



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 22

5th Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

MONDAY, APRIL 19, 1971

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

HON. E. ROBERTS (Min. of Health): Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago Mr. Ron Pumphrey, the moderator of the well-known programme "Phone Forum" received a letter from a lady living in Windsor. The lady wrote to Mr. Pumphrey to tell him of the treatment she had received several years ago at the Central Newfoundland Hospital in Grand Falls, the treatment which she alleged was improper and unnecessary. Mr. Pumphrey read the letter on his programme. "Phone Forum" I am told has a very large listening audience indeed. The allegations and charges were thus given very wide circulation. Subsequently, Mr. Pumphrey sent me the letter, with the request that I investigate the charges. With Mr. Pumphrey's permission I sent a copy of the letter to the authorities at the Central Newfoundland Hospital. They had heard the broadcast and thus were already familiar with the allegation, indeed they had begun an investigation. The hospital acting through their Chairman, Mr. R. F. Miles, have now asked the Government to institute an official enquiry.

The Government, Sir, believe it is absolutely essential that the people of Newfoundland have full confidence in all of our health care institutions. Because of the serious nature of the charges and the widespread publicity they have received we feel that an official enquiry should be held. Accordingly the Cabinet have advised His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, to appoint a well-known lawyer, Mr. John J. O'Neil, to be a Commissioner under the Public Enquiries Act. Mr. O'Neil has been asked to investigate the statements and the allegations made by the lady with a view to determining their accuracy and to making any further recommendations he considers necessary. Mr. O'Neil will, of course, make his own arrangements as to the procedure he will follow in carrying out his commission. Because

of the serious of the matter, we have made arrangements to insure that the lady is represented by Council so that her interests are protected. The only request that I have made of Mr. O'Neil is that he submit his report as quickly as possible. It goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that when we receive the report it will be made public.

HON. G. A. FRECKER (Min. of Prov. Affairs): Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. members and of the public I should like to make the following statement: Shortly before he died, the Hon. W. J. Keough, Minister of Labour, suggested to me that it might be more appropriate for the Hours of Work Act rather to be administered by the Department of Labour than by the Department of Provincial Affairs. I discussed this matter with my officials and later with the present acting Minister of Labour, my colleague by my side, we all agreed that the subject matter, the Hours of Work Act, was more closely related to the work of the Department of Labour than to that of the Department of Provincial Affairs. I subsequently submitted a recommendation to the Executive Council the transfer be affective. I am pleased to inform the House that responsibility for the administration of the Hours of Work Act has now been transferred to the Hon. Minister of Labour (acting) and his department.

HON. W. ROWE (Min. of Comm. & Social Dev.): Mr. Speaker, a week or so ago I indicated to some hon. members of the House that I would be making a statement concerning the present DREE Agreement and giving some information as to the status of the new DREE Agreement which is to be signed shortly. The presently existing Federal-Provincial Agreement on special areas and highways, that is the present DREE Agreement for this Province, was signed on April 22, 1970, less than a year ago. That Agreement amounted to nearly \$82 million, with over \$62 million in grants and nearly \$20 million in loans. The work schedule of the Agreement made provision for a maximum of just over \$40 million in grants and loans to be spent, in the financial year 1970-71 just ended.

This Agreement was a completely new type of Development Agreement for both the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland. Entirely new procedures and new committees of officials were set up to administer the programme under the Agreement. A Federal-Provincial liaison committee was established and charged with the implementation of the Agreement to the point where contracts are let, the actual letting of the contracts being done in most instances through the respected line department of the Province and in some cases through school boards.

Considerable time was spent by the liaison committee I referred to on establishing detailed procedure for preliminary design tendering and the submission of financial claims by the Provincial Government and on developing systematic procedures for the review of projects as well. The work load involved in implementing this new programme, in the first year of its operation, was so great that consultants had to be engaged for some aspects of the work and several subcommittees were set up in addition. In spite of the work load involved in getting the programme started, and in spite of the difficulties which cropped up in procedures and coordination nearly every day, we were able, with the greatest effort, to get \$16 million worth of construction actually completed during the 1970 construction season. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, while that was happening substantial amounts of design work were undertaken for still other projects and I am now delighted to be able to report to hon. members that by March 31, 1971, that is by the end of the financial year just passed, ninety-four contracts have actually been let to contractors, with a value of \$48 million. The total value of this work, which include certain basic materials that are not part of the contract, is \$56.5 million. I have in this statement a breakdown as to departments and how much was spent by departments. I have also appended to this statement a list with a brief

description of each contract, the amount of each contract and the contractor to whom the work was awarded after public tenders had been called.

Of the \$56.5 million, total value of work actually contracted for, about \$16 million, as I said, has been completed, which leaves over \$40 million worth of work outstanding, under presently existing contracts, to be completed during the coming work season. Still to be let on contract in the next several weeks are some thirty-five other projects, valued about \$25 million. In addition to that amount there are likely to be overruns, due to inflation, high bids, changes in specifications and a variety of other causes, of about \$10 million.

This year, therefore, Mr. Speaker, this Province will have under construction, under the present DREE Agreement, nearly 100 projects with a value of approximately \$75 million. When work already completed is added to that total, it means that work with a value of well over \$90 million will have been actually completed or under full construction during this construction season, under the present DREE Agreement.

During all of last year we were actively negotiating the new DREE Agreement with the Federal Government. This Agreement is expected by both myself and the Hon. John Marchand to be signed during the next few weeks, early in the month of May, hopefully. The short delay in what I earlier announced to be the signing date is accounted for by the fact that a large part of our energy and time were consumed in getting the present Agreement actually underway.

The new Agreement to be signed next month will be extremely flexible and will indicate the general direction of action to be taken up to 1975. It will be a four year Agreement. It will contain a number of specific projects, for which tenders can be called immediately upon completion of final design. A number of projects agreed upon in principle by the two governments but which need further preliminary or detailed planning, and a number of projects which, though agreed candidates for DREE participation,

still need to be looked at in the light of further detailed studies and in the light of what level of financial commitment DREE will be able to make to this Province for all the various programmes of that department during the next several years.

Since the accent is on flexibility, this type of agreement is felt to be necessary rather than locking ourselves into a rigid four year agreement, with unrealistic cost estimates, on projects which might not be started for three or four years after the agreement is signed. It is thought advisable to be more general as far as the later years of the agreement is concerned.

Also, while the agreement will be a four year agreement, it is intended to review the schedule of projects on an annual basis to allow new projects to be added as needs arise, as circumstances change and as further studies are completed. There will also be annual reviews to determine what new special areas ought to be approved. We have also taken steps in our planning efforts to provide a balance in our DREE programme between the so-called infrastructure or public service project and resource development projects. Thus, at the same time that we signed the main DREE agreement or shortly thereafter, we shall also be signing such resource development agreement as a forest development agreement and a mineral development agreement. We expect other resource development agreements to be signed in the near future as well. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, following an exhausting year of additional negotiations with DREE we shall be signing in a matter of days or weeks an entirely new rural development agreement under ARDA. This rural development agreement, while retaining many provisions which have general application across Canada, will have many other provisions, especially relating to the fisheries which have been negotiated and tailored to meet Newfoundland and Labrador's unique problems and different circumstances. I trust, Sir, that this information concerning the status

of the present DREE Agreement and what can be expected under the various new Agreements under DREE is of some use to hon. members. I have sufficient copies of this Sir, for distribution to hon. members and to the press.

MR.SPEAKER: Before we begin to take up the matter of presentation of petitions I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that we have in the galleries today some twenty-six Grade XI students from St. George's High School in New Harbour. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Wilfred Wareham, and I know I speak on behalf of all hon. members when we bid them welcome to this House of Assembly.

Again before we go into presentation of petitions, I think it is a good a time as any to name the Select Committee in connection with the Auditor General's Report. I have appointed three members to that Committee and they are as follows: the Hon. Minister of Health; the Hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture & Resources; the Hon. member for Burin.

Presenting Petitions:

MR.T.HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of some 136 voters of the community of Outer Cove. The prayer of the petition is that the road known as the lower road ^{which} runs from one end of the community to the other and joins the Marine Drive at both ends be paved. The road, Sir, has been already widened and upgraded and apart from it being a nuisance from a dust point of view many of our tourists who visit the Marine Drive Area lose their way, so to speak. They branch off on a branch of the area known as the Marine Drive and usually end up on this gravel road. The distance is only one mile, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that it would not cost too much, it would add an awful lot to

MR. HICKFY: The visitors to our Province who go down, in the best area in Eastern Newfoundland, and I certainly support the petition, Sir, I ask that it be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

On Motion petition received.

NOTICE OF MOTION

HON. E. M. ROBERTS: (MINISTER OF HEALTH): Mr. Speaker I give notice that on tomorrow I will ask leave to introduce a Bill, An Act Respecting Mental Health. A further Bill; 'An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Medical Care Insurance Act.' Further a Bill; 'An To Provide For The Management And Operation Of Hospitals In The Province.' And the Bill, being a Bill. An Act To Amend The Dental Act, 1968.

MR. T. A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following Resolution:

Whereas the Government has announced its intention to appoint a Royal Commission to investigation the circumstances surrounding the sale by Lundrigan's Limited to Hotel Buildings Limited of a small parcel of land on Portugal Cove Road, St. John's for the sum of \$50,000, which land had been purchased by Lundrigan's Limited two years previously for an amount of \$15,000 and to report in connection with that purchase of land by an agency of the Government:

And Whereas an investigation is required into all of the circumstances surrounding the leasing by the Newfoundland Liquor Commission of three buildings having an area of 1.665 square feet each for terms of twenty years at yearly rentals in excess of \$12,000 per year for each such building and in excess of \$7.22 per square foot per year for each such building located in Grand Bank, Placentia and St. Lawrence:

And Whereas a copy of a Lease tabled in the House of Assembly, dated February 1, 1969, between the Bankers Trust Company as lessor and the Newfoundland Liquor Commission, covering rental of the building located at Grand Bank, discloses that in addition to the high yearly rental

MR. HICKMAN: the Newfoundland Liquor Commission is responsible for paying all repairs, all heating, electrical, telephone and cleaning charges and all municipal taxes or any other taxes in connection with the premises:

And Whereas the buidings in question could not have cost in excess of \$40,000 whereas the owners of the building will receive in excess of \$240,000 for each such building over the twenty year period thus receiving apparent profit of at least \$200,000:

And Whereas the Government has failed to disclose the names of the true owners of the said buildings who will receive such extravagant profits paid for by the taxpayers of Newfoundland:

And Whereas it is necessary and desirable and in the public interest to have an investigation of purchases of property by the Government and agencies of the Government and rental of property by the Government and agencies of the Government during the last five years:

Be It Resolved that the Government appoint a Royal Commission of three members with all necessary powers to investigate the purchases by the Government and agencies of the Government of property during the last five years and the rental of property by the Government and agencies of the Government during the last five years and, in particular, to investigate and report upon leases entered into by the Newfoundland Liquor Commission for the rental of buildings at Grand Bank, Placentia and St. Lawrence for use as Newfoundland Liquor Commission Stores. the said investigation to be carried out immediately and the report thereon to be released to the public immediately upon receipt thereof by the Government, the said Royal Commission to report on the identity of the owners of the said buildings at Grand Bank, Placentia and St. Lawrence, to report on the reasons for the entering into of the transactions involved and the reasonableness or otherwise of the rentals and other terms and conditions agreed to and the said purchase price paid, the said Royal Commission to hold public hearings and to report by the 1st. day of September, 1971.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, in reply to Question No. 164, on the Order Paper of March 26, in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's West. (1) A feasibility study was received from K-mat Transportation Consultants Incorporated. The method of Transportation proposed in the report was later superceded by a five year charter Agreement at a firm price of \$5.50 a cord. It is not proposed to table the report. In answer to (3) of the question: I have to say that the report is not yet completed. I cannot say whether we will table that report when we receive it.

