



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 1

1st Session

Number 4

VERBATIM REPORT

Wednesday, April 26, 1972

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Hon. members of the House of Assembly it is indeed a pleasure for me to welcome to the honourable House today approximately fifty grade nine students from the Queen Elizabeth Regional High School at Foxtrap accompanied by Mr. George Evans and Mr. Heber Best. I trust that your visit will be very informative, educational and enjoyable.

PETITIONS

MR. E. W. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the people of Noggin Cove, Fogo District. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that this petition could very well apply to perhaps ninety or ninety-five percent of the communities of that district.

The prayer of the petition is that the government provide and sink a number of deep wells in Noggin Cove so conveniently located that the householders can be connected to them. Now, Sir, the problem of pure drinking water, the supply of pure drinking water is beginning to become a very serious problem in numerous and scores of our small communities. During March, as we all recall we have had one of the most severe winters on record. We had heavy frost, as one citizen remarked to me, the old saying holds true, he said "Tory times are hard time." This is one of the worst winters we had for twenty-five years.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very serious. Drinking water, you can look around and there is water everywhere there is scarcely a pure drop to drink. Many of the wells are dried up or polluted and some of the residents are drinking surface water which has drained into their wells.

I strongly support this petition, Sir, which is signed by no less than 130 odd citizens of Noggin Cove and I request that it be placed on the table of the House and directed to the department to which it relates.

HON. W. W. MARSHALL (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of that motion. One of the biggest problems that we have and one of the most pressing problems that we find in this modern day is the amount of pollution that has come to this province in the various areas throughout this province. Over the past twenty years with an alarming amount of frequency we have places that cannot seem to secure pure and adequate potable water. We remember last year, I remember vividly last year the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, then the Minister of Health, got up and gave us a statement of the amount of bodies of water in the province which were polluted, particularly in and around St. John's and I know this has occurred all throughout the island, as I say, with increasing frequency. It is a real problem and it is a problem of our times and I suggest that Tory times are not hard times but Tory times will deal with this particular problem. This is a very important problem that we must deal with and we will wrestle with.

So I have to support this petition and we support it very strongly, that water should be given to these places that there should be adequate wells there. I can only look with some scepticism though at the programme to control pollution that have been adopted in this province over the past twenty-three years and it is quite obvious that this is the problem that must be taken out of the hands perhaps of the municipalities and the various local communities and must be dealt with by the province as a whole.

So I certainly endorse the petition with the qualification that government must wrestle with this very, very vital problem.

On motion petition received.

MR. THOMS (P.S.): I wish to present a petition on behalf of the residents of the Town of St. Chads, Bonavista Bay, also a petition on behalf of the residents of Burnside, Bonavista Bay.

Mr. Speaker, the prayer of this petition is that the roads from Eastport, through St. Chads on to Burnside be up graded and paved. Mr. Speaker, I whole heartedly support the prayer of this petition. The present road is a very narrow and crooked piece of highway. It is a very hard road to drive over during the winter months, as I have experienced during the last month. The road is very treacherous, ditching needs to be done, culverts placed because of the flooding and this road needs to be upgraded and paved. So, Mr. Speaker, I whole heartedly support the prayer of these petitions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this petition be placed on the table of the House and referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. EARLE (H.R.V.): Mr. Speaker, I support most strongly the petition so ably presented by the hon. the member for Bonavista North. This is a problem which is not only common to his district but one with which I am very familiar on the South Coast of Newfoundland, in fact in many sections of my district there are not only roads which need to be upgraded and paved but roads which must be built. This indicates a great short-sightedness and failure to comply with the people's needs of the past twenty years. We can only say that this government intends not only to look after my friend's request but to do it in proper priority in conjunction with all the other many tasks which need to be done of a similar nature throughout the province. I support the petition myself.

HON. A. J. MURPHY: I would like to add my support to that petition for the reason that Burnside is the terminal for the ferry to St. Brendan's and I had on many occasions the opportunity to travel that road and I can only support it quite strongly.

St. Brendan's being a great community over there, perhaps one of the few islands that are surviving and that refuse to give up. I would only like to add my voice, Sir, that this road be upgraded and made passable because I have brought this to the attention of this hon. House over a period of the past three or four

years and as I say I can only add my support to the prayer of the petition as presented by the member.

MR. ROBERTS (E.M.): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say anything because my colleague from Bonavista North is quite capable of saying everything that needed to be said but after the remarks of the gentleman from Fortune Bay I feel I should say a word or two.

I am delighted to know that the government are going this year to upgrade and pave this road.

MR. FARLE: That was not said.

MR. ROBERTS: No. I know that was not said. It was very carefully not said. What was said, Mr. Speaker, was quite mealy-mouthed, that is what brought me into it. I am glad to know that since nothing was done in twenty years they are going to do everything quickly. I welcome it. Since they have spoken of priorities I quite agree, Mr. Speaker, these petitions raise the question of priorities and it is a very good issue and I will again, to repeat the question and I intend to go on repeating it because it must be a priority that work begin immediately on the Northern Peninsula Highway, which is now that the Burin Peninsula Road is all under contract, thanks to Mr. Jamieson...

