are marvelous people, they do great things, but there are some things for which the minister should take a direct responsibility and I think this is one of them.

On motion total subhead 2008, carried.

MR. ROWE: (2010-07) Does the honourable minister have a list of the contracts, economic and social contracts he proposes to enter into or has entered into already in the present financial year?

MR. SENIOR: No I have not got a list.

MR. ROWE: Does a list exist? Have contracts in fact been given out?

MR. SENIOR: Yes, it is just a reference for what the vote was for. I could supply a list.

MR. ROWE: Why does the minister not have this? I do not want to be presumptuous to the minister, Mr. Chairman, why does the minister not have this type of bread and butter information.

MR. ROBERTS: It is something the opposition always asks for.

MR. SENIOR: No, there is no such list.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, none of it is for George, it is strictly for the university. George is not university, not yet.

MR. ROBERTS: (2019-08-01) Mr. Chairman on this one, some of my colleagues may want to say something because it is rather a large amount of money, it is \$31 million, most of which I assume is recovered from DREE, in effect this subhead (08) is the DREE agreement and I will let my colleagues deal with that. I want to raise, however, Sir, one question, one point, which I have been asked to raise by an individual citizen, a gentleman in Corner Brook by the name of Mr. Charles Parsons, He lives in Gearyville in Corner Brook and if I am not mistaken, I do not see any of the honourable gentlemen from Corner Brook here, that is down near the waterfront, just immediately from the Bowaters premises, running up towards Brakes Cove.

The problem, and it relates directly, Mr. Chairman, to transportation development because out of this would come the funds being spent on the arterial road project in Corner Brook. Mr. Parsons has a problem, Sir, he has a very serious problem. It is a problem that is serious to him. It is not of earth-shaking consequence but I think it is worth some time of the committee, Sir.

Mr. Parsons is an elderly gentleman. I believe he is sixty-six years of age. Yes he is, he is retired from Bowaters, receiving a pension that is his only income. I do not know the amount of that. He married a second time, Sir, late in life. He has three children,

aged six, seven and twelve, All of them, of course, are in school.

He and his wife and his children live in this home at Gearyville, in Corner Brook. Now, Sir, Mr. Parsons had thought he was settled away for life, He retired and got his pension, had his nice little home down there, but the inevitable path of progress came. I am glad the Minister of Highways, the member for Humber East is here, I am referring to a case, I think it is probably in the honourable gentleman's constituency, of Mr. Charles Parsons, I think it is Mr. Charles Parsons, the honourable gentleman may be familiar with it, but Mr. Parsons asked me to raise it and we are on the item where it should be raised, the arterial road.

I have just told the committee a little of Mr. Parson's background. The honourable gentleman I am sure knows him, he is a sixty-six year old man, retired from Bowaters, married a second time late in life and has three young children, they are six, seven and twelve, they are all in school. His future looked reasonably secure, everything was going along fine, but then it was decided to build the arterial road and Mr. Parsons home, along with a fair number of homes; actually, I was amazed, when I was last in Corner Brook, to discover how many homes are to be expropriated for the arterial road, especially when it sweeps down over Hospital Hill and comes down in by the CN docks and to its border-front terminus.

Well Mr. Parsons did not really object to losing his home. I mean it would not have done him much good and he was citizen enough to realize that the state needed the home to build the arterial route. Everybody seemed to feel an arterial route was a good idea in Corner Brook. The Government of Canada are paying what? Three-fourth of the cost, the minister will tell us, but a large part of the cost.

MR. SENIOR: All the cost, one hundred per cent.

MR. ROBERTS: One hundred per cent, that is the kind of cost-shared

programme even the Minister of Finance would go for. One hundred per cent federal, all for that.

MR. SENIOR: Resource development is one hundred per cent too.

MR. ROBERTS: Resource development is one hundred per cent, Good!

We should have more of that too!

Anyway, Mr. Parsons, Sir, to make a short story a little longer, received (I do not know when he received it) on the first day of May the letter was written, without prejudice. That phrase that we lawyers so love, a letter from the Chief Highway Engineer telling him that his home had been expropriated. It was not a legal expropriation order but I mean this was it, the axe had fallen.

I am reading from the letter now, Sir. The value: The appraiser retained by the government had placed on the house and property a value of \$15,000, The appraisal was in the form of a report available for Mr. Parsons' inspection at the Department of Highways Office in Corner Brook. "The department are prepared to offer you the appraised value of \$15,000 plus a disturbance allowance of \$1,500 making a total of \$16,500. Would you please

Mr. Roberts.

say whether or not this price is acceptable." That letter was written May 1, by the Chief Highway Engineer. It may not even have been written by him. It was signed by him. It is a normal letter. There is nothing unusual about it. On May 4, Sir, Mr. Parsons writes back to the Chief Highway Engineer and makes one simple point, Sir, and this is the whole burden of the argument. I know the minister is familiar with it and I believe the Parliamentary Assistant to the Premier is familiar with it. Mr. Parsons is about to lose his home and like O'Brien, has no place to go. In his letter of May 4, addressed to the Chief Highway Engineer, in the department here in town, he says: "He cannot get a house, an equivalent house in Corner Brook for less than \$20,000." He points out that in addition to the \$20,000 he would need an amount sufficient to cover his moving costs.