Question No. 295, on the Order Paper of March 29th. in the name of the same hon. gentleman the answer to (1) is that the contracts were cancelled before construction of the carriers began. (2) That on October 10, 1968 the hon. Jean Marchand, as Minister of Forestry and Rural Development, issued a press release signifying conditional approval for aid totalling \$12 million for harbour improvements at Stephenville and Goose Bay. However, because of the subsequent restructuring of the projects at Stephenville the harbour improvements were no longer required, and so the money did not have to be spent.

Question No 297, on the Order Paper of March 29th. in the name of the same hon. gentleman. I have to say in reply to (1) that in a press release of October 10th. 1968. the hon. Jean Marchand announced conditional approval for \$6.5 million ADA (Area Development Agency) Grant to the Melville Project. The project, however, because it failed to meet the March 31, 1971 deadline, failed to qualify. The project cannot be completed before 1972. And in reply to (2) I say that it is quite obvious that a favourable recommendation was made or the Government of Canada would not have announced approval.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, has any attempt being made to secure such a grant even though the March 31, 1971 deadline cannot be met?

MR. SMALLWOOD: In answer to that I have to say that I do not know. It is certainly not by the Government. It might have been made by the project, though that I doubt. But I do not know.

Question No. 481, on the Order Paper of April 15th. in the name of the same hon. gentleman and inquisitive member, the answer (1) an Imperial Sedan with eight cylinder, 440 cubic inch engine and an automatic torque flight transmission. The car is equipped as follows: dual exhaust, sure grip rear axle automatic air conditioner and heater, AM/FM radio

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): stereo tape auxiliary unit, power door locks, automatic head-lamp dimmer, auto-pilot, power deck lid release, engine block heater, safeguard sentinel, tinted glass, head-rest right and left, outside rear rest, license plate frames, molding door edge, adjustable tilt and telescopic steering wheel, black vinyl roof, dark blue trim with split bench seats.

MR. CROSBIE: So far, so good.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Monotone paint.

MR. CROSBIE: Reclining seats.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Price, \$12,980.00, less trade \$4,400. making a subtotal of \$8,580. to which the S.S.A was added which is in one pocket and out the other, bringing it to \$9,180.60. I hope I have left out no parts of the description here.

MR. CROSBIE: You forgot the year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, that is in there. It is license plate frames, but not license plates.

MR. HICKMAN: Would the hon. Premier, for the information of the House, tell us what an auto-pilot is in a car.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not know. I cannot tell the House because, I do not know. I do not know what an auto-pilot is. I know what an auto-pilot is on an aeroplane.

MR. HICKMAN: Right, I was wondering if it was the.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not know what it is on an Imperial Chrysler. I think it may - I do not know what it is, why guess. Let the hon. gentleman find out elsewhere, I cannot tell him.

The answer to the second part of the question is as follows;
operating costs, \$2,606.99. Driver's salary \$4, 740., driver's overtime \$963.72. Incidentally, he averaged I think it was fourteen hours a day. He averages fourteen hours a day. The car was purchased on the 26th. of April, 1969, from City Motors Ltd. the agents for that car.

Question 489, on the Order Paper of April 1st., in the name of the same hon. gentleman. Mr. Fitzgerald is employed by the Department of Provincial Affairs

as assistant press information officer, remuneration \$4,900. a year. Question no. (510), on the Order Paper of April 19th. in the name of the same ineffably curious hon. member for St. John's West. In answer to the first part, Mr. Vardy is not a Government appointee, rather, he was elected by the appointees of the Government and Canadian Javelin as the third member of the voting trust. Neither Mr. Vardy nor Mr. Stead receive any remuneration whatsoever from either Government or company. The answer to the second part is that Mr. Stead is not now and has never been a director of Canadian Javelin, or of any associated company. Mr. Vardy has been a director of Dominion Jubilee Corp. since November 7th. 1962.

MR. SPEAKER: Further answers to questions:

HON. H. STARKES (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the answer to question no. (442), asked by the hon. member for Fortune Bay. And, Mr. Speaker, in connection with question no. (364), on the Order Paper of April 1st. in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West, I am sorry I cannot give detailed information.

MR. CROSBIE: What is the number again there?

MR. STARKES: (364). I am sorry I cannot give detailed information regarding this, as the associations have been going on for some time, and they are still going on with regard to this load. It would be most unwise for me to make any public statement about it at the present time, and I fear that hon. members will have to wait for announcements that will come in due course.

HON. E. WINSOR (Minister of Labrador Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I table the answer to question (435), asked by the hon. member for Fortune Bay, appearing on the Order Paper of April 13th.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, before we continue with Orders of the Day, I would like to ask the hon. the Premier whether there are any agreements entered into by the Government under the Industrial Development Incentives Act, 1968, in connection with subsidies for electric power, and if so, when is the Government going to table the agreements in accordance with the provisions of the Act?

MR. SPEAKER: That question could go to the Order Paper.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, that question is already on the Order Paper, but

there is some urgency. The fifteen days have long since passed since the House opened.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. the Premier whether he now has the name of the commissioner, to head the Royal Commission announced on Friday?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. MARSHALL: I would also like to ask the hon. the Premier whether the Government has yet received a report of the inquiry into the affairs of the Town of Bay Roberts, and if not, whether the Government is prepared to give a deadline to the commissioner?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to--

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but if we are going to continue with answers to questions, I have a number here that--

MR. SPEAKER: We had called it out of order, I shall ask the Leader of the House to answer another question, at the pleasure of the House, if not we can move on to the next item. Is it the pleasure of the House that we revert to answering further questions? The hon. member may answer his question.

HON. J.A. NOLAN (Minister of Supply and Services): This is question no. (140) asked by the hon. member for St. John's East, and appearing on the Order Paper of March 25th. The answer is no termination has been made.

MR. CROSBIE: No termination?

MR. NOLAN: Correct.

MR. CROSBIE: But that does not fit into the question. The question was--

MR. NOLAN: The question is, what amount will the Newfoundland Labrador Power Commission be required to borrow during the calendar year 1971? That information has not been made available as yet.

MR. MURPHY: It has not been determined as yet?

MR. NOLAN: Exactly.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, determination.

MR. NOLAN: No determination has been made was the answer, and still is.

MR. CROSBIE: Not determined yet.

MR. NOLAN: The answer to question no. (205), asked by the hon. member for

St. John's East, on the Order Paper of March 29th. the answer in - eight parts to this answer, the Electric Reduction Company of Canada Ltd. of Long Harbour; Fishery Products Ltd. of St. Anthony; Nat Lake Ltd. in Burgeo; Burgeo Fish Industries Ltd., Burgeo;

MR. CROSBIE: A little slower please.

MR. NOLAN: I will table this Mr. Speaker. Newfoundland Forest Products Ltd., Hawkes Bay; John Penney and Sons Ltd., Ramea; and H,B,Clyde Lake Ltd., of Englee. I have three or four copies of this answer here Mr. Speaker, which I would like to table for the information of the hon. member for St. John's West. He would like to make a note of them apparently, and for any other hon. member who may wish to make notes of the answer provided.

MR. CROSBIE: A supplementary question Mr. Speaker. In connection with these agreements subsidizing the rate of electric power rates, is the minister going to table these agreements in the House, in accordance with the Industrial Development Incentives Act, of 1968, which requires them to be tabled within fifteen days?

MR. NOLAN: I am referring to the question which I just answered, no. (209) and that is the answer I have given. As a supplementary question, is the minister going to table these agreements in accordance with the law, as required by section (8) of the Industrial Development Incentives Act, 1968. Question no. (306) Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: Is the minister going to answer this supplementary question or is the minister going to continue disregarding the law?

MR. NOLAN: Question no. (306) asked by the hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. CROSBIE: He is going to continue disregarding the law.

MR. NOLAN: On the Order Paper of March 30th., the cost is estimated to be \$30 thousand. The second answer to this question, none. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, the answer to (490), in the name of the hon. the member for Burin, on the Order Paper of April 16th., the answer to the first part no, and therefore, the answer to the second part does not arise. I have a question, I am not sure of the number, Mr. Speaker, it is not on the sheet. The question is in the name of the hon. member for Burin, and it has to do - - I will read the question Sir. Has the Lamaline area been designated a

special area under ARDA, and if so when? I suggest that part should be referred to my colleague the Minister of Community and Social Development. The second part, has the minister or the Government given any approval for the establishment of a sheep raising industry in the greater Lamaline area and if so, when and to what extent has Government made financial commitments? The answer specifically to the specific question, Mr. Speaker, is no. Did the minister or officials in his department receive a brief from the greater Lamaline area Development Association on June 8th. 1970, or on any other date? The brief received by the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources arrived about two and one-half weeks ago. I know of no brief on June 8th. 1970, which would, ^{be} nearly one year ago. The fourth part, if the answer to three is yes, will the minister lay upon the table the details of all action, if any, taken by the minister or Government in response to the requests and recommendations contained in such brief. As I said, Mr. Speaker, I know of no brief of June 8th. 1970, but there have been discussions, and there have been visits by officials to the Lamaline area, and on last week, I believe on Wednesday or Thursday, a general meeting of the Development Association was held and certain proposals by the Division of Agriculture and Food, which I understand were voted upon by a general meeting of the Association in an evening meeting, following a meeting with the executive and other individuals in the afternoon, and that the proposals presented by the division were endorsed, I think unanimously.

I have for tabling, Mr. Speaker, the answer to question no. (229), standing in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's West. The question in several parts has to do with the development of the Gros Morne National Park, and I should like to add to the written answer, Mr. Speaker, that we anticipate that the survey, the formal survey with respect to the boundaries which are outlined in a map

MR. CALLAHAN: that is attached to the answer, will get under way this week. I understand that the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development are this week to award the tender for that survey.

The previous question, I am informed, Mr. Speaker, is question 427, that is the one dealing with the Lamaline area.

MR. HICKMAN: I was looking at the answers and I could not find the question here.

MR. CALLAHAN: There was no prepared answer, Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to see the hon. gentleman later and tell him the story again, if he wishes.

I also have for tabling, question number 231, standing in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West, tabling that and question number 490, standing in the name of the hon. member for Burin. Did I give that answer?

MR. HICKEY: Yes.

MR. CALLAHAN: I did

MR. HICKEY: The answer is no.

MR. CALLAHAN: The answer is no. That is it, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. HICKEY: I would like to ask the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, in view of the break-out at the Girls' Home over the weekend, has the Minister any information to give the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Supervisor at the Girls' Home to provide me with a report of the incident that took place on Saturday night and got so much play from press and radio, radio and T.V., and it may be of interest to both sides of the House if I read this report, Mr. Speaker.

"On Saturday, April 17th. at approximately 10:00 P.M., I was informed by telephone, from one of the supervisors at the Girls' Home that seven girls, out of our present population of ten, had run away while the three supervisors on duty were escorting them, after supper.

MR. NEARY:

from the main building at the Boys' Home to their temporary quarters in the adjacent building. The three girls that did not run were escorted inside by two supervisors, while the other supervisors went to report it to the Chief Supervisor at the main building.

Once inside with the three girls, one supervisor telephoned me and I, in turn, reported to Mr. A. J. McCrowe, Director of Institutions. I then telephoned the Home and told them to report the incident to the R.C.M.P. and local Police. Having done this, I immediately left the Girls' Home to assist.

On arrival at the Home, I was informed that the seven girls had run up through the woods behind the Home and that a female supervisor, and the Chief Supervisor at the Boys' Home had gone to search for the girls in the van. I informed the supervisors that when the girls were returned, they were to be showered and put to bed.

I then drove in my car towards the fire station at Pleasantville where I spotted the seven girls running along the hill behind the Newfoundland Poultry Farm. I telephoned the Home from a house nearby and informed them of my findings and told the supervisors to notify the Police. I remained there and shortly after a Police van arrived. After some persuading two girls gave themselves up. They were escorted back to the Home at approximately 6:45 P.M. The other five girls ran back up over the hill and disappeared into the trees. The Police and ourselves searched for them, and at 7:15 another girl was found and escorted back to the Home. At 8:00 P.M. a fourth girl gave herself up and she too was escorted back to the Home by our van.

I received a telephone call from the Police while we were back at the building, asking if someone who knew the girls would come and try to talk them down from a position they had taken on the rocks, behind the

MR. NEARY: Power Station at Pleasantville.