HON. T. A. HICKMAN: Not necessarily.

MR. ROBERTS: Not necessarily thanks to Mr. Jamieson or not necessarily all under contract?

MR. HICKMAN: It is not under contract.

MR. ROBERTS: It is all under contract or will be. The hon. gentleman will have to wait and see. But the Northern Peninsula Road, Mr. Speaker, is now the largest single road in this province— 35,000 people represented by the Minister of Labour and by the member for St. Barbe North and by myself. I do not have

Mr. Roberts.

anything approaching adequate road services. So again I repeat in supporting this petition that the pavement be done in this part of Bonavista North that also at the same time the government in their priorities and in their planning go ahead immediately with the paving on the Northern Peninsula. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition

On motion petition received.

MR. T. M. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to present two petitions from the historic District of Ferryland. It seems a pity that we have to present so many petitions to a minister who, through no fault of his own, is not in the House. However, I am sure that his department is quite capable of looking after them. As these petitions are similar, I will refer to both of them in the same vein. One is from the people of Admiral's Cove, Cape Broyle, and the other from the people of Brigus South.

The prayer of both petitions is that the Minister of Highways take a good look at the roads there. They have not had any work done on them for a number of years. At the present time it is not passable for any type of vehicle and it is especially dangerous for the bus transportation of school children during the school season. The people in both areas claim that if attention is not given to these roads, it will be quite likely that it would be impossible to have them passable for school children.

These petitions, Mr. Speaker, have been signed by approximately ninety per cent of the registered voters in Admiral's Cove, Cape Broyle and Brigus South. I have much pleasure in putting them forward.

HON. G. R. OTTENHEIMER (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to support the prayer of the petition of my friend the hon. member for Ferryland. As the districts which we represent are, of course, contiguous, there is a community of interest, quite naturally. We have heard and sympathetically heard and understood the needs to improve transportation on the Great Northern Peninsula and on the Bonavista Peninsula and I think it

Mr. Ottenheimer.

is quite obvious as well that all peninsulas, including the Avalon Peninsula. It is so frequently thought that all the areas in the Avalon Peninsula are St. John's or suburbs of St. John's but certainly Admiral's Cove and Brigus South, many areas in the District of Ferryland, many areas in the District of St. Mary's, Placentia East and a number of places on the Avalon Peninsula (It sounds like the capital) are in many ways just as rural and have as great needs as peninsulas which geographically might be many miles further away. All of this I think points out, certainly the prayer of the petition that my friend presented points out the needs of the people of Admiral's Cove and Brigus South. I think all of it together points out the very great need in terms of transportation and adequate road services of so many of the rural areas of the province and certainly it is our hope and it is our intention during this government's term of office that we will be able to provide for the rural areas of this province and all the peninsulas, whatever peninsula it happens to be, will get their share of public funds and public services which unfortunately they have not had for quite some time.

I am very pleased to support the prayer of the petition and in general to endorse the needs and the very legitimate hopes of the people in the rural areas of the province, the Avalon Peninsula and indeed every other peninsula.

MR.W.WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition for road upgrading, the hon. member for Ferryland. Since I have been sitting in this House in the last four days I have heard a number of petitions being presented by members from all parts of this Province, all parts of the island I should say possibly, for road upgrading, paving and breakwaters or causeways and things of that nature that are connected with roads. But I would like to say now, Mr. Speaker, that I have not heard anything mentioned about roads in Labrador, neither have we received any petition. But I would like to bring it to the attention of the honourable members of this House that there is a pressing need and a great need for a road in Labrador. I trust that the honourable -

MR.W.MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, if I may, we allow a certain amount of latitude with the rules, Mr. Speaker, but in supporting a petition it is not open for a member of the House to make a speech nor to discuss another matter. The honourable member is out of order by reason of the fact that he is not and has not addressed himself to the petition.

MR.WOODWARD: As I was saying in support of the prayer of the petition and -

MR.SPEAKER: Order please!

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker,, to a point of order, This would have to come up at some point in the House. Since it was in reply to something one of my colleagues said, I wonder if perhaps Your Honour would wish to restate the rule. Those of us in the House have the right to laugh and joke and everything else but really the people in the galleries have to listen with silent amusement or silent contempt as they wish. You know in the last couple of years it did get out of hand I am afraid, and everybody was ashamed. Could we - I am sorry - the honourable gentleman must take his share of the blame as do I, as does everybody who is here.

I am quite serious, Mr. Speaker, you know if the House is to mean what it must mean to the people of Newfoundland - I am sure the Premier and the House Leader on the government side will agree. You know, let us get this session off on the right footing, We go by the rules in here, We will joke

back and forth and crack at each other because that is the game, but that is only the forty-two of us who have been sent here by the people of Newfoundland. It has happened two or three times in this session now. It has happened in reply to something we have said over here, so I do not feel I am speaking out of turn but I do think the point should be made, Mr. Speaker.