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I submit, Sir, that this matter is not in order under this particular vote because we are primarily concerned with financing highways and we are not the Department of Highways. We do not actually get involved in the construction of highways and we would not have any information relative to this particular matter. I suggest, Sir, that it would be taken up with the Department of Highways.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, if I may to the point of order, Sir. The minister is requesting \$31 million. It is all right to spend that money. It does not matter if it is spent by the Department of Highways, because it is his agent. Spending that money for the purpose of building certain roads including the precise road in question, the \$15,000 would that be paid? Do we pay it right away? Does Ottawa pay it?

MR. SENIOR: I think probably the province in fact pays it right away.

MR. ROBERTS: In any event we have come to the end of the estimates. This is the one place where I can raise the matter. I think it is in order, Your Honour, even if it is not, I would ask leave of the committee to bring it up. This man feels he has been treated unjustly. The most ancient form

Mr. Roberts.

of supply, "there is no supply without redress of grievances." If we ever come to the day, Mr. Chairman, when an individual case cannot be raised in the committee and presented this way - the man has gone to the Department of Highways, Sir. He has gone to the Parliamentary Assistant to the Premier. I have here a photostatic copy of a letter from the honourable gentleman, written just ten days ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Leader of the Opposition will keep within reasonable bounds, the item I feel can be considered just on the borderline of relevancy.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank Your Honour and I shall attempt to keep within reasonable bounds and if I should stray I know that Your Honour will bring me to task. In any event, on the 4th of May, as I was saying, Mr. Parsons wrote back to say that he had no real objection to giving up his home. It would be a discomfort. It would be an inconvenience for a sixty-six year old man to have to pick up boot and baggage and move but so be it. He said that he could not get a house for less than \$20,000. On May 10, the Chief Highway Engineer writes back again: "Dear Mr. Parsons: (without prejudice) Thank you for your letter of May 4. I am very sorry to hear that you cannot see your way clear to accept our offer. We have been advised that the appraised value placed on your house represents market value and other properties of equal value will be priced the same. If you increase that price to \$20,000, then the property you are looking at will not be the equivalent of your own home but a much higher value. The department has in all cases tried to pay a fair value and we feel that we must stick to our offer, that is \$15,000, plus \$1,500 disturbance allowance. Would you please reconsider our offer? Chief Highways Engineer."

On June 26, Mr. Parsons wrote back to the Chief Highways Engineer: "Replying to your letter of May 10, I cannot reconsider your offer

Mr. Roberts

of \$15,000, plus \$1,500 disturbance allowance. I checked two real estate offices here in the city on Friday, June 23 and now I find out that I cannot get a four bedroom house at not less than \$24,000. As I told you in my previous letter dated May 4, (which I read to the committee, Mr. Chairman) I need a four bedroom home, as I have now." He has a four bedroom home now because he has a family of five. Any smaller home would be useless to him. He cannot get a four bedroom home in Corner Brook for \$15,000. I may add on that that the Minister of Highways, who has lived in Corner Brook for a number of years, seems to be agreeing and certainly my research with some of the real estate agencies out there confirms that a four bedroom home is not to be had for \$15,000.

AN HON. MEMBER : Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that since the arterial roads came on the scene it has driven the prices in that area rather high. As far as Mr. Parsons is concerned, he is going through the regular channels. I have been advised that there has been machinery set up for arbitration on this and at this moment I think this is where it lies.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I was not aware of that, Sir, but let me finish presenting the case. Mr. Parsons I think just wants some information. In any event he wrote back and he said, in addition to the fact that he could not get a home for less than \$20,000. It seems to be reasonable. That is common ground between us. He has a contract with Bowaters to move all their rail wood and keep a check on freight rates to the mill. He cannot drive a car. He has to live near work because he has to visit the mill daily. It would be very inconvenient for him to live in Curling, for argument's sake, or out in Humber Town or out in the bay somewhere. He mentions the matter of lawyers' fees. I think, Mr. Parsons is a man who is aware of the value of lawyers to enforce his rights. My friend from Bell Island is still munching his hamburger. It is probably just as well. The hon. member for Bell Island is pretty good at looking after people's rights. In any event,

Mr. Roberts.

the point is very simple, Mr. Chairman. I should add that Mr. Parsons also quite properly made representations to his political leader, his political representative. I am not sure if the original letter were written to the Premier or to whom. I have a copy of a letter written by the honourable gentleman from Gearyville, on June 19, addressed to Mr. Charles D. Parsons: "I have now received information from the Department of Highways in connection with your property. In the opinion of the department the amount which they have offered you, \$16,500, should enable you to purchase the property which would be the equivalent of your present home. The department advises that they have purchased several homes in Corner Brook at a similar value and as your property was appraised at \$15,000 plus a disturbance allowance of \$1,500, they must restrict their offer to this price. I trust you will understand their reasoning in this matter. Sincerely yours."