"We were informed that they were in a dangerous location and, as darkness was closing in, we should act quickly. One of the Boys' Home supervisors and myself proceeded to the area and on arrival were asked by the Police if we would go back, because the girls said they would not come down if we were there.

"We left and joined another Police car that was located, behind the girls, upon the hill. After consulting with the Police officers we started through the woods towards the girls. When we reached the rocks, we found that the girls had moved further down the hill. As it was now quite dark we rejoined the Police car at the foot of the hill and searched the buildings, as the Police informed us the girls had moved back up the hill and they had lost sight of them.

"The Police drove us back to our van which had been left on the top of the hill when we started our walk through the woods. Having informed the Officers that we were going back to Quidi Vidi area, they left and we returned to the area where the girls were last seen. When we reached this, we saw a light further up the hill and were about to investigate when two Police Officers and a Police Inspector joined up. We informed them of our finding and they proceeded with us up the hill where we located the three girls who were in the company of two boys. They were sitting, smoking a cigarette, and talking.

"We escorted them down the hill to our van and back to the home.

"After the last three girls were returned to the Home, they too were given showers and put to bed.

"I then spoke to all the girls concerning their running away, explaining to them that running away proved nothing only that they were still very unstable and were, by their actions, only keeping themselves in

MR. NEARY: the Home longer.

"The girls were very talkative and as a result it took considerable time and talk before they finally settled down to sleep at approximately 12:30 A.M. , when I left the Home.

"The only punishment the girls received, if indeed it can be considered as punishment, is that they were confined to their own building. Their meals were brought over to them. Some girls refused their breakfast and dinner but at supper all girls ate a full meal. Even though some refused their meals, the meal was there for them if they wished to eat it."

And that is signed by Mr. L. C. Power, Assistant Superintendent, of the Boys' and Girls' Training Home.

I may point out, Mr. Speaker, you may have noticed this, that in this report there is no mention of any of the juveniles involved in the incident, and I would like to point out to the members that this is in keeping with the policy of juvenile homes and shelters across Canada, on the grounds that any release of the names of residents might prejudice their future life when they enter into the community in their adult years.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I have one further question, in view of the seriousness of the situation in connection with those girls, the numerous break-outs that have taken place, and also the charges that have been made, either by the girls or indirectly by those two boys that were with them, does the Minister not think it is in the best interest of the girls, the Institution, his Department, and indeed all concerned, that the report on the fire last year and all the information pertaining to the whole matter, be tabled in the House or at least provided to member and provided to the press, so as to clear up any misconceptions that have arisen?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the whole matter is a gross exaggeration and a complete fraud, played up by a news-hungry media and I have no intention of tabling it in the House.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I have one further question. Does the Minister not agree that one sure way of clearing the air on this whole matter, if the news media are at fault, is to prove that by producing this report, if this is so?

MR. HICKMAN: I have a question for the hon. Minister of Fisheries. Has the hon. Minister received any representation from inshore fishermen in the Pass Island area and Fortune, relative to foreign draggers fishing within four miles of Brunette Island and other parts of Fortune and Connaigre Bay, indeed eleven foreign draggers all told have been there for several weeks? Has the Minister received any complaints and if so what action has been taken?

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I have received complaints, as a matter of fact, it is almost a daily occurrence, receiving complaints from the inshore fishermen regarding foreign draggers, and every complaint we receive we forward on to the Federal Department of Fisheries at Ottawa. I think the same reply would be applicable to the hon. member as I gave to the hon. member for Fortune Bay, they are conscious of the fact and they are trying to resolve the problem the best way they can. But they are aware of the situation the hon. member referred to.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on Orders of the Day, the question of the hon. the Premier, or in his absence, the Minister of Justice, has the Government any comment on a statement made at the annual meeting of British Newfoundland Corporation Limited, that uncertainty over the tax system has made impractical, commercial and financial studies related to the power potential of the Gull Island location, downstream from the current Churchill Falls Project, has the Government got any comment on that? Uncertainty over the tax system has made impractical these studies.

MR. HICKMAN: No comment?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on Orders of the Day, in the absence of the Minister of Finance, to the hon. the Premier, is the Government prepared to co-operate with the Government of Canada in their assurances in relation to pensions, the Government of Canada has now agreed to provide, through legislation, that public servants have an option to retire at age fifty-five, but in connection with civil servants who worked for Newfoundland before Confederation, their prior years of service, responsibility of the Government of Newfoundland, has the Government agreed?

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a question that is in order. I suggest that the hon. member put his question on the Order Paper.

MR. CROSBIE: Well would the hon. the Premier have the Minister of Finance make a statement on that, this is a complicated situation that affects

MR. SPEAKER: We must not have a debate either.

MR. CROSBIE: This is not a debate Mr. Speaker. It is an attempt to get information.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions (1) to (16) on today's Order Paper. To save a little time in routine, I think, if all hon. members are agreed, we would read each one separately, for the first reading. That would obviate the necessity of going through every single one of them for leave to introduce. If I hear no dissenting voice, I will put it in that form. We still will read each bill and move its first reading:

Has the hon. Minister leave to introduce those bills? That are contained in Items (1) to (16), in Motions?

On motion carried:

On motion Bill No. 17, - a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Statute Law", read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion Bill No. 34, - a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend The Summary Jurisdiction Act", read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On Motion, Bill No. 8 - a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Survivorship Act, 1963"; read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On Motion, Bill No. 42 - a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Wills Act", read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On Motion, Bill No. 38 - a Bill, "An Act To Repeal The Department of Municipal Affairs (Amendment) Act, 1969", read a first time, order read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, Bill No. 10, A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Insurance Companies Tax Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, Bill No. 6, A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Insurance Contracts Act, 1961," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, Bill No. 7, A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Fire Insurance Act, 1957," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, Bill No. 21, A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Stamp Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, Bill No. 20, A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Livestock (Health) Act, 1964," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, Bill No. 44, A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Children Of Unmarried Parents Act, 1964," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, Bill No. 31, A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Child Welfare Act, 1964," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, Bill No. 43, a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Adoption Of Children Act, 1964," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, Bill No. 35, a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Elevators Act, 1969," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, Bill No. 40, a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Annual Vacations With Pay Act, 1969," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, Bill No. 32, a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Community And Social Development Act, 1966," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain to the House that the hon. minister has to leave town on Wednesday and I thought I better bring on this Bill while he is here.

Motion second reading of a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Social Services And Rehabilitation."

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is a new Act respecting the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation, which introduces changes in the old Department of Welfare Act, 1965. The Act will clarify the interpretation of provisions of the 1965 Act. It also contains a new provision enabling the minister to enter into agreements with the Government of Canada, because this was not spelled out in the 1965 Act. It has actually been in practice down through the years. Such agreements, of course, Mr. Speaker would be subject to the approval of the Cabinet, the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council.

The new Bill also enables the minister, Mr. Speaker, to authorize research projects in the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation with the stipulation that any cost involved would be approved in the usual way. I do not think there is anything else I need say about the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I move second reading.

On motion a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Social Services And Rehabilitation," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion second reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend, Revise And Consolidate The Law Respecting Social Assistance.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this Bill will consolidate the law respecting Social Assistance as it now appears in the Social Assistance Act, 1962, and the amendments to that Act made in the years, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1969 and 1970. Clause (5) is new and Sub-clause (2) of Clause (9) is rewritten or is a rewritten Section (2) of Section (8).

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, when enacted will make easier the work of anyone needing specific information rather than having to search through

Mr. Neary

a number of different sources and cross-references, he will now be able to refer to a specific Act, properly indexed for ready reference. I move second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN: This Bill, amongst other provisions, sets forth the principle that is contained in Clause (18) that where Social Assistance has been properly paid, this is to be regarded as a debt to the Crown.

My feeling, and I base this on complaints that I have received and I am sure complaints that other hon. members have received from time to time from the people in this Province, and that is that there should be and must be some discretionary power left in the minister in so far as Clause (18) is concerned. There is not much doubt that if Social Assistance has been obtained by fraudulent methods or deliberate failure to disclose the facts or misrepresentation that obviously the minister, in the exercise of his responsibility and his duty, must seek to recover this amount and this amount becomes a debt to the Crown.

Mr. Speaker, we sometimes find ourselves in a position where a recipient of Social Assistance, through no fault of his own and because of mistakes, and I do not say this in a critical sense but because of mistakes that are made by officials of the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation, that at some later date they are deprived of the necessities of life, as a result of deductions made from payments to which they now become entitled. I know of one, and I agree with the hon. minister's policy that this is not the sort of thing where you should disclose the names of people who are involved. But let me give this House one or two examples, Mr. Speaker: One example is a widow who has a dependent son. Upon the admission of the welfare officer or upon the admission of someone in the Department of Welfare, there was an overpayment. This widow was unaware of this. She

Mr. Hickman.

now finds that her total entitlement, including Canada Pension, is \$22.60, plus \$56.91 per month. Strong representation was made to the minister and to the Premier, by her clergymen and eventually a reply was received from an official of the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation. I need hardly say that the reply that was received left a pretty nasty taste, not only as far as the recipient was concerned but as far as her clergymen were concerned. Because the simple fact, Mr. Speaker, is that that lady cannot subsist on \$52.00, plus \$22.00 - \$70.00 odd per month, and maintain a dependent son of sixteen or seventeen years of age at the same time.

This is why I say, Mr. Speaker, that the whole principle, as I see it, of Social Assistance is one where obviously there has to be compliance with the law. But compliance with the law should, in this particular case, allow the minister to temper law enforcement with some mercy. This is not the case of anyone who fraudulently or deliberately misrepresents fact. This is a simple case of an official, of the Department of Welfare, inadvertently making a mistake. Months later, this widow is deprived of normal subsistence in order to allow this debt of the Crown to be collected. As I read the Bill that is before this House now, the minister has no discretionary power at all. This is quite wrong. It is not within the spirit of Social Assistance legislation. It is not, in my opinion, what the whole department was set up to do.

Mr. Speaker, may I give you another example. This one you can hardly believe that it would occur in Newfoundland today. But in 1959 or in 1958, there was a gentleman in this Province who found himself unemployed. He was a miner in Northern Newfoundland. He had, at that time, twelve dependent children. He had to return to his home because of illness in the family. He was unemployed from November, 1959 until April 11, 1960, when he obtained a job. He subsequently - and during that period, he received what he referred to as a dole order, amounting to \$200.

Mr. Hickman.

The gentleman, in question, is now suffering from silicosis. He had been assessed as having a permanent, partial disability of eighty per cent. This total disability or eight per cent disability occurred on October 24, 1969, ten years after he had been paid a \$200 dole order. I do not know what the error was at the time, but I suspect that there must have been some unemployment insurance benefits involved in being paid.

Now the Workmen's Compensation Board, on April 24, 1969, awarded this man benefits, at the rate of \$193.40 per month. The Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation adjudged that he was entitled to another \$80 per month on account of Social Assistance. But this amount, Mr. Speaker - suddenly the department checked into their records and found that ten years ago - ten years before, this man had been over-paid to the tune of \$200. He still has a wife and five dependent children. But the department, whether it be in the enforcement of law or whether it be in their anxiety to recover from this poor unfortunate man, I do not know, but whatever the reason, the fact is that they have recovered from that man a debt that was ten years old, and no one else could recover it, only the Crown. It would not be a recoverable debt by any private individual. But yet this money had to be repaid.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that these are only two small items, when you treat them in the context of the total budget and the total payments made by the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation. I can think of others. I know the hon. minister can think of many, many more.

And what I say, Sir, is this, that there is something more to the implementation of a Social Assistance Programme than simply taking these regulations and enforcing them without any discretion

Mr. Hickman.

at all on the part of the minister to alter them. I am fully cognizant of the fact that Social Assistance is paid pursuant to the terms and conditions of a Federal-Provincial agreement and that the Federal officials are most insistent that this agreement not be breached.

I can recall very vividly the difficulties that were encountered with respect to the widows of the "Blue Mist" and the "Blue Wave" and the difficulties that were faced there but eventually overcome.