MR.SPEAKER: The Chair is inclined to agree with the honourable Leader of the Opposition and request the people in the galleries to refrain from showing their emotions one way or the other. Thank you!

MR.R.CHEESEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition on behalf of fifty-eight parents of school children in the Conne River area of the district of Hermitage. The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is to the effect that school facilities be enlarged in this community to take care of the needs of the children.

There is a rather unusual situation existing here in that children in Grades VII and VIII or at age twelve and thirteen have to journey from their home in the Conne River area to St. Alban's to attend school. By so doing they have to be boarded with people in the St. Alban's area who will take them on a weekly basis. This in turn is made necessary due to lack of roads and other communications. It is not unusual for children all over the province to have to journey by bus on a daily basis, to high schools, regional high schools

MR. CHEESEMAN and high schools. I think it is, however, Mr. Speaker, most unusual for children at age twelve and thirteen to have to leave their homes and to live with what amounts to, I suppose in the first instance, strangers. These people may be kind and friendly, with whom these children live, but I believe, Mr. Speaker, that anyone in this Honourable House today will agree that to take all of the children in grades VI, VII, VIII, IX, X and XI from their homes and to have them live in this situation is intolerable in this day and age.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, support this petition most heartily and ask that the petition be received and that it be referred to the department to which it relates. The motion is seconded by my friend the hon. member for Fortune.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, in agreeing so thoroughly and seconding the motion presented in this petition from the member for Hermitage, might I say that his district and mine are back to back and conditions are very similar. It strikes both of us that in this day the fact that children have to travel so far and sometimes stay overnight to attend school is a situation that must be corrected. In my district and I am sure the same applies to his, there are cases where very young children have to travel distances of many miles back and forth to school. Sometimes it is not only great hardship to them but to their parents.

The situation such as my friend described is something that needs most serious attention. I hope that in referring this petition to the department to which it relates, they will most certainly give it the urgent attention which it deserves.

HON. J.A. CARTER (Minister of Education and Youth): Mr. Speaker, I take much pleasure in seconding or commenting on the petition of my hon. colleague and I would like to assure him that we will do all in our power to see that this very, well in my view very grave situation is rectified as soon as possible. Thank you.

On motion petition received.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Long Island. The prayer of the petition concerns the construction of two roads, one on Long Island itself, a distance of about two miles to a place Long Tickle and the other on an island nearby, Sunday Cove Island, where a road needs to be constructed to Gerry's Harbour.

Having these two roads constructed and a wharf built at the end of each would supply a pressing need of the area for an adequate ferry system. By having these two roads constructed and the wharf facilities, there would only be a short space of ocean or water between the two places. It would also mean that transportation between those two islands, which would then lead to the mainland, would reduce the unfortunate situation that happens now when you have severe winter frosts and so on. This tickle is open just about the whole year round and I sort of get a chuckle sometimes, Mr. Speaker, when I hear petitions legitimately put forward by the hon. members and all the petitions being legitimate ones.

I have to chuckle at the same time, Mr. Speaker, because when I

MR. PECKFORD:

look at my own district and see the islands involved there and that we have hundreds of people living on those islands who do not have a proper highway system, who do not get proper medical attention, who do not get proper educational attention and many other of the amenities of life, makes me chuckle a little.

So I support this petition wholeheartedly. The prayer of the petition goes on to ask for also the upgrading of the road that was built last year on Long Island in the communities of Beaumont and Lushes Bight. So I move, Mr. Speaker, that this petition be put on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion petition received.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Orders of the Day be now read. It is now three-thirty and it is private members' day. The hon. gentleman's petition could perhaps wait until tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a very short petition that will endear itself to His Honour because I have been requested by His Honour to present it.

MR. ROBERTS: In that case, Sir, I will yield and withdraw the motion, by leave, but then I would move the Orders of the Day be now read.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions from the district of Lewisporte that you have done me the great honour of asking that I present to this honourable House because you, Mr. Speaker, are not in a position to present these on behalf of your constituents.

The first is a petition from the voters of Leading Ticksles urging government to construct a road from the existing main road to the coastal wharf serving the post office and telegraph office, general business and fifteen individual homes. This petition, Mr. Speaker,

MR. HICKMAN:

has been signed by a large number of residents of Leading Tickle, one hundred and seventy-four in all and I suspect that that constitutes by far an overwhelming majority of the people of Leading Tickle.

Their prayer is one that will commend itself to this House and to the honourable members and I feel quite certain will commend itself to the honourable the Minister of Highways.

The other petition, Mr. Speaker, from your district of Lewisporte is from Phillips Head and the petitioners of Phillips Head take very strong objection to a decision which has been made to close out their school and transport the children, from grades one to four, to Botwood for their education.