I have some private information. It comes from reliable sources that there is no way that the man can get a home. Let me just put the matter in perspective and maybe some honourable gentleman opposite Sir, would comment upon it. This administration stand committed (I agree with them. They said it in the Throne Speech. My party will vote for this gladly and with enthusiasm) to the principle of a home for a home. I do not think anybody would argue against that. It is the most reasonable and decent and common sense approach that could be envisaged. I live in eternal shame that I was part of the administration that changed the Family Homes Act in St. John's, to remove the home for the home. Well it was done at the request of the then minister, The then Minister of Municipal Affairs. I think he should be ashamed of it. The honourable gentleman could speak to him at cabinet the next time he is there. He is now the Minister of Finance. Be that as it may - yes, he was the minister.

Mr. Roberts.

He has seen the errors of his ways. There are other errors which he will see.

It is a principle, Mr. Chairman, that is a sound one and a very good one.

Here we have a case that is squarely the principle. Mr. Parsons as I understand him and the information I have comes from him - I raised it at his request. He says he has run out of all other recourse. He may have some legal rights but that gets into arbitrations and appeals and is cumbersome and difficult. Meanwhile at some point the man will lose his home. Maybe it is gone already. The road is marching inexorably down. It is coming along quite well. The Department of Highways, acting on the advice of their advisers, offer him a sum of money which is not adequate to replace his home. It is that simple. It is that simple. All I ask of the administration and I ask it now in Mr. Parsons' behalf, is that they undertake to give him a home. I do not think it is a matter of giving him any cash. I think it is a matter of the administration, if they wish to go out and acquire a home and give it to Mr. Parsons, I assume he has free title to the home he now has, well then they would give him equal free title.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. Leader of the Opposition confine himself to the matter of relevancy. I believe the point of the letter has been brought out to the committee. I am concerned that it is not quite relevant but since it was a matter of concern, a matter of large concern to one individual, it is something with which leeway should be given. However, I think the matter has been brought to the attention of the committee but I feel that debate on this particular matter would not be relevant under the heading 2010-08-01, Transportation Development, and Economic Expansion Agreement Programme.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, may I make a comment, if Your Honour wishes I would make a submission that it is in order because this subhead, 08-01 business, is the head out of which will come the funds to build the road in respect of which Mr. Parsons' house is coming down. I do not think it could

Mr. Roberts

be much more relevant than that, with respect, Sir. I really do not. In any event, if Your Honour wishes I will make such a submission. I have drawn my remarks largely to a close. All I ask is that perhaps the Minister of Highways is the appropriate man, maybe the Minister of Community and Social Development - anybody. If this administration mean their public commitment of a home for a home, can they now assure the committee that Mr. Parsons will get a home for a home because now, Sir, he is not getting a home for a home. He is losing his home and he is getting in return a sum of money which is not adequate to provide him with another home. That is really the whole burden of my argument, Sir.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak briefly to that home for a home because I am somewhat familiar with it.

MR. ROBERTS: Home for a home is not the subject under debate.

MR. AYLWARD: Well that is what we have been discussing here for the last hour or so, Mr. Chairman. I would like to say this really that on the Blackhead Road, under the Urban Renewal Scheme, which was worked out with C.M.H.C. and the previous administration, there was an arbitration - I acted for an individual and the board was set up and constituted. We argued that the principle of a home for a home applied and that the amendment to the Family Homes Expropriation Act did not apply. You will recall that, that is anybody who is familiar with the act, the home must be up to a certain standard. Our argument was that the standard should not be the building standards of all Canada but the standards of the area. We felt that the home in question, which was a home belong to an individual named Taylor, was standard for the area. We went before an arbitration board and I think the now Deputy Minister of Justice acted as counsel for the minister under the expropriation. The board awarded the claimant the sum of \$8,300.

MR. ROBERTS: That would not have bought him another home, I do not think it would