Now this Act, as I see it, and that clause in particular, does not give the minister any discretionary power. Mr. Speaker, I say that that is quite wrong. It is quite incorrect. Because any Government - I may be way out in left field on this, but I believe that the first responsibility of any government is to act as the social conscience of our people. This takes priority over everything else. When a man or woman or family find themselves in the position where, through no fault of their own - I am not talking about the fraud. I am not talking about the man or woman who, with malice aforethought, will go and deliberately mislead a welfare office or deliberately mislead the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation. I am talking about the

MR. HICKMAN: genuine mistakes, and they must occur, when you are dealing with a large number of claims every month, every day, it is inevitable that mistakes will be made by officials in that department. You may argue that if a mistake is made and a man or a woman or a family benefits as a result of that mistake, then they should repay it. But, that, Mr. Speaker, is easier said than done. Because an awful lot of these people do not realize at the time that they receive these monies, these are monies being paid over and above that to which they are entitled. They genuinely believe that this is what they are going to receive and this is what they will continue to receive. They do their purchasing and their budgeting, if they can budget on the meager amounts that they receive. They do that based on what is now coming into them. Then suddenly a month later, in one case, ten years later, they find that an error has been committed unintentionally by an official in the Department of Welfare, and that they have to pay the penalty, as a cruel heartless Government acting under a cruel heartless Law. lowers the boom on them and collects this debt to the Crown. Mr. Speaker, it is quite wrong and there is nothing in this Act, as I see it, to remedy that situation.

I would like very much to see that section changed, that principle changed and to confer on the minister some discretionary power where there is no evidence of fraud, where there is no evidence of misrepresentation and where the recipient has not deliberately withheld facts. It is a just, I submit it is a just request, it will save a lot of embarrassment to the minister and it will save untold hardship to the recipients.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, as the minister said, this is a Bill that consolidates the Social Assistance Act of the previous legislation, and I have several points that I would like to mention, I think, they are unsatisfactory in the Bill. First, I am sure the minister read the quotation I read several days ago in the House here from the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, where the late Mr. J. K. McKay said, "there is no reason why the innocent indigent on welfare should enjoy fewer rights than a suspected bank robber at large." I am sure the minister would

MR. CROSBIE: agree with that statement.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. minister agrees with motherhood?

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Excellent. He is even a greater man than I thought he was.

Now in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, there were great plans made here last year, or the year before, that there was to be set up a Social Assistance Appeal Board, an Appeal Board to which anybody who applied for Social Assistance, who was turned down or who got less than they thought they should get, could appeal to this Social Assistance Board, they could appeal from the department to the Social Assistance Board: and this legislation here provides for reviews and appeals in Section 12.

To my mind, Mr. Speaker, it is a very unsatisfactory appeal board that this legislation provides for; (1) The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council is to appoint an appeal board to be known as, "A Social Assistance Appeal Board" consisting of three persons who are not employees of the Government, or of any board, commission or other body which is an agency of the Government. That is perfectly correct. But this would be an impartial appeal board and the three people on it should have no connection with Government at all. They should be absolutely impartial. But, in addition, to that, Mr. Speaker, they should hold office for certain period of the year, without the Government been able to remove them, except, as is the case with a Judge, except by a Resolution passed by Parliament or by the House of Assembly in this case. But Sub-section 8 of the Appeal Section says, "the members of an appeal board hold office during pleasure. In other words the three people appointed to the Social Assistance Appeal Board can be dismissed by the Government at anytime without any reasons been given and they have no security of tenure. Now how can they function, as a fully independent and impartial appeal board, if they are subject to being dismissed by the Government at anytime and for any reason, and for no reason if they hold office during pleasure. I would submit to the hon. the Minister that he should consider amending this

MR. CROSBIE: legislation so that the appeal board will be appointed and hold office during a specific term during which they can only be removed because of misbehaviour or the usual clauses that apply to Judges or Boards of this nature, not just during pleasure.

In addition, to that, Mr. Speaker, the section is weak, the Bill is weak, I believe, because too much power is left again with the Government under Sub-section 20 of that Clause. No finding of a regional administrator or a review committee or the appeal board respecting the granting, refusal, suspension, discontinuance, reduction, resumption or amount of social assistance. all those positions are not subject to appeal to or review by a Court of Law. In other words, the person who is receiving Social Assistance or who applied for Social Assistance in this Province, if he is unsatisfied with the decision of the Government or a decision of the Appeal Board, he is forbidden by this legislation to appeal to a Court of Law. Why? Why should a person on Social Assistance be denied the right to appeal a decision to a Court of Law in this Province? The Section says it is not subject to appeal to or review by a Court of Law. Why? The bank robber, the Minister was good enough to say a few minutes ago, he agreed with the statement. There is no reason why the innocent indigent on welfare should enjoy fewer rights than a suspected bank robber at large. The minister said he agreed with that.

The accused bank robber has a right to appeal. He goes to a magistrate or before a court and is convicted, he can appeal his conviction. He is not forbidden to appeal to a Court of Law, why then should a welfare recipient be forbidden to appeal to a Court of Law? Mr. Speaker, there was a case in Ontario recently, mid-January 1970, the case was withdrawn actually, where in Ontario (and I would like the minister to inform the House, whether this is the case here) in Ontario it was the practice that the Government would take away welfare allowance for a deserted wife and her children, if there was any male person living in the house with her. If it was suspected that she was living common law with a man.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: The boarder himself might be on welfare, might be indigent himself. Is that right? In other words,

AN HON. MEMBER: Support his common law wife and family.

MR. CROSBIE: Right. Well, apparently the law in Ontario where the practice was different, and that they are going to govern the morals of those people who are on welfare assistance. And then, if they are deserted by their boyfriend or girlfriend or vice versa, their social assistance will be lost. But the minister says, that is not the case in this Province. That is not the case here. The Government does not stop welfare assistance just because a woman may be living immorally.

MR. HICKMAN: I know of one case where it was stopped.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, the minister can explain this when he gets up, but apparently the Civil Liberties Association took a Court case against the Ontario Welfare Administration of the Government of Ontario. And the Government agreed to restore the welfare allowance for a deserted wife and her four children and to provide a guarantee that hereafter their personal relationships with her male boarder will in no way effect her right to a family benefits allowance. She has been getting this. This deserted wife, I hope the minister will say this cannot happen here. She and her four children having been getting welfare allowance, they got a letter from the Department of Welfare telling her that because of her relationship with a male boarder in her house, her welfare benefits were suspended. Now the woman has admitted to having sexual relations with the boarder, but swore that she receives no financial support, except room and board which she is willing to declare and deduct. But the welfare department did away with all of her allowances anyway, for herself and the four children. But the Civil Liberties Association took that matter up and the Government changed their position on it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: I am talking now about the Government of Ontario. Yes, a cruel Government. I am hoping that the minister will make it clear, when he replies, the Department here does not unwarrantly infer with the private, personal lives of welfare recipients.

MR. NEARY: We do not go into the bedrooms of the people of this Province.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, the minister's peril, the Prime Minister decided that he would keep his nose out of the bedrooms of the nation.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. CROSBIE: We would like the minister to keep his nose out of the bedrooms of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. CROSBIE: Or his activities. But, Sir, that is a serious point that I would like for the minister to deal with.

In other words, because you are on welfare, or you are receiving welfare assistance, there is no reason why the Government should make decisions based on whether the Government thinks you are moral or immoral, particularly, Mr. Speaker, when we would have here an appeal board provided for, from which there is no appeal to a Court of Law. And I would like the Minister to consider changing that, (1) make the board more independent, (2) permit an appeal to a Court of Law. Now, if it is a nonsensical appeal, if there is no real substance to it, the court is just going to dismiss it. But, there is no reason why, if you are on welfare, there may be very well a serious point of principle involved that not only that individual but some welfare association may think should be determined by a Court of Law, Mr. Speaker, and it is not right for this legislation to forbid that.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, under this Section 12, dealing with the Appeal Board, too much is left to the regulations. It says, for example, that the Appeal Board shall, this is Sub-section 20. I am sorry the minister is leaving, because I was hoping that he was going to note down a few of these points and answer them.

MP. NEAPY: Inaudible.

MP. CROSBIE: You are not going to leave. Good.

The Appeal Board shall, subject to the regulations, communicate in writing to the person who has appealed to the Board, its finding or decision. Now, Mr. Speaker, why have subject to the regulations? Surely, the appeal board shall, must communicate in writing, to the person who made the appeal, what the decision was. Why put in this, subject to the regulations, that would mean that it is possible for a regulation to provide that they do not need to communicate their decision to the person who appeals. And I do not think that, that qualification should be in there at all. This House should say, 'the Appeal Board must communicate its decision in writing to the recipient once the appeal has been heard.' And further in connection with appeals, Mr. Speaker, I think that it would be a good practice, and perhaps the minister can elaborate on the practice, for the department to retain a lawyer who will act for people who want to appeal to this Appeal Board, or who want to go through the appeal process. Obviously, if they are receiving Social Assistance they are not going to be able to afford a lawyer themselves. Perhaps, if we had a fully fledged legal aid service they will be able to get one through legal aid. But, I would think it would be even better if the minister's department retained, and the lawyer would not need be retained full time, but retain a lawyer who, if requested by people who are disgruntled, do not think they are getting their proper treatment under the regulations, and the law would act for them on appeal. This would mean several things, (1) It will mean that the lawyer will advise a number of people who want to appeal that they have no grounds, that they are wasting his time, that the thing is in order in accordance with the Law, it will save a number of appeals. (2) When they do appeal it will mean that there is really some point to be decided, because the lawyer has now looked into it and still recommended that there will be an appeal. (3) That person will become competent. that lawyer in the field of Social Assistance and Welfare,

MR. CROSSIE: and will be familiar with it, and will be able to deal quickly with it. And the minister will be sure of having appeals going to the Appeal Board with some substances. So, I think, the minister might when he answers speak on that point as to whether he will consider doing that. The Act certainly does not say that that will be done.

So, I think, that the Appeal Section is too weak. Then, again, Mr. Speaker, the same section, Sub-section 13, "A person appealing to the Appeal Board under this Section is entitled, subject to the regulations, to appear before the Appeal Board." Now, surely, the person who appeals - this says, subject to the regulations, the regulations can provide that in all cases you do not have the right to appeal before the Board. Why is this wording there? It should say, "a person appealing to the Appeal Board under this Section is entitled to appear before the Appeal Board, either personally or by a representative. Surely this House cannot pass legislation that would permit an Appeal Board to sit and person appealing would not have the right to appear before the Board either in person or by writing. This is poor draftsmanship at best, and if it is a policy decision I do not see the reason for it. Surely the minister intends that anyone who appeals has the right to do that in writing or to appear before the Board.

MR. NEAPY: Inaudible.

MR. CROSSIE: Well, the minister can reassure us on that when he speaks. But there is no

MR. CROSBIE:

reason why the Act should allow that situation to occur. Perhaps the next Minister will consider this position differently and will not want them to appear. The Minister does not draft the Legislation but he is responsible for the Legislation when it comes before the House and if he agrees it should be amended it can easily be amended.

So apart from the Appeal Board, Mr. Speaker, there is a matter I would like the Minister to address himself to and that is this, it is something along the lines that the hon. member for Burin said a few minutes ago. I do not believe the Minister was in the House the other night when I cited the case of the man from St. Alban's with eleven children who was injured last October 15th, he did not get his case decided by the Workman's Compensation Board until January and in the meantime he had to go on social assistance. When the Workman's Compensation Board allowed his claim, they wrote him in January and said his claim was allowed now the Workman's Compensation Board allowed him seventy-five per-cent of his salary, His salary was quite low so that seventy-five per-cent of his salary only came to (I do not have the figures here with me now) something like \$200.00 a month or a little over \$200.00 a month. They sent him a cheque in January for three months, November, December, January and deducted from it \$645.00 which he had received from the Department of Welfare during the three months while he was waiting for his claim to be decided by the Workman's Compensation Board, so that he received a cheque from Workman's Compensation for \$76.00.