This, Mr. Speaker, is becoming a perennial complaint of parents throughout this province. Centralization of high school facilities and in some cases centralization of elementary school facilities

MR. HICKMAN: have a great deal to commend to themselves, to the people but in the anxiety to centralize and in the anxiety to establish large boards throughout this province I have a feeling that the local involvement and local initiatives on the part of the people in various communities throughout Newfoundland is being stymied, indeed tragically has almost disappeared. I can speak with some knowledge from my own district where we now have a large school board and goodness knows, Mr. Speaker, the past where we had more school boards in Newfoundland than in England and Wales has very little to commend itself. But again in the anxiety to consolidate, I believe, the pendulum has swung too far the other way and in so doing we have sacrificed, tragically sacrificed local initiative and local involvement in education and this is not good, Mr. Speaker. Parents of the pupils in Philip's Head are very concerned and justifiably concerned that their young children in the elementary grades, grades one to four, are being unnecessarily transported to a larger school and thereby losing the parental control and to some extent subjecting themselves to hazards of transportation that they feel is totally unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, on your behalf, Sir, I present to this House these two petitions, the one from Leading Tickle, which I move be tabled in this House and referred to the department to which it relates and the one from Philip's Head, that I also move be tabled in this honourable House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. J. HARVEY : Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition from the people of Leading Tickle in Your Honour's area of Lewisporte for the upgrading and construction of roads to public facilities. Being from the district of Labrador South, I have many communities myself, Mr. Speaker, needing road construction and upgrading of roads to facilities such as nursing stations, post offices and the like. I will speak a little further on that at a later time but I will certainly support the petition of the honourable member from Lewisporte.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like as well to support both petitions presented on Your Honour's behalf so ably by the Minister of Justice.

All the petitions which have been presented to this House today and in earlier sessions of the House calling for road construction and the upgrading of roads, the pavement of roads, are all well received by this House and I believe all received by the minister concerned and by the government of the day.

There has been, Sir, a considerable amount, a great amount of work done on road construction throughout this province, particularly throughout the island part of the province in the past several years but a great amount remains to be done. I certainly hope, Sir, without raising the hopes of the people of Newfoundland too much that the present administration find themselves capable within the amount of money which is going to be available to them and knowing the temperament and sociology of the Minister of Finance I do not think there is going to be a great amount of money available in the next four or five years. But I do hope that in the next four or five years the present administration can find the amount of money necessary to upgrade, pave and reconstruct many roads around this province because the sum total of human misery, I suppose, without being too dramatic, caused by bad roads or the lack of roads is all too evident to anybody who has travelled around this province.

On the second petition, Sir, I would also like to support the words stated by the Minister of Justice in spite of the fact that a petition dealing with education of the type like that petition, dealing with school construction or matters which come under the control of boards of education are strictly speaking out of order in this honourable House, because this House does not have all the control that may be necessary or all the control that some people would consider desirable over educational matters because of our peculiar constitutional arrangements in this province.

MR. ROWE: Therefore, strictly speaking it is out of order because we in this House can do nothing about the problems which have been mentioned by the honourable member except perhaps to use our own influence as members of this House.

But I would like to support Your Honour's petition. Because although I agree completely with the idea of centralization of education and educational facilities for the high school students of this province where greater centralization is necessary, if we are going to have the facilities and the good teachers and give the good education to our high school students, when it comes to elementary school children, Sir, children of five, six, seven, maybe up to ten or eleven years of age who are forced to leave early in the morning in buses and travel over roads which are hazardous and in some cases travel for an hour or more than an hour, to school and back from school in the evening, I think that is a type of a burden which should not be imposed on the young children in Newfoundland and Labrador today and certainly, Sir, it is a burden and an anxiety which should not be reposed on the shoulders of parents in this province today. Because I do know something of the anxiety experienced by parents who have small children going off in buses over hazardous roads especially in the winter months.

Therefore,

MR. ROWE (W.N.).

Sir, I support wholeheartedly and completely the burden of the petition so ably presented by the Minister of Justice, on behalf of Your Honour.

HON. J. C. CROSBIE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, before these petitions are passed I would like to say a few words. I support the prayer of the petition but I do not support the sly innuendo or insinuation of the hon. member who just spoke when he inferred that whether or not there were monies spent on these roads would depend on the temperament or the nature of the hon. Minister of Finance. That is a lot of - I will not use the word, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): A point of order, Mr. Speaker!

MR. CROSBIE: A contemptible statement!

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Speaker, the Standing Orders of the House of Assembly clearly state that there is to be no debate and no personal references needed when petitions are presented to this honourable House. I would ask Your Honour to so rule.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, a point of order, the hon. gentleman opposite raised a contemptuous insinuation which I am addressing myself to in connection with this petition.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): May I have a ruling Your Honour?

MR. CROSBIE: Whether or not the Minister of Finance has any temperament or has -

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Speaker, a point of order, Sir!

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. ROWE (W.N.): May I have a ruling on the point of order raised, Sir?