MR. AYLWARD: Yes that would have bought him another home comparable to what he had lost. In fact he was very, very pleased with it and so was I because the original offer to us from the department I think was in the vicinity of \$4,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the arbitration board awarded the arbitration, based on a home for a home principle, we were very, very pleased with it but what happened was that the Minister of Public Works, under whom all the expropriations were taken under the act, then appealed that decision. I think it was an unfortunate step as far as the resident of the area to not leave the decision of that board standing. The result was that we went before the appeal board of the province and the appeal court held that the Family Homes Expropriation - the amendment to the Family Homes Expropriation Act applied and this was not a standard home and as a result they reduced the award. I contacted every one whom I thought was concerned with housing at that time, including the then minister, who was Mr. Nolan, Minister of Supply. I also contacted Mr. Vivian at the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation and Mr. Dawe in Municipal Affairs - no, I contacted Mr. Nolan in his capacity as representative for the area. The act itself at that time came under Mr. Dawe, who was Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. I felt, myself, Mr. Chairman, that the decision of the Board of Arbitration was an excellent decision and it not alone affected, of course, the claim that the court was considering, that is Taylor, but all the other residents in the area. Of course, not alone were the government aware of the amendment but everybody concerned was made aware of the significance of the reversal of that decision and that is exactly what happened, of course. The Appeals Board found that the Family Homes Expropriation Act, the amendment applied and as a result the award was reduced from \$8,300 to \$4,300 or \$6,300. I thought that that was a desperate thing because as I said before that was a test case and as a result there are numerous people, in the district of my hon. friend here from St. John's South, in the same position

as a result of that decision, because if, of course, the award is based on the market value, the award is considerably lower. Not alone did the administration - you said how you expressed your regret at being a part of it, for bringing in that amendment...

MR. ROBERTS: I was a member of the House, and I supported the administration.

MR. AYLWARD: Yes sure, supported the administration. Not alone that, but even when there was a decision they went further and appealed it and added insult I think to injury.

MR. ROBERTS: Is the honourable gentleman finished?

MR. AYLWARD: I think we met, representing the Householders Union of the Blackhead Road. They met with the Premier and extracted from him, of course, a commitment to repeal that amendment.

MR. ROBERTS: We would have done it.

MR. AYLWARD: But all urban renewal development - it applies in Corner Brook as well.

MR. ROBERTS: Does the honourable gentleman then see - I agree with him and maybe the administration will act retroactively when they bring in this amendment and clean up this unfortunate situation on the Blackhead Road. If an injustice has been done, maybe they -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Well let me just finish one sentence. I assume the honourable gentleman from Placentia East in effect agrees with the submission that Mr. Parsons should have his -

MR. AYLWARD: I think the amendment should be repealed, sure.

MR. ROBERTS: The amendment does not apply out there, I would think I do not know under what Act they are proceeding.

MR. AYLWARD: The Urban Renewal Act, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: No, this is not urban renewal. This is expropriation for a highway we are talking about. All I am saying is that my friend from Placentia East, the learned gentleman agrees with the submission that

Mr. Parsons should have a twenty thousand dollar house, a comparable house instead of the lesser sum that has been offered to him by the Department of Highways.

MR. AYLWARD: What I am saying is, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make my position clear. As far as the people of the Blackhead Road and everybody concerned with the urban renewal project which by that amendment excluded the "Family Homes Expropriation Act" with a very, very poor piece of legislation, I would like to see that Act repealed. How it would affect Mr. Parsons, I do not know. I do not know the situation but I would like to see that amendment repealed.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know why, Sir, the honourable—

MR. WELLS: I feel the same, Mr. Chairman. What the honourable member for Placentia East said is quite right. He set out the thing admirably. That is the position and it is something that cannot be let lie. He does not intend to let it lie or I do not intend to let it lie.

MR. ROBERTS: I will join you honourable gentleman.

MR. WELLS: A policy has to be evolved where there is better and more equitable compensation.

MR. ROBERTS: Once the government can do it retroactively, they can compensate those people retroactively.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 2011-01 carry?

MR. ROBERTS: Is the administration making no answer to the point? I mean I will not debate it—

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, no!

MR. ROBERTS: But is no member of the government going to make an answer? Is Mr. Parsons still to be left hanging? Will the minister say a few words?

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer the honourable member for White Bay North by saying that I will take this under advisement.

MR. ROBERTS: May I ask the minister, on behalf of Mr. Parsons, because I understand the house is to come down, you know, daily, if it is not

already down. I realize the minister has been away, ill. We all know that. I am not looking for the answer, but Mr. Parsons would like to know when he might expect some reply.

DR. FARRELL: I would say, Mr. Chairman, as soon as possible. We are working on this problem. We are working on the many other people that are involved in similar situations. As soon as we possibly can, we will bring down a reply.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the honourable gentleman.

On motion, 2010-08-02 through 2010-08-04, carried.

On motion, subhead 2010, carried.

On motion, Heading XX, Community and Social Development as amended, carried.

Heading XVIII, Supply and Services:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 1801-01 carry?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Is the minister going to make any kind of a general statement?

MR. DAVE: I will not enter into any kind of a preamble on this, we will just get right to it. Perhaps in a half hour we will be finished, Sir.