I have written the Workmen's Compensation Board and they answered; this is what they do. If a person has received any assistance they pay it back to the Department of Welfare. But there is something wrong here, Mr. Speaker, I think. Here is a man with eleven children, now his Workman's Compensation is low enough, at seventy-five per-cent of what he was getting paid, so it only amounts to some \$200.00 or \$220.00 a month, while he is waiting to hear whether he is on Compensation or not, he goes to the Welfare

MR. CROSBIE:

Department and gets \$600. and some odd dollars over this three month period. Now I cannot understand why he only got the \$600.00, a man with a wife and eleven children, so that is little enough. Now he survives on that I do not know. Then, when his claim is allowed, he gets a cheque for \$76.00, and the Department of Welfare has been completely repaid.

Now admittedly there has to be a line drawn in this situation that you could not, I presume there has to be some kind of line drawn but when the Workman's Compensation itself is so low, is there not some way the Government can exercise its discretion in a case like that, set some kind of ceiling under which they do not collect all that money back from the Workman's Compensation Board? I mean, it certainly is pretty frustrating, for the man who has had to survive for three months on some six hundred odd dollars, with eleven children, to have all that money deducted from his first Workman's Compensation cheque. When he was working he earned little enough. So I do not know whether the Minister has considered this or whether it is possible to do anything about it, but it seems to be pretty harsh, extremely harsh.

I would like the Minister to explain, if he would, how you could arrive at welfare assistance of only say \$200.00 a month, when a man has eleven children, I would have thought it would have been much higher than that, but in his case it was only some six hundred odd dollars.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: No, from Workman's Compensation, for the period, it was seven hundred and something from which they deducted the \$645.00 that he got from welfare. But in any event, Mr. Speaker, I think that that is quite a serious problem and I do not know whether anything can be done about it or whether it is just regulations have to be that way or what the danger would be if the regulations read a little differently. But I think the point raised by the hon. member for Burin, where the deductions were made from the gentle-

MR. CROSBIE:

man who had received welfare assistance ten years earlier, illustrates that there is something wrong in the Department of Welfare, that there is a bit more humane treatment needed, that these regulations need to be checked over.

Surely, if a man was on welfare five years ago or four or three and received assistance after a period of a year or two, then the Government should forget that and not deduct it when he starts to become entitled to receive compensation some other way. I think the same thing should apply in Workman's Compensation, that there should be some formula so that if the amount you are receiving from Workman's Compensation is not high that the bit of social assistance you received, while you were waiting for your claim to be settled, is not taken back again. So I would like the Minister to address himself to that, if he does not mind, and I am sure he will not. I think that the Minister does mind but he will address himself to it. I think that is the main point.

When we go through the Bill in Committee, of course, there are clauses that I have some questions on but those two points, the Appeal Board is definitely not strong enough, Mr. Speaker, the fact that it is just an Appeal Board for social assistance should not make it any different than an Appeal Board on any other situation. There is no reason why the innocent indigent should have any less rights than a bank robber, the Minister says he agrees. He does have less rights under this Legislation than the bank robber does when he is convicted of an offence. After all, you are not convicted of an offence when you go on welfare, it is something that most people try to avoid in fact, ninety per-cent I would imagine, particularly the able-bodied, and the rest are there not because of any fault of their own.

I am sure the Minister appreciates that.

There is one other point the Minister might expand on. Two years ago the Government announced that they were going to engage, or perhaps it was three years ago, quite a number of additional welfare officers. There

MR. CROSBIE:

was a lot of public outcry at that time that there was a lot of abuse of the welfare system, too many people getting welfare that were not entitled and so on and twenty-five or thirty additional welfare officers were taken on. Would the Minister tell us now how the work load is found to be and what percentage are discovered to be either receiving welfare or not entitled to receive it who are getting it, and just how this has worked out and whether there are now many complaints or not about abuses of the system?

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, there are just a few points in this Bill to which I would like to refer. They are questions rather than I ask the Minister to answer when he replies. There is one particular section, section 5, which is quite deep and on the Minister's powers to designate people to do the work of administrators. Now on reading this section over it would appear to me that it is rather loosely worded insofar that it gives the Minister complete power to designate people. It does not specify too clearly as to who these people may be. What I mean by that is it is quite in order that a welfare officer, who is trained for the purpose, should be designated to do a certain job for the administrator but does this section mean that when there is a shortage of staff that the Minister can appoint anybody to do these investigations? I notice the Minister nods, if this is so it is a very dangerous precedent because in dealing with welfare cases, I suppose there is no more sensitive area in the administration of Government activities that requires a diplomatic and sympathetic approach, and welfare officers and other officials who have gone through long periods of training and experience are, for the most part, very adept at handling these situations. But to put in a rank outsider or a person who has very limited experience in this field, it can be catastrophic, particularly in small places, because everyone's business in these small places is everyone else's business and, for the most part, people who are forced to accept welfare assistance are to a certain degree ashamed of it and feel that they are somewhat lesser than first class citizens. I do not think it does

MR. EARLE:

them any good whatsoever to have any of their personal facts of life revealed or disclosed by some clumsy individual who may do so without intention.

I would bring this to the notice of the Minister, that this particular section here maybe tightened up to specify under what conditions and in what training and so on that designated persons can be named to do this work. I repeat, it is an extremely sensitive area which needs the most delicate of handling.

The hon. member for St. John's West referred to the section of the Bill having to do with illegitimate children or children of unmarried mothers. This is also a very difficult and sensitive area. I do not entirely agree with him because the section here says, "to a mother who resides in Newfoundland and has residence with one or more children." Now what is it to be? Is there to be any line drawn at all? Is it to be cheaper by the dozen or is there to be some regard taken for the behaviour of the person concerned? Now there have been many cases where they cannot find the first punitive father, that is all right, a girl falls by the wayside, the fellow skips the country and the child is looked after and this may go on one or two times, but when it becomes habitual and there are twelve or fourteen children involved is there not some way to draw the line that the people concerned do take a close look at it? In fact, it might be to the benefit of these children if they were removed from the mothers' care because certainly, in many cases, they are living under circumstances where it is not the best circumstances for their upbringing or for their training or anything else. I am wondering if the Minister would elaborate on this somewhat when he gets up to answer our questions.

Another very difficult point in the administration of welfare and this, of course, is generally left to the common-sense of the welfare officer concerned and, as so much of this act has to be administered by the men in the field and carried out by them, there is all kinds of room for virtually

MR. EARLE:

unfair treatment or what would appear on the surface sometimes to be unfair treatment. I refer to a section here where it deals with a father who is compelled to remain at home because he is a widower and he has nobody to look after a group of small children. I have had this drawn to my attention on a number of occasions, where the children are too small to look after themselves or even it may reach the stage where a young girl or a young boy in his early teens is forced to look after a family because the father must go out and earn. But in some cases, even to keeping the child away from school and in one or two cases that has been brought to my attention where the child itself, who was forced into this position, was a very bright and intelligent child and had good prospect, if they were allowed, to carry on with their education. But perhaps a welfare officer going in and seeing the circumstances there are with a fine buxom girl there who can look after the family says, "Well, it is time for you to get down and look after the family so that the father can go out and earn something."

There are a terrific number of circumstances here which have to be looked at. This is where the value of the training of welfare officers is so, so very important. This often gets into difficulties when there are sometimes relieving officers sent out or young fellows, who are in the course of their training, who go to places and they are not thoroughly familiar and, while the situation could be remedied if the people concerned would apply to the supervisor in the district, he very often accepts the lesser way out and goes ahead and complies with the instructions of the welfare officer, sometimes to the detriment of his family. This is where social counselling of the highest order is absolutely essential.

There is another point under section 11 - the reporting of income: I have come across numerous welfare cases where quite unintentionally and with best of motives a man has earned a few dollars and has not reported it sometimes, although most of them are conscientious about it, he finds himself

MR. EARLE:

in the position of having spent that. Sometimes he pays a bill which has been owed for a long time and perhaps his creditor is dunning him for it and then he finds that this is caught up with and it is demanded as a back payment because he owes it on his welfare cheque, and it is deducted. Well, it is a lesson to the man not to be careless, but it is a very hard lesson in some cases, particularly where there is innocence and complete ignorance of the law. I really do not know how this can be overcome, but it seems to me there are many cases in which a lot of common sense could be used and a lot of leniency because these are not people, for the most part, who are out or set out to do the Government or do the department in any way. But very often, through innocence of the law, they do get themselves into trouble. It is all very well to claim that a man should know what the regulations are and what the law is but an uneducated person, with no knowledge or no ability to know these things, very often finds himself in a completely unenviable position.

Then there is the other problem, which was expressed to me only a few days ago in my own district, where an officer may say to you sometimes; "Well, it is not my job to look for trouble. There is plenty of trouble around without my looking for it." Now in my opinion that is not the right attitude because there are many, many cases where people are receiving assistance, perhaps over and above that which is absolutely essential and necessary. They are clever enough to cover up -

Mr. Earle.

But there are equally many cases, just as many cases and perhaps more, where people are not being helped. I have seen a number of cases, a great many cases, where people, through embarrassment or they do not wish to disclose their circumstances or they feel self-conscious about it, will go to the welfare officer as a last resort. It is only sometimes, when the member comes around, that they will approach him deferentially and ask, "is there not anyway in which I can be helped?" It is surprising. It is an eye-opener to me, I know, and it must be to other members of the House, to come across some of these cases where people have held back for so long and suffered so much without really appealing for the assistance they can get, when perhaps their next door neighbour or a fellow man or woman very close to them is living in what is, compared to them, comparative luxury. Yet, they question the justice of it all. Sometimes it is their own deference and lack of desire to go and seek welfare, which, of course, is extremely commendable. But it is not commendable when the people concerned suffer, as they very often do.

I had a case the other day, in one of these small places in my district. I was there last fall and an old chap who had suffered a severe heart attack was living alone in this small house, which was not really fit to protect him from the elements. It was in poor condition - very poor condition. Now I reported that to the welfare officer last year and he allowed some materials for repairs to that man's house, which only did up a section of it. Well in a sense, a section of a house that is in very bad repair, that is being repaired, is not a great deal of improvement on not having it repaired at all, because, while the front of the man's house looked fairly good, the back of the house was completely open for the weather and all sorts of wind and rain and cold and so on. The old chap must have suffered through a very, very tough winter indeed. Well I

Mr. Earle.

saw him the other day, and I went in the house and I saw that the same conditions prevailed. I said, "Heavens above, man, did you not do something about this?" He said, "I saw the welfare officer last fall, and he gave me something to fix up the front of the house. But he did not give me anything for the windows for the back or any of the back of the house." I said, "did you not protest or did you not go to him?" He said, "no, sir, I figured I got as much as I could." I said, "have you said anything about it since?" He said, "no." So, I went to the welfare officer and I said, "this condition that I pointed out last year. You were not here. It was another welfare officer, but did you not follow this up to see that the job was done properly and that the man was reasonably comfortable?" He said; "no, no, that man has not come to me." He said; "he has not mentioned it to me at all." I said; "does the poor old fellow have to come to you and appeal to you?" I said; "actually he is in your beat. You pass his door, when you go in the settlement. And you, without looking for undue trouble, surely commonsense would say that you would go in and inquire how an old fellow is getting on who had been assisted." But this just seemed to be a certain amount of indifference, as far as I can see. It is not good enough that a person in these circumstances has to continue running to the welfare officer, other than the welfare officer looking after the job and seeing that the job is completed.