MR. CROSBIE: A contemptible worm.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman -

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

On motion petition received.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to finish my remarks on it unless -

MR. ROBERTS: It has been carried, unless the hon. gentleman did not hear the motion being put, Sir.

MR. CROSBIE: I was speaking when there was a point of order. Is the hon. the Speaker going to deal with the point of order first or can I proceed with my remarks first?

MR. SPEAKER: The petition has been presented, received and passed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down "mutton chops."

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

HON. F.D. MOORES (Premier): Mr. Speaker, regarding Question No. 5 on the Order Paper of April 26, I assume (I would like a clarification from the hon. Leader of the Opposition) he means Question No. 5 the recent appointments, as opposed to the Clerk of the Council and others who have been there for many many other years or does he want a total review?

MR. ROBERTS: There must have been some changes, the Clerk of the Council is not carried on the Premier's staff. I thought he was paid out of Head II, the Executive Council.

MR. MOORES: The records - the Clerk of the Council is all.

MR. ROBERTS: I know what the Clerk is paid or what he was paid.

MR. HICKMAN: He also gets paid from the office of the Premier.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, but he is not paid any salary, if the hon. Minister of Justice wants to look at the estimates. He is paid as Clerk of the Council, Head II, the Legislative Council vote. If the Premier either wishes to see me outside the House, Mr. Speaker, or if he wishes to ask his parliamentary assistant to see me, I will try to clarify the question for him, gladly.

MR. MOORES: Okay, fine Mr. Speaker.

For recent appointments, I have the information here for the hon. gentleman now or perhaps it would be better to clear it all up as to the total content or meaning of the question. Question No. 6, I will take as notice because this information is being gathered and will be filed tomorrow. Question No. 7, I would like to comment that Mr. Robert Nutbeem happens to be a personal friend, as well as a brother-in-law and I would like to be in a position to say yes

Mr. Moores

but the answer to Question No. 7 (1)(a) is no; (1)(b) is no; (2)(a) is no; (2)(b) is no and no. 3 is no.

With regard to Question No. 8, the answer to no. (1) is yes; no. (2) is Monday, April 19, 1972 and title is as Director of Newfoundland Information Service and is to be responsible for the establishing and operating a new branch of the Premier's Office for the two-fold objective: (1) The general information of the public on government policy through the news and public affairs media; (2) To initiate specific information projects, to make groups and individuals aware of existing and proposed government programmes. The answer to part (3): It is contractual and the second part of that question is for one year. The third part of that question, it is renewable on a year to year basis and, therefore, (4)(a), (b) and (c) are not relevant. The answer to part (5) is no, but secretarial staff will be provided up to the number of two people. The second part of that question is that a job description has gone forward to P.A.D. for their ruling on it. The last part of that question is that the vote will come from the office of the Premier.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, would the hon. the Premier inform the House if, with the appointment of Mr. Butler as Director of Information Services with the hon. Premier's department, they would be replacing the Newfoundland Bulletin with another publication or if they have entered into an agreement with any television or radio stations in St. John's to carry out public service broadcasts on behalf of the government?

MR. MOORES: The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is no. There has been no contractual arrangements carried out with the media. It will be one of disseminating news as opposed to propaganda which was the function of the "Bulletin." It will be one that will be passing out the information of government programmes only in the form of leaflets illustrating exactly what the programmes are to concerned individuals whom they happen to affect, without the pictures of the necessary cabinet ministers attached.

MR. NEARY: Another supplementary question, and I appreciate the answer that the

Mr. Neary

hon. the Premier gave to my previous question. We will be watching for these pamphlets and see what kind of propaganda they will be pumping out.

I would like to ask the hon. the Premier - Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister of Justice would be just a little bit patient, hold his horses, I will get to the question on my own time and I will not be brow-beaten by the hon. Minister of Justice. I want to ask the hon. the Premier if there is any move to replace the adoption programme? The "Newfoundland Bulletin", in my opinion, was a great help in promoting the adoption programme because the pictures of the children were carried in the -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I ask my question in silence? I would like for the hon. the Premier to indicate if the government have any plans to replace that programme? I thought it was very worthwhile and I think it was the main reason we brought the number of children available for adoption down from 600.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, if I can, Mr. Speaker. The government are determined to allow a certain amount of latitude with respect to questions that was not accorded to us in opposition, but it is a rule that questions are to be asked and you are not to state facts, arguments or opinions. I feel that the hon. member for Bell Island is drifting away from the rules of the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier indicated that he would like to answer that question so I will not interfere.

MR. MARSHALL: Well ask the question and you will get a frank answer.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, regarding the question of the hon. member for Bell Island, the answer is that we agreed that the adoption service performed by the "Newfoundland Bulletin" was probably not the only one but was a worthwhile service and certainly it will be given consideration by this government to carry on a similar type programme for the purpose of this very worthy cause of looking after those very unfortunate people who cannot look after themselves.

HON. T. P. HICKEY (Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 9, asked by the hon. member for Bell Island.