MR. ROWE: Well that being the case, we will probably finish before we start.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, before we move on to the minister's salary, there are a few remarks that I would like to make concerning the purchasing of supplies for the retail stores in the District of Labrador North. I am sure that the honourable minister is familiar with this particular phase of his department. There are a number of areas that have been unsatisfactory over the - especially last year, leaving a number of people without supplies in a number of communities. I was wondering if the honourable minister would explain to the House the procedures, the changing procedures that have been set up regarding the purchasing of supplies for the retail

stores, a division of NLSD, and would he expound on the improvements if any that his department has made in this respect.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Chairman, the purchasing of these supplies is done at the request of the Department of Welfare or Social Services. We act only as the purchasing agent. We do not determine what goes down there. The person who determines that or the area in which this is determined is through the Welfare Department. I understand it is in accordance with the requirements of the people in that particular area in Labrador.

However, I shall keep this in mind and my deputy and I have already agreed to go to Labrador sometime this summer and have a look at the whole setup.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, that was a very vague answer to place before this committee. The honourable minister does buy on behalf of the Social Services and Rehabilitation Department some \$1 million worth of stock. His department is heavily involved in the normal purchasing procedures of this particular commodity or the supplies for the retail stores. It is an unique situation. It is not the same type of procedure that they use for the institutions in the province. It is a retail store where there is a changing demand, the quantities increase. Some of the communities have been left with shortages of even food supplies.

I would like to ask the honourable minister if they are going to do some upgrading in this particular system, and to give to NLSD, if possible, a better service, a wider range of purchasing. I would like to hear his views, Sir, on the flexibility, the change of the particular system of purchasing for that particular department. I do not think the changes or the legislation that is set up now fit that particular organization. I feel it should be treated possibly on the same basis as a wholesale firm, where you have flexibility, where you can go to the market without going through the rigid procedures of the Department of Supply doing the purchasing. When I say rigid procedures, I think in

terms of the tendering process that the honourable minister is forced to go through because of the legislation that was enacted.

I would like to hear the honourable minister - I am sure that he is aware of this. I am equally sure that if he does not have the information, his capable official sitting beside him does have it. I would like to have the honourable minister present to this House his views and tell us if there are to be any changes. I would like to know also what direction he will take in this respect to correct some of the inadequacies of this particular system?

MR. DAVE: Mr. Chairman, I am certainly not trying to be vague on the question at all. As a matter of fact it is a question which should have been asked when the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation Estimates were being discussed. As I have said, we act as an agent only, a purchasing agent. We are given a list of supplies that are required in Labrador by the NLSD and we go out and we purchase them at the best price we can get. It is the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation to whom this question should have been directed when his department's estimates were going through.

However, since I do have a slight involvement or my department does, I am willing to go to Labrador this summer, have a look around and make recommendations to the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation. Apart from that, I have no other authority to do anything about it.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that I cannot accept this very vague answer from the Minister of Supply and Services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Would the honourable member, and the Chair must apologize but the Chair cannot catch what the information is that the honourable member is seeking. Would the honourable member point out what it is.

MR. WOODWARD: The information that I am seeking, Mr. Chairman, is that there were supposed to be some changes made. The honourable minister's

Department of Supply and Services does the purchasing on behalf of the Northern Labrador Services Division. The matter has been discussed with his officials and there were supposed to be some changes made, there was supposed to be some flexibility in the system so that they could serve the needs of the people concerned who are purchasing from the retail stores in Labrador.

I am sure the honourable Chairman was aware this winter of the adverse publicity, of stock shortages and hardship caused citizens in communities on the Coast of Labrador because of the shortage of supplies. We expressed the need of a change in the system. I somehow sympathize with the honourable minister because of the fact that he is dealing with it directly through the involvement of someone else. The honourable minister, in cooperation with the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, should work out a system, Mr. Chairman, whereby the service can be upgraded. I am asking the minister if he would give the committee some information as to what his views are on this particular subject and if this particular system will be upgraded to the degree that it will suit the needs of the people concerned.

MR. DAWE: At the risk of being repetitive, Mr. Chairman, I can do little more than repeat what I have already said. However, if the honourable member would like to know what we are doing in this respect, I would like to inform him that I am working closely with the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation and the Minister of Labrador Affairs. I am not all that familiar with your problem down there. All I know is that the depot manager comes up with a list of goods that he requires, he contacts the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation and from there the Department of Supply are contacted and requested to purchase these items. That is as far as our authority goes. We do as we are told.

We purchase the items according to brand name if this is what they want. We have no authority to change them or change the orders, the amounts nor anything else. However, as I said, I will be only too happy to accompany the other two ministers to Labrador, have a look

around and try to determine some better system if that is possible.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, it is quite obvious that the honourable minister is not too well briefed on the system. Maybe it is partially because of the fact that there is another department involved. The honourable minister's department is doing the purchasing. The only thing that Social Services and Rehabilitation do is have an expediter to see that the purchasing is done as quickly as possible. What we need here, Sir,

Mr. Woodward.