Now this sort of thing happens in my district, and I am sure that it must happen in all other members' districts. It puts the member, himself, in a very unenviable position, because he is not a trained welfare officer. He should not have to get into the field of trying to solve what is right or what is wrong. But commonsense dictates that he should draw these things to the attention of his department, and he does. But when it is only partially done and when it is

Mr. Earle

only partially remedied - these problems - that again puts the member in a worst position, because he is not doing his job. He is only going back and getting the thing brushed off. So, I would commend to the minister that in the instructions to welfare officers on these particular points that I have mentioned that a certain amount or a great deal of follow-up is necessary. My hon. friend, the member for St. John's West, mentioned that some years ago there were to be additional welfare officers appointed for this very purpose. I recommended it before I departed that portfolio. I do not know what has been done since. But it was the opinion of us, at that time in the department, that these people were very, very necessary to follow up, not so much on abuses of welfare, but to follow-up on social counselling and help in cases where help was not being given. It has always been said that when people start to talk about welfare that there are tremendous abuses of welfare. I am not so sure that the percentage of abuses is so great. It is sometimes more the percentage of neglect that needs more attention. The percentage where people are not being properly looked after. I would hope that the minister has followed through on this particular request, that more of this type of person, going around the Province to investigate circumstances, have been appointed.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the only comments that I wish to make at the present time, on the Act.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, there are two or three points that I would like to make in connection with this Bill. First of all with regards to overpayment. This is a problem, Mr. Speaker, which is very aggravating and in too many instances creates undue hardship for a lot of people. I can think of one particular example, which is a really difficult one to handle, by the department and certainly it creates, possibly, the greatest amount of hardship on the recipient, and that is assistance that is received pending the receipt of unemployment insurance.

Mr. Hickey.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the minister attempt, that the Government attempt to have the Canada Assistance Plan amended so as to provide for, at least, a couple of weeks or a month's assistance pending the receipt of unemployment insurance. The situation seems to be that because the Federal Government contributes to both forms of assistance, that of unemployment insurance on the one hand and the welfare assistance, under the Social Assistance Act, on the other hand, that they insist that any over-lapping, any monies that are paid to a recipient must be refunded, if it is paid for the same period of time.

I am not suggesting, Sir, that a person has the right to assistance from both programmes at the same time. But what I am suggesting is this, that when someone is out of work and when they have not been fortunate enough to set aside any monies or enough monies to get by for a month, they find themselves in a rather difficult situation. I think any recipient or all the recipients in the Province would be more than happy if they could at least receive assistance from one or the other, either unemployment insurance (and if they receive that, of course, they will not need welfare assistance unless it is in the form of supplementary order). If not, that they be assisted under the Social Assistance Act, pending the receipt of unemployment insurance and that, when their claim is approved, they not be asked to pay it back, or that the people at the Unemployment Insurance Office take care so that or make the necessary arrangements so that there is no overlap. It is a real problem, as I have said. It is a real problem for the recipient, in as much as they find themselves having a certain amount of money taken back from them. It is then, Mr. Speaker, that they begin to feel it. Because the amount they receive certainly, while it may be a lot greater today than it was five years ago, a family on welfare have a great number of needs that a lot of us do not realize. Every dollar means more to a welfare recipient, I can assure you, Sir, than it does to us or to the more fortunate people who are

Mr. Hickey.

not in receipt of welfare.

I am quite confident that if a sincere effort were made by the Government, through the minister, that some arrangement could be worked out so as to eliminate this over-lapping thereby preventing this hardship which is caused so many people, at various times during the year. It is also important, Mr. Speaker,

more important Mr. Speaker, to point out that the money which is to be collected by the Department of Welfare, as a result of this overlapping, cost the Government money. The administration of it is costly and I question, Sir, if we do not lose on both counts, because in a lot of cases the overpayments lie there for years on end. They are never collected totally, it is costly to collect them, as I said. I do not see why some provision cannot be made to work this matter out so that this problem is eliminated altogether. A matter, Mr. Speaker, which is even more important, because it deals to a great extent with those who are ill, incapacitated and who probably has been in receipt of assistance for a long time, that kind of overpayment which comes about as the result of some small income in the home and where the welfare officer who has a busy or a heavy case load, does not get to that person to review their case for possibly three, four five months. Those people are charged an overpayment, Mr. Speaker, they are charged an overpayment rather unjustly, as I see it, because, while the regulations may say in plain language that a recipient is required and expected to report any change in his or her circumstances to the department, I can assure this House that a lot of our people are unaware of this. I know too it can be said that it states right on the application, when a person applies for welfare assistance. But even that Mr. Speaker, that does not always bring it to their attention. I maintain that it is the duty of the department to get to those people to review their cases on time. If it means the recruiting of more welfare workers then we must recruit them.

It is very important that we get to those people on time and review their cases and catch any possible overpayment there might be. In the meantime, whatever small amount, Sir, that might have been incurred because the welfare officer did not get there, I think something should be done about it so that the people involved are not asked to refund it. Because, as I see it, it is not really their fault. It is not like a person

who wilfully and intentionally withholds information from a welfare worker when he visits the home. If a person visits a home for the purpose of reviewing a case and enquires as to income and the people concerned blatantly and bluntly tell him they had no income while in fact they have. Certainly no one quarrels with that kind of an overpayment.

But, Mr. Speaker, where the overpayment occurs unintentionally on the part of the recipient, primarily because the worker did not get to their home early enough. I think it is quite unfair, quite unfair indeed for the department to expect and, in fact as they are doing and as they have done in the past, demand by reducing the allowance thereby collecting the overpayment.

Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said regarding the appeal Board. Certainly I would just like to briefly state that there should be no instance where persons, whether they are in receipt of welfare or not, are unable to appeal the case to a court of law. Certainly, Mr. Speaker,, it is fine for the department to say that they have an appeal board. It is fine to say that those people are only human too, and in a day when we place so much emphasis on courts, when everyone seems to be able to take the case to court, I see no reason why a welfare recipient should not have the same right and the same opportunity.

In connection with the general administration of the department. Mr. Speaker, I feel and I feel very strongly that there has to be a change in attitude, change in attitude by the Government generally, by the Minister particularly, and by the top officials in the department. For too long the workers in the Department of Welfare or Department of Social Services, as it is now called, are just looked upon as people who did a job, had little or nothing to contribute except to perform those duties to keep people from being hungry to keep clothes on their back. For too long they have been looked upon in that light, for too long they

were paid accordingly. They are still not paid enough, Mr. Speaker, they still deserve higher wages.

MR.SPEAKER: Order please.

MR.HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I thought I was on the general administration of the department, if I do not say it here, it is going to be difficult to say it clause by clause. What I wanted to refer to primarily is the light in which welfare workers are considered, both from the public point of view as well as by Government. We had an instance, Mr. Speaker, just a few months ago when three people in the department, their integrity in my view was questioned. It was questioned because of certain correspondence that was made public -

MR.SPEAKER: Order please, this particular Act we are dealing with now is the Social Assistance Act, and I do not see anything in it relating to the administration of the Department of Welfare, which is another Act altogether I believe. The member should restrict his remarks to matters relating to the Social Assistance Act.

MR.HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I felt that I could deal with this subject under this Bill because it deals with administration -

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. member will have the occasion to do that under the estimates and so on.

MR.HICKEY: I will abide by your ruling. I will just say that there has been comments already on welfare officers and so far as -

MR.SPEAKER: In so far as the duties relate to the administration of the particular Act.

MR.HICKEY: Well maybe At any rate, Sir, I would like to see the Minister take those couple of ideas and attempt to do something about them. I would also like to see this matter of overpayment thoroughly gone through because it is not just a matter that a suggestion comes from this side. Mr. Speaker, it is very, very important, it deals with the people who are in receipt of Social Assistance and I do not think

that politics should enter. When we get down to this it should not matter less as to where an idea comes from. If it is going to help people, then I think it should be explored, I think it should be looked into. I think that the Minister would find, if he were to interview a lot of people who have had the experience of having to pay back money to the department, I think he would find that he would be considered doing them a great favour if he would do something about the situation which presently exists. It is just ridiculous and I think it is time that we did something about it.

HON. S. A. NEARY (Min. Soc. Serv. & Rehab.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member that just took his seat is apparently out of touch with the other members of his party both here and in Ottawa, because I can assure you, Sir, that I can go to my files in the office down on the third floor and find all kinds of letters, from the hon. members counterpart in Ottawa and his colleagues here in the Province, commending the work of the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation and myself and the field staff that are carrying out this very difficult job.

Now, Sir, there were a number of points raised by members who have spoken on Second Reading of this Bill. I will not deal with all the matters here, I will try to answer some of the questions in Committee of the Whole. The hon. member from St. John's West raised a very interesting point on common law relationships. Now, Sir, I want to assure hon. members of this House that neither I nor the officials of my department decide whether it is immoral for people to live common law. That is their own business. It may be socially unacceptable, Sir, but it is certainly not for me or for the officials of my department to decide. But what we do decide, Mr. Speaker, is this; that when people decide to live common law, which I said is their own business, we treat them as a

family unit. If the head of that house is then employed and earning good wages, then we think, Mr. Speaker, that he should support his common law wife and family and not rely on the taxpayers for support.

Mr. Speaker, just look how unfair it would be if a man and woman were living common law and the woman was receiving social assistance say of \$200 a month, and the man was earning \$500 a month. That would be \$700 going into that house, as opposed to a family, to a man or woman who are married and he is out working, earning a living, providing the taxes to give that woman the cheque. Mr. Speaker, I ask you would that be a fair arrangement, would that be fair to the taxpayers? I say no it would not. Some of the points that were raised by members of the opposite side of the House, Sir, are impractical, they just will not work. I think the hon. members were just talking a lot of wind. They wanted to make points that they thought were appealing to people on social assistance but they know in their hearts, Sir, that it is not practical to implement some of the matters that have been raised especially the ones concerning overpayments. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. John's West knows full well that the arrangement between my department and the Workmen's Compensation Board, the hon. member has been in touch on a number of occasions recently with members of the Workmen's Compensation Board, and he has been made aware of the arrangement; where Workmen's Compensation is in doubt, Mr. Speaker, we will

MR. NEARY: grant, social assistance, short-term to the person and his family, on the grounds that if Workmen's Compensation is granted, the money has to be repaid to the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation.

This is pointed out to the clients of the Department, Mr. Speaker. He is made aware of it. They are aware of it, Mr. Speaker, it is explained to them by the social worker and they are told that we will grant temporary social assistance on a short-term basis. If Workmen's Compensation is granted, then the money has to be repaid. This is only fair, Mr. Speaker. It is only fair to the taxpayers, who provide the money for this Department to pay social assistance. They cannot have it both ways.

Look, Mr. Speaker, there is nobody in this House who would like to shovel out money to people on social assistance like I would but I have to thank God I have enough common sense to know what is practical and what is not practical. The same thing applies to unemployment insurance benefits, Mr. Speaker. If there is a delay in the application for unemployment insurance benefits, why of course we will grant social assistance. We are not going to see a man with a wife and family hungry. But Mr. Speaker, when the man receives unemployment insurance, he either pays back the money or he will create an overpayment and the next time he comes back to us we will cover the overpayment. Sir, I want to say this about overpayment, that there is no agency on the face of the earth today who are as lenient and as generous in recovering overpayment as can be the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation.

Mr. Speaker, we have no choice but to collect overpayments because the Government of Canada is paying 50% of the cost of social assistance in Newfoundland and they insist, Mr. Speaker, that where there are overpayments that we recover these overpayments.

But there was one other point raised by the hon. member for St. John's West in that regard. He said that the Minister should

MR. NEARY: have the right to forgive overpayments. Well, Mr. Speaker, the practice down through the years (and my hon. friend from Fortune Bay knows this) the practice down through the years, where we find a legitimate case, the Minister has the right to recommend to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council that it be written off, and we do this all the time. This is common practice, The hon. member did not know that. Just found out now? Just as I told him, and this goes on all the time. But we are not going to write off every case, Sir. We have to have some control.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can go to the records of the Department of Social Services and I could find all kinds of legitimate cases where the overpayment was written off. Written off with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

MR. EARLE: Never saw one in five years.

MR. NEARY: Now Sir, while the hon. member might not have seen one in five years, things have changed since he was a welfare officer. He is talking about the old Department of Welfare. We are now talking about the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation.

Now Sir, there were quite a number of points raised on the Independent Appeals Boards, and incidentally, Mr. Speaker, one of the members of the Independent Appeals Board resides in the hon. member's district, St. John's East Extern, a welfare recipient, the only one I suppose in Canada. The only Province in Canada, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, where we have an Independent Appeals Board with a welfare recipient. Well Mr. Speaker, the lady I am referring to resides in Shoe Cove, and I think that is in the hon. member's district. Oh St. John's North, well your Honour has the honour of having that lady residing in his district, and I must say she is doing a very fine job as is the Appeals Board, Sir.