The question is as to whether or not there is to be a home for the aged established in the District of St. George's. My answer to this question is, the only record in my department is a copy of a Minute in Council dating back to August 1971, where there was approval in principle given and that the former minister who now is asking the question was assigned a task of following it up. He is now asking me what has been done. He is asking me really what he did and I do not know. Maybe he will tell us what he did.

MR. NEARY: I wonder if the hon. minister would confer with the member for St. George's, Mr. Speaker, because he made an announcement at a public meeting recently in his district that a senior citizens home was to be built there. So I wonder if he made this announcement without prior consultation with the minister, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKEY: I answered the question, Mr. Speaker. I gave the answer based on the question and as I have indicated, no representation other than what has been made to me by my friend from St. George's. The former minister knows all about this and he has the information. He knows that he did not do his job so why is he asking me what he did not do.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I had to drag the information out of the hon. minister. He now admits, Mr. Speaker, that he did confer...

MR. HICKEY: This is from the sublime to the ridiculous.

I have some questions the hon. member can ask me. If he wants a few hints, I can give him a few.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, one quick question which I think is in order, if not we will put it on the Order Paper; has Mr. James Stratton, formerly employed by The "Evening Telegram," been retained by the government, if so, in what capacity and so forth? If the Premier would like it on the Order Paper I will arrange it that way.

MR. MOORES: No, Mr. Speaker. The answer to that is yes, as of yesterday. It was not included in this question per se and he is the only other one in that department as of now, as a Research Assistant to the Director of Information Services, who will be acting as researcher and press secretary to that

particular department.

MR. ROBERTS: Could the Premier indicate, Mr. Speaker, the salary to be paid to Mr. Stratton and perhaps to Mr. Butler since I do not think it was in the question, so he did not answer that naturally?

MR. MOORES: I will check on the one regarding Mr. Butler and file it Mr. Speaker, and in the case of Mr. Stratton it is \$8,500.

MR. ROBERTS: A year?

MR. MOORES: A year.

MR. WINSOR (E.W.): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. the Premier in his capacity as Minister of Fisheries, what progress has been made in supplying trawlers to the fish plant at Burgeo?

MR. MOORES: I will have to take it as notice, Mr. Speaker. Regarding Burgeo I can give a general reply. I had a meeting with the representatives of the fish trades last evening regarding the trawler company interpretation and proposal that is working very well. We are setting up a committee between the trades, the union and the government, that will advise the final formulation and activity of this company. The first priority in the attaining of trawlers, as has been said, is that the first two will be for the use of the Burgeo plant. That is as far as it is right now.

MR. EVANS (A.): This is supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I did not get the hon. Premier, Did he say that there were two now on order for that plant?

MR. MOORES: I said the first two that will be hired or bought whatever their formula happens to be will be for the use of the Burgeo Fish Plant.

MR. EVANS: He does not know how soon?

MR. MOORES: No.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose in the whole history of this hon. House has there been a resolution put forward on a matter of such great importance to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and rightly so, Mr. Speaker, because I suppose at one time or another every politician in Canada, indeed, Sir, perhaps every politician in the western world and especially those who were in opposition to government, has taken a pot shot at one of the major issues in society today - unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, hon. members of this House are no exception. They soon find that in a very short time, along with all the other things they have to do for their districts, that they will be practically turned into employment agents and, to use an old cliché, Sir, this matter of unemployment has become a political football and used mainly, I would suggest, as a vehicle to get publicity, appeal to the emotions of people rather than to suggest any solutions to this very real problem. To see unemployment in its true perspective, Mr. Speaker, we must face up to two major facts of life - first, Sir, governments all over the free world are offering all kinds of concessions and incentives to attract industry to their little particular corner of the world and Newfoundland is no exception. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, despite dramatic increases in our gross national product and our gross provincial product and despite a higher standard of living, the likes of which we have never known before, unemployment figures released at the end of each month or at the end of each quarter show a steady increase in unemployment which, as I stated a few moments ago, provide a spring board to practically every politician in Canada and in Newfoundland and every bleeding heart across the nation to climb aboard the band wagon of the critics who like to focus attention on the problem

MR. NEARY: but without coming up with a single constructive or positive idea or suggestion as to how we should cope with this problem which in my opinion is going to get progressively worse.

Mr. Speaker, in introducing this resolution to this Honourable House, it is certainly not my intention to take a negative approach in this matter. I hope, Sir, to be able to convince members on both sides of this Honourable House that we as politicians have a duty to the people of this province to use our imaginations and our creative minds to set new goals and objectives and that in our technologically sophisticated world of today, government, members of this House and anybody else in public life will fulfill their responsibility of attempting to create jobs on a massive scale that cannot be created by business and industry today if they are to continue to be economically viable.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot over the past fifteen or twenty years in this province about industrial development. Well, Sir, let us take a look at industrial development. As I see it, Mr. Speaker, the aim of the industrial developer is really to produce goods at as low a price as possible that will result in a profit for the owner and for the shareholders. Industrial development, Sir, in my opinion is not carried on for the sake of job creation even though a limited amount of employment will result from it.