As an honourable minister and a policy maker of this particular government's administration, I would personally like to hear the views of the honourable minister on what changes - there is a need for a change. I am sure that has been discussed with the honourable minister, Mr. Chairman. There is a need for a change in the system. Going to Labrador, looking over the situation there it is now necessary to change the legislation that was brought into this House. I feel that the legislation does not fit this particular system. There is some other means whereby we can give them a better and a more adequate service because of the nature of the purchasing for Labrador. This summer making the changes will be too late in order to get the resupply in for next fall. Then again, Sir, I would not want the citizens of those communities to suffer under the same conditions that existed last year. I am not elaborating on the conditions. There was a certain amount of controversy. I suppose it is quite obvious that the honourable minister will not give me an answer. I would like to express those views, Sir, and maybe the honourable minister, in consultation with his officials, who are I am sure familiar with it too, can give me maybe a broader view of what is taking place.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Chairman, maybe it is a little late for some of the matters that my honourable colleague is bringing up here - I think the honourable minister is quite right when he says that his only participation and this is where I may query with the action of that department - the depot manager, in a place like Makkovik, Hopedale, Nain or David's Inlet, wherever it may be, he makes his requisition in July and August for his winter supply. That requisition in turn comes out to the Department of Northern Labrador Affairs and Services. It was renamed three times I might add. Then, of course, that requisition is passed down to the Department of Supply and Services. I think what happens then is that the Department of Supply and Services call tenders. But where the slow-down is in getting supplies is maybe between the time of receiving that requisition and the time that the tenders are called and closed. Maybe there is too long a period, between the calling of tenders and

Mr. Winsor.

the closing of tenders, to get the supply in. Now it is very difficult to get supplies into Northern Labrador at any given time. They may miss the boat by one day and by missing the boat by one day, the supplies are delayed for at least two to three weeks. I do not know what changes really can take place unless the requisitions come direct to the hon. Minister of Supply and Services or the hon. Minister of Social Services and have the authority to go ahead and place the orders once they receive them. Now there may be some room for manoeuvring between the two departments.

Now it is difficult to get enough supplies into Northern Labrador, as my honourable colleague has pointed out on two or three occasions, to last for a nine month period, without running the risk of having shortages during sometime, especially during the spring. Whether the items they run short of are very essential or necessary - I would not say necessary, but for instance you could get an item like eggs or fresh fruit and it is utterly impossible to get that in. But some arrangements should be made with some air line to transport these perishables into those stores in Northern Labrador during the winter season. Then the store would not have to carry such an inventory. The last boat goes in there in November and no other supplies go in there until the next spring. As a matter of fact, right now I do not think there is a ship in there and it is doubtful if she will get in within the next week. You see unless there is an arrangement made whereby you can transport supplies in by air, then I do not think you can resolve this problem of shortages. Now you cannot fly oil and fuel in. That must be taken care of during the navigational season or otherwise you run short. I think last year, maybe the first year or second or third year you found the consumption of gasoline higher during the winter months than during the open water season when people are fishing. They are using the ski-doo now, in the same manner as we are using our cars. The ski-doo is the means of transportation for the people of Northern Labrador. It is there automobile. This is why it is very difficult to get enough supplies in to carry them through. That problem can be solved too. An attempt was made last year to get tanks in there. I think maybe

Mr. Winsor

they are getting tanks this year, holding tanks. If not, then that is an avenue which can be explored. Instead of taking it in by barrels, unloading hundreds and hundreds of barrels along the wharves (The hon. Minister of Labrador Affairs has not been there but he will see it, hundreds and hundreds of barrels) which are not only a danger, of course, but the very risk makes it difficult - not so much loss but the cost involved, yes. Those are just a few brief remarks and I can appreciate the minister's position in dealing with the services.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, not wishing to delay it, but seeing that I am Minister of Labrador Affairs and this is a very basic and contentious matter that we are discussing - as the hon. member for Labrador North runs into this more than any other member and the previous member who has spoken has had tremendous experience in that area. The set up is this: The honourable member said that the minister's answer was very vague, which I thought was not right. He has no more to do with, as far as any store in Nain are concerned than buying a reel of thread and basically this is it. The system is what is wrong. This is that everything that is bought by government (I think every one will agree) we have a purchasing arm and this may not be the most convenient thing for Labrador, possibly it is not. Can we have a long, hard look at it? When I say we, the various departments (I have been trying to do it for the past two or three months) that are operating into Labrador, get together with the member for Labrador North and try to get a set-up, discuss the whole thing where Northern Labrador Services as such may be given the authority, apart from the department here, to purchase for their stores, basically as a business. This is the only answer I see. We can talk about the thing for weeks and months. The hon. member for Fogo has perhaps more experience than any of us in the matter. He has been handling these things. Oil has been a tremendous problem this winter. I understand that all our supplies came in from Quebec. I talked with all the oil companies with regard to tanks. Our oil is brought in Quebec. Is that not right? Well the supply comes in from St. John's. They do. Well

MR. MURPHY.