Now hon. members will remember that last year we brought in an amendment to the Social Assistance regulations, setting up this Appeals Board. It was purely an experiment. We did not know how it was going to

MR. NEARY: work out, Mr. Speaker, but it is working out just fine. And Mr. Speaker, I may say that it is not the number of meetings or the number of appeals that have so far been processed by the Board, that is not important at all, as a matter of fact, we, following the announcement of the Independent Appeals Board, we were swamped in the Department of Social Services with letters from all over the Province, but most of these letters, Mr. Speaker, did not constitute an appeal.

Any legitimate appeals that has come up has been heard by the Board and the Board are now considering making trips outside St. John's to hear appeals. They have not made any trips yet. But they will, I hope, in the months to come, in the months ahead, Mr. Speaker. They are doing a fine job.

The Appeals Board has met several times since I gave that figure in the House. I do not know how many have been allowed, I do not keep that close watch on the Appeals Board, Sir. I like the Appeals Board to be completely independent.

I do know this, the first appeal that was heard by the Board, the decision was in favour of the recipient and that recipient has been most vocal of the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation.

MR. CROSBIE: What about appeal to a Court of Law?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member suggested that lawyers should be brought in on appeals. Do I have to answer that Mr. Speaker?

These appeals do not involve legal matters, Sir. Every recipient, or client, wants to bring in a lawyer or a clergyman or a mayor or a doctor or a politician, to represent them before the Appeals Board, Sir, but we have no objection to it, that is their right. But we are not going to provide lawyers. It is an appeal on administrative grounds and it does not involve legal matters.

MR. CROSBIE: No, it is an appeal on all grounds.

MR. NEARY: If the hon. member for St. John's West thinks that he has the gift of gab, that he can present an appeal better than the client, why of course he is welcome to come in and appeal before the Board. But we are not going to provide lawyers, Sir. I never heard of such a ridiculous suggestion.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, as I said, most of the points that were raised are completely impractical and I do not want to waste the time of the House answering points that I know were just meant to attract attention and not considered to be workable by the hon. members who made these suggestions.

Therefore, Sir, if there are any other points I will be very happy to answer them when we go into Committee of the Whole.

On motion Bill read a second time, orders referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion: Second reading of a Bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Made Between Her Majesty In Right Of Newfoundland, Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation And National Sea Products Limited And To Make Provision Respecting The Making Of Certain Monetary Grants And The Payment Of Certain Subsidies And Respecting Other Matters Connected Therewith", (Bill number 19.)

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move the second reading of this Bill, which is one to give statutory effect to an agreement made by the Government some months ago, with the great Canadian fishing company, National Sea Products of Halifax.

Mr. Speaker, one of the industrial tragedies to occur in Newfoundland since the coming of Confederation was the failure of the Ross Steers Fishery Enterprise on the southside of the harbour of St. John's. The Ross Group in England are one of the world's large fishing companies. They own more fishery ships in Britian than any other company in that Country. They are very big and they have been very successful. Since they first came to Newfoundland they

MR. SMALLWOOD: have been bought out by The Imperial Tobacco Company of England and now form part of an even bigger complex than they did before.

Most of us felt, when they came here and linked up with the local Pratt Brothers to form the Ross Group, Ross-Steers Company, that it was a very good combination of English capital and English marketability with the local know how and the kind of deep interest a local firm would have in a fishery development, that it would be a very good combination indeed, especially as there were two separate parts to the activity. One part, the building and operation of a Plant to deal in salt cod fish, the other was to build and operate a Plant for frozen fillets, the freezing and packaging of frozen fillet, But, Sir, they were not here six months, the frozen fish plant was not operating, I think, even as much as six months when it closed down completely. They withdrew back to England the draggers they had sent out to serve the Plant, and then put the plant in moth balls where it has remained ever since. That is several years ago.

The Salt Fish Plant continued to operate to this present time and, I may say, that negotiations are going on at this moment between the Government and the Salt Cod Fish Marketing Board and the Pratt Brothers, with regard to its future, but up to now the Salt Cod Fish Plant has operated. The Frozen Fish Plant has been in moth balls almost from the time it opened. I may inform the House that the Pratts and the Ross Group in England came to an arrangement between themselves whereby Pratt withdrew completely from the Frozen Fish Plant and the Ross Group withdrew completely from the Salt Fish Plant. But both Companies continued back of the two Plants, vis-a-vis Government, because the deal that was made with the Government was a deal whereby Ross and Steers guaranteed repayment of the loans that were made by the Government or guaranteed by the Government. They guaranteed the loans and the Government could be called upon only if, as and when Ross and Steers people defaulted. The chances of that were utterly negligible. In fact you might

MR. SMALLWOOD: say they just did not exist at all. And the Newfoundland Government never were called upon to pay a single dollar in connection with the Ross-Steers fishery venture in Newfoundland.

But the plants lay idle over there and, though it was not costing the Newfoundland Government any money whatsoever in respect of the cost of the plant, it was costing the community of St. John's, and therefore the Government of the Province, something for the lost employment. The 200 or 250 people who would have been working in the plant, would have produced revenue to the Government and would have produced revenue to the City of St. John's and would have improved the economy of St. John's and of the Province to a substantial degree.

All of that was lost by the closing down of the Plant. I myself made numerous

MR. SMALLWOOD: efforts to get someone to move in and take over the plant, the frozen fish plant. The Pratt Brothers made numerous efforts as well. They travelled to the Mainland of Canada and to the United States and to the United Kingdom in that effort and I did likewise. Attempt after attempt failed, meeting after meeting, held in Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal and St. John's and London, failed. But success came at length in the person of National Sea Products of Halifax, who are one of the most successful fishery companies in the whole nation, indeed, indeed one of the most successful fishing companies in the whole of North America.

The National Sea Products people said quite frankly that they could not even think of taking over that plant on the Southside and operate it, unless the plant could be served by at least six druggers. And six druggers would be only a beginning, because they would want it to be served by ten or perhaps even twelve druggers. But they could not even begin with at least six druggers. They wanted to know what the Newfoundland Government were prepared to do to help them to acquire the six druggers. They wanted no financial help from the Government, for the plant itself. They would merely take over the loan that the Government had already made or NIDC, for the Government, had already made to the original Ross Steers group. This is an amount of about \$2 million. I think, it was \$2,025,000 of which about \$300,000 had been paid back. So that there was an outstanding debt of \$1,700,000. Now what happened there is quite easy to explain. That money was paid to the Government, the \$1,700,000 was paid back here some weeks or some months ago, and was promptly lent again to the new enterprise, meaning, which is merely a bookkeeping entry and a bookkeeping way of transferring the loan from the Government to the Ross Steers group, from the Government to the National Sea Products, at I think a higher rate of interest than the former rate, I think, at a higher rate. So that we are not helping the taking over of the plant by National Sea Products, except to the extent of continuing the loan that

MR. SMALLWOOD: was already outstanding to the former owners. What they wanted was help on the dragners. So I asked them what kind of help do you want? And they wanted to know if the Newfoundland Government would give them the same help that they were able to get in Quebec, in Nova Scotia and in New Brunswick? And I said, "well, what kind of help do you get in those Provinces?"

In the Province of Quebec, provided the ships were to be used in Quebec, they would get a degree of help that I felt we could not afford to give in this Province. In the first place, they would get the fifteen percent gift, fifteen percent of the cost of each dragger, as a gift from the Government of Quebec. Incidentally, from the Government of Nova Scotia they could get a gift of fifteen percent of the cost of the draggers, and from the Government of New Brunswick, they could get fifteen percent gift, contribution, of the cost of the dragger. In those three provinces, they could get fifteen percent, which is the amount that the Government of Canada dropped. The Government of Canada used to give a grant of sixty percent, but they dropped it to thirty-five percent, which is what they now give. And those three provinces give the fifteen, they take up the slack, so that the owner of the dragger, the firm getting the dragger built, gets one-half the cost of the dragger in the form of the fifteen percent gift from the Province and thirty-five percent gift from the Government of Canada.

Then, in addition to that, the Government of Quebec lends the full cost of the dragger, the full cost as a help, provided the dragger is built in Quebec and used in Quebec. The Government of Nova Scotia in addition to giving the fifteen percent gift on the draggers, will do so, if the draggers are built anywhere, and they have given that gift to draggers built in Quebec but used in Nova Scotia. The dragger must be used in Nova Scotia to draw the fifteen percent gift. It may be built anywhere and the Government of Nova Scotia will still give the gift of fifteen percent.

Then in addition to that fifteen percent the Government of

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nova Scotia will lend the full cost, the remaining cost, the fifty percent remaining cost of the draggers. They will lend it to the man or company that is getting it built. The same thing in New Brunswick. In Nova Scotia, if it is being built anywhere, but provided it is used in Nova Scotia, they will give fifteen percent, and they will lend fifty percent, remaining cost, after the fifteen and thirty-five equal to fifty, with fifty remaining. they will lend the fifty that remains provided the draggers are used in Nova Scotia, and no matter where they are built. And it is approximately the same arrangement in New Brunswick.

Not only that, Sir, but the Government of Nova Scotia subsidizes the interest rate on the loans they make for the building of the draggers. They give the draggers, they give the money at an interest rate substantially below the market. Indeed, they subsidize the interest rate.

We negotiated over a period of several weeks, meeting after meeting, after meeting, in this Building here, with the heads of National Sea Products and we came finally to this agreement as contained in the Bill now before the House. (1) They would build six draggers in Marystown. That is number one. They would build six draggers in Marystown provided, of course, the price was competitive, and provided also the quality of the ships was satisfactory and provided finally that the ships could be delivered in time. Now it was recognized, at the very beginning, that the plant would not start until they had six draggers. They would not make the beginning at all at operation without having six draggers to start with. It was also recognized that, if the first six draggers to serve that plant were all of them to be built at Marystown, in the circumstances of a shipyard that has been largely idle from the standpoint of building ships, if not from the standpoint of repairing them, it would take time to get the staff assembled and to reacquire, acquire or reacquire sufficient skill and speed to turn out the draggers, it would be impossible for the plant on the Southside to wait as long as it would take for Marystown to build the six draggers.

MP. SMALLWOOD: So they proposed that they would place an order with Marystown for two of the six draggers and an order in Nova Scotia or Quebec or New Brunswick or Ontario or anywhere they felt like for the building of the other four, on condition that the four that they would build for the plant here in St. John's, that they will build elsewhere, would be replaced by four that they would build in Marystown, even if that four were not to be used in the plant in St. John's. In other words the six draggers they would need to start the plant going would be built two at Marystown and four elsewhere, making a total of six. And the four that would be built elsewhere would not have been built in Newfoundland, though they would be servicing the plant in Newfoundland. And the four that they would later build in Marystown might not be used in Newfoundland at all, but might be used in Nova Scotia or somewhere else.

This was the deal we made, that we would give them the fifteen percent, actually fourteen, I will explain that in a moment to the House. We would give them, in effect we would give fifteen percent of the cost, as a gift, and we would lend them forty, (I think it is forty percent of the cost) and they themselves would put in, as equity, ten percent of the cost of each dragger. In other words the money to pay for a dragger would be made up of the following amounts: a gift from Ottawa, thirty-five percent, a gift from Newfoundland, fifteen percent, ten percent equity, put in by the company itself, and forty percent loan to be guaranteed by the Newfoundland Government, but not at subsidized interest rates, but as cost to the Government. so as to make sure that the only cost there would be to the Government would be the cost of the fifteen percent contribution.

This is the deal that we have made. We are proud of it. We are very proud that we have brought National Sea Products into this Province. Now, Sir, it must be obvious, it must be quite apparent to the House and to the Province, that when we do that for National Sea Products or, put it another way, when we do that for a fish plant on the Southside of St. John's

MR. SMALLWOOD: we must be equally, at least equally, prepared to do the same thing for a fish plant elsewhere in our Province. Whether that fish plant be owned by a locally domiciled company or a company from some other part of the world, the ownership really does not matter all that much, what matters is that the plant is in Newfoundland, that the draggers are used in Newfoundland, that the jobs are in Newfoundland that the employment is in Newfoundland, and that it is Newfoundland's economy that is helped and strengthened thereby. That is what really matters.