You see, Mr. Speaker, when you are talking about successful business and industry today, you are really talking about machines and not people. Machines, Mr. Speaker, substituting for people and hands and producing goods at a record pace. Well, Sir, I was alarmed recently when I read that even today computers are operating and supervising machines. We are told, Mr. Speaker, that if some of the automobile people were to bring in all the new technology and automation that they could install in their factories, that many, many thousands of Canadians could be put out of work with the snap of a finger.

Mr. Speaker, I say that if we are lucky enough in this province to continue to attract business and industry, we must all be conscious of the fact that the use of automation even in the basic industries like forestry and fishing, even these industries cannot attain their profit goals by padding payrolls or employing large numbers of people.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most hon. members in this House will remember the time when some twenty thousand heads of households in this province either earned a part-time or a full-time living from the logging industry.

MR. NEARY:

Your Honour will probably remember because I think Your Honour's own district was affected, remember the part-time logger fishermen? It seems like a long time ago, Mr. Speaker, but may I remind the House and Your Honour is probably aware of this that this was only ten years ago, only ten short years ago, twenty thousand heads of households in Newfoundland either earned a full-time living or a part-time living from the logging industry. They were logger fishermen. What do we have today, Mr. Speaker? Probably about three thousand to thirty-five hundred men getting their living from the logging industry and this is diminishing year by year with new machines and new technology.

Mr. Speaker, a more recent example of the point that I am trying to make and of how production can be doubled with very little increase in the permanent work force when an industry expands, such as is happening today, as my hon. friend from Labrador West will agree, in his own district in Labrador City. When the construction period is finished, Mr. Speaker, when all the construction work is complete we are told, and I think my honourable friend will have to agree with me, that only a handful of new workers will be hired to double the production of these mines. I do not know whether the honourable member is aware of that or not. Perhaps he could nod his concurrence or non-concurrence of the statement that I just made, that the Iron Ore Company of Canada intends to double production at Labrador City with only a handful of additional or new employees, maybe a couple of hundred or two hundred and fifty.

The honourable member, Mr. Speaker, I take it has agreed with the statement that I made. I think he indicated that six men, technically speaking, could run the whole operation in Wabush City.

Mr. Speaker, another example, down the Trans-Canada Highway a few

MR. NEARY:

miles at Come by Chance when this great oil refinery is operating at full capacity, and God only knows that we were reminded of this situation on numerous occasions by members of the present government when they were in opposition. We were reminded, Mr. Speaker, that \$155. million of tax payers money was being put up to create a miserable three hundred to three hundred and fifty jobs. But, Mr. Speaker, what the critics who were on this side of the honourable House at that time did not say, this is the real truth of the matter, is that the oil refinery which is a Newfoundland company will increase our gross provincial product and that we can skim off some of the wealth generated from the oil refinery into the gross provincial product to look after the diminishing number in the work force who will not be producing.

Mr. Speaker, it is a provincial company and as the honourable Minister of Finance should know that in production, when you talk about industrial development today you are talking about increasing your gross provincial product. You are talking about productivity. In the case of Labrador City that I mentioned a few moments ago I do not think and I am subject to correction on this, that the production of iron ore at Labrador City is credited to the gross provincial product of this province because the head office of the company is either on the mainland or down in the United States.

So, Mr. Speaker, the honourable Minister of Finance may think it bunkum but he will have his opportunity to stand on the floor of this House and speak in this debate on this resolution, if he is interested in the unemployed heads of households in this province and I will look forward to hearing what he has to say, Mr. Speaker. We are not all well-to-do people in this province. We have large numbers of unemployed people in this province, Mr. Speaker, and we

MR. NEARY:

will find out how dedicated and how sincere the honourable member is when he stands in this debate; which I hope he will, and speak in favour of this resolution. We will soon find out.

Mr. Speaker, one thing that I have never had to do is to import a public relations company from Bay Street, Toronto, to do my public relations work for me.

Mr. Speaker, I thought on opening day, yesterday I thought that we had restored dignity to this House but I am convinced now, Mr. Speaker, and I think that the press should record this, the press should record it so that the people of Newfoundland will really know who the real culprits are in this House

when it comes to name-calling and character assassination. Last year Mr. Speaker, the press tried to pinpoint the member for Bell Island as the culprit. I have sat in this House now, Sir, for three days and all I have done was try to be kind to the new government. No name calling no insults but what do we hear this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, when the honourable member for White Bay South was trying to speak in support of a petition? We heard the dirt and the filth, character assassination that we have heard over the last two years, Mr. Speaker. If I were the honourable Premier on that side of the House, I will tell you this that I would whip that honourable member in line pretty fast because we do not want to see a deterioration of this House that we have seen since the honourable gentleman got clóbbèred when he ran for the leadership of the Liberal Party back in 1969. I hope Mr. Speaker, that Your Honour will not allow this to go on.