I understood from Mr. Coughlan that that is not so. Basically these are some of the problems. We need tanks and what not. But as I say, as far as the honourable minister is concerned, he is just in the position where every department requisitions from him. His department is purely the purchasing arm and cannot do anything about it. I would like to see the thing developed, quite frankly, and now is the time to do it, as soon as we possibly can - if we ever get out of the salt mines here.

MR. NEARY: The honourable minister was not here all night.

MR. MURPHY: What does that have to do with it? What does that have to do with buying supplies for Labrador? If I were here from twelve o'clock, could I remedy the situation? What a stupid, foolish thing to say!

MR. NEARY: The honourable minister does not like to -

MR. DAWE: Mr. Chairman, just before we leave that point I would like to make the two honourable gentlemen from Labrador aware of the fact that there is a liaison officer who was appointed last year in the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation. His prime function, of course, was to look into these problems and to ensure that the supplies got to Labrador and that all the supplies required and requested got there. The supplies for this year have been purchased. They are now awaiting the first boat to Labrador and everything they requested is presently awaiting the first boat to Labrador right now. So if it turns out that there is a shortage in Labrador, then we can only blame it on the requisitioning officer or the depot manager of the store.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the honourable minister's remarks. Maybe in the heat of debate I said that the answers were vague. I suppose I consider them to be vague and maybe they were not. I feel that there is a need for a change in this system. Until that change is made, as the hon. Minister of Labrador Affairs has said, it is an entirely different ball game from the normal type of purchasing that the honourable minister is required to do. I do not want to belabour the committee any longer. I am sure that we can resolve this particular problem by maybe sitting

Mr. Woodward

down with the ministers concerned and dealing with it. I am very much afraid that there will have to be separate legislation brought in to deal with this particular problem.

On motion 1801-01, carried.

On motion total subhead 1801, carried.

On motion total subhead 1802, carried.

On motion total subhead 1803, carried.

On motion total subhead 1804, carried.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Chairman, 1805-01, does that cover all the printing and photography, the whole government agency?

MR. DAWE: Quite a lot of the government printing is done through this department. Many of the reports have to be tendered for and given to outside interests. I think there was only one annual report that we print and that is the one for the Department of Education.

On motion 1805-01, carried.

On motion total subhead 1805, carried.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Chairman, Appropriations-in-Aid, what is this minuscule amount of \$1,000 for sales and services? It is such a small amount when you consider the total subhead there \$163,000. One wonders why it is even carried. Why is it even bothered to be carried as an Appropriations-in-Aid?

MR. DAWE: This is for small printing jobs which are done for, well outside interests sort of like the Memorial University, small bits of printing and so on.

On motion total subhead 1806 carried.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could tell us whether there are any built in estimates here for Mr. McLean or McLean's Associates?

MR. DAWE: None.

MR. NEARY: Good!

On motion Block Provision Canada Pension Plan, Carried.

June 29, 1972

Tape no. 1215

Page 6

On motion Block Provision Unemployment Insurance, carried.

On motion total heading XVIII, Supply and Services, carried.

4116

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: Why could you fellows not be co-operative like that last night?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, on the Supply Bill, I am informed that the Supply Bill is on its way to the Confederation Building now and His Honour Lieutenant Governor will be here shortly after. I would now move that the committee rise for fifteen to twenty minutes, until the bill comes and we can go through the passage of the Supply Bill. We introduce the Bill into committee and we go back and we have to rise the committee and then we come back to Committee of the Whole on the committee of ways and means. We will then reconvene in about fifteen or twenty minutes.

ON motion that the committee rise and report having passed certain estimates of expenditure, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair:

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have passed estimates of expenditure under the following headings: Heading XIV - Fisheries, Items 1413-05 to 1431; Heading XIII - Municipal Affairs and Housing, all items; Heading XVI - Labour, all items; Heading XX - Community and Social Development, all items with some amendments to 2006-10; Heading XVIII - Supply and Services, all items and have passed all estimates of expenditure under all headings including all block provisions and totals and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of Supply reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and have passed certain estimates of current expenditure and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion committee ordered sit again presently.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, for reasons that I outlined in the committee

June 29, 1972

Tape 1216

JM - 2

of the House, the fact that the Supply Bill which we wish to pass, pursuant to the passage of the estimates, is on its way here, I would move that Your Honour rise for a period of fifteen to twenty minutes until the bill arrives and then we can go into the passage of the Supply Bill.

Recess.

On motion the House recessed:

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: "June 1972.

"The Honourable the Minister of Finance.

"I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit estimates of sums required for the public services of the Province for the year ending 31st day of March, 1973 by way of further supply and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act of 1867, as amended, I recommend these estimates to the House of Assembly.

/s/ Lieutenant-Governor."

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I move that the matters referred to in the letter from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be referred to the Committee of Supply for their consideration.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY:

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I think the law clerk has a resolution for the consideration of the committee and that the business of the committee would be to consider the letter from the Lieutenant-Governor in connection with the estimates and the resolution which the Chairman now has. I move, Mr. Chairman, that we pass the total amount as shown in the resolution which the Chairman has and the members of the Committee.