Now we have insisted on the insertion of a clause in this Bill, that the House will find on page 13 and it is Section 13, which is also exactly a verbatim copy of a clause that we have in the fish plant deal at

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Marystown with Atlantic Sugar. In the case of Atlantic sugar, that clause turns out to be one of the most useful clauses in our history of making agreements with corporations because the clause says that they have to continue operating the plant unless they can show that it is not economic to do so.

When Atlantic Fish Processors, who operate the plant at Marystown, this company that is owned by Atlantic Sugar of Toronto, one of Canada's great corporations, came to the Government and said - they did not come, they wrote a formal letter to the Government notifying us that they were going to close down the plant at Marystown, it was, by evoking that clause in the contract that we were able to prevent them from doing so. It was fortunate for Newfoundland that we were able to prevent them from closing, and it turned out also to be fortunate for the company itself because they, being prevented from closing down, inside of a year found themselves in a far more fortunate and prosperous and profitable position than they had even dreamed they would be. We have the same clause here in this Bill at all times while any amount is outstanding under the mortgage, or any mortgage on a trawler.

National will operate the fresh fish plant and the fish meal plant, will operate them for the purpose of processing and storing fish and the by-product thereof, and will carry on such operations to the extent that it is economically feasible to do so. In other words, to close they have to show that it is not economically feasible to operate. So long as it is economically feasible to operate, they have no choice but to do so for the life of the mortgage, in other words, while Newfoundland's credit is at stake.

We think it is a very good deal. It is a deal I had notified all our fish companies of. I have called a meeting of them in my office, and I have described to them the details of this contract that we have made with National Sea Products. I have told them that we will be happy to make the same kind of arrangement with any one of them so as to get ships built in Newfoundland. First to help them, to help the fish companies, to help the fish plants, to help employment in the fish plants, and second, to help the

shipyards at Marystown. We have a lot of money invested in the shipyards at Marystown. The Government of Canada has some millions of dollars in it as well, and the shipyard was no sooner built, it was no sooner built than the purpose of it disappeared. The purpose of it was to build draggers. That purpose disappeared when the bottom dropped out of the frozen fish markets in the United States and indeed elsewhere, so that the price dropped precipitantly, disasterously. Where we had a programme from all our own fish plants calling for the construction of sixty new draggers, sixty, as a result of a survey made of all the fish companies and their assurance to us of the numbers of draggers each firm would need to replace old or worn out draggers, or aging draggers, or to add new ones to increase the number of draggers, as a result of that survey we knew that some sixty additional draggers would have to be built. This would handsomely justify the construction of the shipyard at Marystown, but as I say, the shipyard was no sooner built they had built only two draggers when the bottom dropped out of the whole thing.

Obviously the Government are anxious, not merely for the sake of Marystown, and that whole part, that whole area of Newfoundland, and not only for the sake of helping the fish companies of the Province, but also for the Government's own sake. We have a lot of money invested in these shipyards and we are making very great efforts indeed to reactivate the shipyard, and not only to reactivate, but, Sir, to do much, much more than merely to reactivate it. On that I hope to have some information for the House, for the Province before too long from now.

I do not know if I have covered all the salient points

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I do not think that is a condition.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SMALLWOOD: No we do not, that is not an addition from us.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SMALLWOOD: We hope so. We hope indeed that before National Sea Products

sign this agreement, or came to the final conclusion of their negotiations with us, and ours with them, before we reach the point where we were both ready to sign, they had approached the Government of Canada, they had ascertained that they would indeed be given industrial incentive grants from the Government of Canada. I have no doubt they have received them or are about to receive them.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is, because they have to spend on the plant, the best part I think of \$1 million to change, to alter, to modify and to improve the plant because, having come and examined the plant over a period of some weeks and having brought their best technicians with them to do that, they came to the conclusion that the plant was not well designed, that it was not well laid out to allow maximum efficiency and economy in production, and that the best part of \$1 million would have to be spent to put the plant in the kind of efficient condition that appealed to a great successful company such as National Sea Products.

I think the House may feel confident that when National Sea Products have modified that plant, and have begun to operate and begin to fish six draggers in and out of the plant, it will be truly an efficient plant with every possible chance of being prosperous and profitable, and being an outstanding business success, which of course is what we want. It never does Newfoundland any good, it never does any Province any good for a business failure to occur, especially in our basic industry the fishery. It always is a calamity, it is always a very black black eye when a fishing enterprise fails. Because, if a fishing enterprise fails in Newfoundland, then in God's name what can succeed? We have been at it for nearly five hundred years, and we are known throughout the world. If we are known for nothing else, we certainly are known to be a fishing country, and to have been such for centuries. A failure in a fishing enterprise does Newfoundland more harm in the eyes of the world than the failure of any other kind of a business enterprise.

What we want is a successful revival, a resurrection I suppose from the dead, because, it was dead, a resurrection of that business

enterprise, and to have it become a real success story. Because, if it is, it will become an example. I would say something else, Mr. Speaker, and I know I am treading on thin ice when I say it, but I am going to say it. I have believed it for long years now, it is; what Newfoundland needs, most desperately needs in the frozen fish industry, is a quality, a kind and quality of leadership that it has never had.

We now have in the salt cod fish industry, the Canadian Salt Cod Fish Corporation, and the Salt Cod Fish Marketing Board, under that corporation, under the capable leadership of Aiden Maloney, I think, that, after decades of endeavour, attempts to get that system going, it is now going and I think it will succeed. The other great aspect of the fisheries is the frozen fish, the filleted fish in the great filletting and freezing plants. If ever an industry needed superior leadership, leadership of a superior quality, it is this frozen fish industry.

I remember when I tried to get the father of the present Mr. Morrow, William Morrow, his father Clarence Morrow, the then head of that great corporation. I got him down here to Newfoundland ten or twelve years ago and pleaded with him to come. I sent him up to Fortune to have a look at the plant in Fortune that was lying idle. It had failed, it was a derelict, it was a wreck, and Fortune was a derelict town as a result of it. Some of the finest people in all Newfoundland, in the whole Province, some of the finest people we have in our Province were in the depths of despair because the one substantial industry they had, this freezing and filletting plant was lying there for a year, two years, I do not know, maybe three years, lying idle a long time and Fortune was a veritable graveyard.

I tried to get Clarence Morrow to take it over. We talked for hours in my office, and I said, 'Mr. Morrow, it is not only that you could take over this plant in Fortune which would be a Godsend to that community, but it is this, that you by your very success as head of National Sea Products' (which he had built up into an enormous success) "by that you will become overnight in Newfoundland the leader, the acknowledged, gladly acknowledged leader of the frozen fish industry"

He went up there and he decided against acquiring the plant, and I was bitterly disappointed. We subsequently got someone else to do it, we got Booth Fisheries to do it. For a while we continued in black despair, and it was only after a while that I learned why he had not taken it. The reason he did not go in for the plant at Fortune was that just at that time he was negotiating to acquire an immense fishing empire in the State of Maine, which I think he did acquire at an absurdly low price, half a million for twelve or fifteen million dollar profit, or maybe twenty million dollar profit. An immense fishing property that failed he acquired for a song, which is why at that time he was really not interested in the plant at Fortune.

We offered to give it to him as a gift. We gave it to Booth Fisheries as a gift. The House may have forgotten that. This Government, which owned that plant, because we had lent money, the company failed, so we took over the plant, we foreclosed the mortgage. We had this plant on our hands and we could do what we liked with it. We gave that plant, free or almost free, not literally, almost free we gave them that plant so anxious were we to get a great company such as Booth Fisheries to take it over. We had already offered to do the same thing to Clarence Morrow, because, Mr. Speaker, to bring into the Province firms like B.C. Packers

MR. SMALLWOOD: from British Columbia, Booth Fisheries from Chicago, National Sea Products from Halifax and other great names, to bring them into Newfoundland, these companies with immense resources, with vast marketing capability, wonderful market connection, is a great thing. But what I want to see is that the local companies, that are purely local, that are locally owned, locally manned, I would like to see these local companies somehow or other the recipient of some kind of special help because, you know, you christen your own baby first. It is good to have some outside companies come in and bring in their special skills and drives and experiences and resources. It is good. It is good, although in the case of the Ross Group it was not very good. Admittedly it was not very good. They were a failure. But, generally speaking, and also

MR. CROSBIE: Bird's Eye.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Bird's Eye, these two great English companies, the two biggest in all of England came into Newfoundland, both of them a flop. Each of them a complete flop. You know, a most dramatic failure, but it is not true of the Canadian Mainland and the United States Mainland fishing companies, they have on the contrary prove to be very good. As a matter of fact, I am told the one in Cape Briton now, the one where all the trouble has been, is another English company. What do they call it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Acadia Fisheries.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Acadia Fisheries. They came here negotiated with us, thanks be to God, it did not work, the negotiations were not successful or we would have another such outfit on our hands.

Mr. Speaker I do not know whether there is anything I can add. I am going to move it, and it has come to six o'clock, I think our thought is that we will meet again at eleven o'clock tomorrow morning, but not meet tonight. We are getting through our business quite nicely that other Bill of my hon. friend who took up a fair amount of time. I do not know, if it is the right of every hon. member of the House last, every single, individual last member, to speak on everything that comes before the House

MR. SMALLWOOD: But, if everybody insists on using his right, then I say that the twenty-eighth or the twenty-ninth of December or say Christmas Eve we might adjourn the House and resume after Christmas Day. If every hon. member is going to speak on every Bill and every bit of business, which is his right to do, then it will take a long time, normally. I think, what happens normally in Houses in Nova Scotia and other Houses Ottawa, Westminster, the normal thing is for the viewpoint of a party to be stated by a chosen speaker of that party, and then maybe one or two will buttress him with special points of view and then in this way viewpoints of all the parties, not the individual viewpoints of individual members, but the group viewpoints are given ample expression.

When we go into Committee of the Whole, maybe that on one clause after the other there will be some spirited debate and there maybe information sought, and certainly any information I have, I do not think I do not pretend I know every last clause of this agreement. I do not even pretend that I do, and I am not going to pretend it, if I do not know the answer I will say so, but if there is any essential information that hon. members want, if I have not got it, I will get it from someone who has it. There will be the people who drafted it, the lawyers down in the Department of Justice and the people in the Department of Fisheries and so on, between them all they will be able to get any information I am sure the House may want.

Yes, I do not think I will be wanting to go on with it tomorrow, except maybe by way of closing the debate with a closing speech, but in the meantime I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. W. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, before the House rises, if I have leave, I would like to make a brief statement that would be of interest to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is agreed.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, I would wish to inform the House that the drilling rig the "Sedco I" the \$16 million drilling rig of the Southeast

MR. CALLAHAN: Commonwealth Drilling Company, which is leased to AMICO Petroleum of Canada, arrived on the Grand Banks during the weekend. It now is moored in a position one hundred and twenty-six nautical miles south southeast of St. John's and at that location it set out anchors at 1 P.M. on Saturday and is preparing to undertake deep drilling at that location.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, to know that there are sixty-three men living on the rig or at least on the rig at the moment, which means that we in fact have a small community newly established on the Grand Banks. The weather so far has precluded the departure of some of our officials to the site, to moor the rig, to inspect the operation and to supervise at least the initial drilling work. But, if the weather clears in the morning, Mr. Oakley of the Clean, Air, Water Soil Authority who, as the House knows, is a man with twenty-two years of experience in very senior positions in the oil production industry and the drilling aspects, he will be going along as will be the Chief Inspector of Mines, Mr. Kibnis, and the Mechanical Electrical Inspector, in the inspection of Mines Division. Mr. Archibald, they will be going by helicopter the first thing tomorrow, if the weather clears. In the meantime, they are on standby.

But this, I think Mr. Speaker, marks a new watershed in the development of this Province. I hope it will be an oil shed and, I think, is of interest and, therefore, I have brought it to the attention of the House at this time.

On motion, all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred:

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Tuesday, at 11:00 A.M.