Motion that the Committee report having passed the Resolution, carried:

On motion, that the committee rise and report having passed amended Estimates of Supply, totalling \$366,801,100, in addition to the initial sum of \$119,654,500 authorized for like purposes by the previous Supply Act, and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair:

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have passed the amended estimates of supply totalling \$366,801,100. in addition to the initial sum of \$119,654,500 authorized for like purposes by the Supply Act No. 1 of 1972 and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion Committee ordered to sit again presently, by leave.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would move that the report of the committee on supply with respect to the estimates of 1972-1973 for the financial year ending March 31, 1973 together with a resolution and a bill attached thereto be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. The resolution I believe, Your Honour, has been distributed to all members of the House as has the bill.

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the matter referred to the committee is a Resolution That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for the defraying of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1973, the sum of \$366,801,100 in addition to the initial sum of \$119,654,500 authorized for the like purpose by the Supply Act No. 1 of 1972.

I therefore move this Resolution.

MR. ROBERTS: For our part we are certainly not going to indulge in any further debate as it has been nearly nineteen hours since the Committee of the House sat.

MR. ROBE(W.N.): No prolonged debates.

MR. ROBERTS: No prolonged debate, a couple of hours should do it. Let us put it to the vote. Mr. Chairman. If anybody stands up, I submit the Committee will know how to deal with them.

June 29, 1972

Tape 1217

JM-3

On motion, Head I, Consolidated Fund Serviced, \$150,000, carried:

On motion, Head II, Legislative, \$949,600, carried:

On motion, Head III, Executive Council, \$479,800, carried:

On motion, Head IV, Finance, \$2,212,700, carried:

On motion Head V, Department of Provincial Affairs,
\$631,200, carried.

On motion Head VI, Department of Education and Youth,
\$93,091,800, carried.

On motion Head VII, Department of Justice, \$7,955,500
carried.

On motion Head VIII, Department of Mines, Agriculture and
Resources, \$12,217,700, carried.

On motion Head IX, Department of Public Work, \$12,219,200,
carried.

On motion Head X, Department of Health, \$77,213,500

On motion Head XI, Department of Social Services and
Rehabilitation, \$46,237,900, carried.

On motion Head XII, Newfoundland Liquor Commission,
\$1,312,100, carried.

On motion Head XIII, Municipal Affairs and Housing,
\$11,665,100, carried.

On motion Head XIV, Department of Fisheries, \$6,924,900,
carried.

On motion Head XV, Department of Economic Development,
\$25,472,900, carried.

On motion Head XVI, Department of Labour, \$737,000, carried.

On motion Head XVII, Department of Highways, \$29,606,800,
carried.

On motion Head XVIII, Department of Supply and Services,
\$2,330,700, carried.

On motion Head XIX, Department of Labrador Affairs,
\$370,900, carried.

On motion Head XX, Department of Community and Social
Development, \$35,021,800, carried.

On motion, that the committee rise and report having passed the Resolution and recommend that a bill be brought in to give effect to the same, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion Resolution read a first and second time.

On motion a Bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Seventy-Three And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service," read a first time, ordered read a second time, now by leave.

On motion a Bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Seventy-Three And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service," read a second time, ordered read a third time, now by leave.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service

For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Seventy-Three And For Other Purpose Relating To The Public Service," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Mr. Speaker, His Honour The Lieutenant-Governor has arrived.

MR. SPEAKER: Admit His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR SPEAKER: It is my agreeable duty on behalf of Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal Subjects, Her Faithful Commons in Newfoundland, to present to Your Honour, Bills for the appropriation of Supply granted in the Present Session.

"An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums
Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of
The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending
The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine
Hundred And Seventy-Three And For Other Purposes
Relating To The Public Service."

HIS HONOUR THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR: In Her Majesty's name, I thank Her Loyal Subjects, I accept their benevolence, and assent to this Bill.

MR. MARSHALL: Before moving adjournment of the House, I would like by leave of the House and at the request of the Leader of the Opposition, to make a motion. Since the appointment of the Committee on rules and procedure in the House, the honourable, then member for Labrador South, is since no longer a member of the Legislature and he was one of the nominees of the opposition on this committee. Your Honour has, of course, the right to name the committee, but I would like to request Your Honour, with leave of the House, and advise Your Honour that the replacement for the former member for Labrador South is the honourable the member for St. Barbe North, I would so request Your Honour to appoint him to the committee, with leave of the House,

before it adjourns.

MR. SPEAKER: I appoint the honourable member for St. Barbe North, as the honourable member of this committee, replacing the honourable ex-member for Labrador South.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I do move that the remaining orders of the day stand deferred and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Tuesday, 3:00 o'clock in the afternoon, and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn.