We intend to try to do a good job here in Opposition, Mr. Speaker. We are going to do, carry out our work to the best of our ability. We are going to try to be positive in our approach because, as the honourable leader of the Opposition pointed out this afternoon that we have to provide the alternative to government. It does not make any difference, as I said in a previous debate, Mr. Speaker, it does not make any difference about the crowd on that side the individuals nor the crowd on this side. It is what we stand for that counts, and what we intend to do for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador that counts and not the individuals. I hope that the honourable member will remember that. Let us not hear any more snide remarks in this House during this session.

I am sure the new members sitting here today - the new members that are sitting here today, Mr. Speaker, now know who the real culprits are. I hope they do not follow the bad example that has been set here today by the honourable Minister of Finance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will get to the special works, Mr. Speaker here we are, Martin & Rowan again. But Mr. Speaker, let me say this, I hope in

this debate on this resolution that the honourable member for St. John's East will get up and speak. I have heard rumours in the last day or so that there will only be one speaker from the government side of the House on this Resolution. Only one speaker, Mr. Speaker. Can you imagine, how about the honourable member for Fortune Bay, how much unemployment does he have in his district? The honourable member for Hermitage, how much unemployment, how many people on welfare in his district? How about the honourable member for St. John's South, who I hear is going to be the only speaker in this debate. How much unemployment in the honourable member's district? The honourable member for Burgeo, the honourable member for St. George's, the honourable member for Trinity North, the honourable member for Harbour Grace, my good friend from Harbour Grace, how much unemployment in the district of Harbour Grace? How many of the honourable members constituents come to me looking for employment? How much unemployment? Yesterday we heard from the Member for Green Bay about the closing down of all the mines in his district. How much unemployment in Green Bay?

Do you mean to tell me, Mr. Speaker, that all these members have taken the oath of silence when we have such an important resolution before this House that could help solve the unemployment in this Province?

Mr. Speaker, we have heard quite a bit about resource development. A little industry here, \$50,000 industry here, \$100,000 industry here, \$150,000 industry there. Mr. Speaker, you know, does Your Honour know really what that means? What it means, Mr. Speaker, is this: That the policy they intend to follow is to pass out, hand out to the fellow that will come in making an application for the \$50,000 industry, a little sawmill here, a little sawmill there.

Then he will put himself on the payroll for \$25,000 a year, he will put his son on the payroll for \$15,000 a year. Then the next year, Mr. Speaker, he is back or the next month he is back with his hand out to the government again. This is no way, Mr. Speaker, to solve the unemployment problem in this province. If the honourable members will just listen for a moment I

will tell them the only reason, I will tell the honourable members the only real solution to the unemployment problem in Newfoundland and in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the examples of Labrador City and Come by Chance that I have just given I am sure will make any thinking member of this House sit up and take notice and to see that when we talk about industrial development that we are really talking about machines. not people and not hands. Yet, Mr. Speaker, those members who sit on the other side, who are in business, know that all the jobless of this Province and of Canada are still needed as customers and consumers.

Sir, it is no secret, I did not make it up, goods and services are being produced in Canada and in the United States today at a record pace And, Sir, would there not be a surplus of goods, or as we say in Newfoundland would not the markets become glutted if we had more layoffs, if we did not put the purchasing power in the hands of our unemployed and the low income group who are not producing this wealth. What then, Mr. Speaker, I ask you is the real answer to this problem? Is it improved social assistance? Is it a guaranteed annual income or some sort of reverse income tax? No, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the answer to this problem is either social assistance or guaranteed annual income as the total solution to the problem.

However, Sir, I might say in passing that I do think that the guaranteed annual income must be implemented at an early a date as possible and that the present obsolete system or method of looking after people in need be thrown out. During my three and a-half years, Sir, as Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, I felt that social assistance was merely a clumsy way for looking after needy families. I said so publicly, Sir. It is on the public record. I felt that the way we look after needy people today is just a method designed to soothe the conscience of those who were, who are more fortunate endowed with good health and with great wealth.

April 26, 1972.

Tape 86.

Page 4.

Mr. Speaker, I may have digressed from the original resolution slightly but to get back to the main point and the prime reason for bringing this resolution before this honourable House,

MR. NEARY: I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that all other other hon. members of this House will agree with me that every citizen has the right to work and that it is the duty and the responsibility of government to step in and create jobs that are within the capacity of our unemployed to perform. Give them work as an alternative to handouts, Mr. Speaker, by creating work that they can handle and work that they can handle now.

A couple of months ago, Sir, it was raised here in this Honourable House again yesterday, I caused great gales of laughter across Canada by suggesting that unemployed miners and others be given a chance to get off welfare by offering them the kind of work that they know how to do by digging a tunnel under the Straits of Belle Isle. The point that I was attempting to make, Mr. Speaker, and this seemed to escape the imagination of the press, that I was not attempting to focus attention on the fact that the Island of Newfoundland needed to be joined up with the mainland of Labrador by a causeway or a tunnel. This could be of tremendous benefit to Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, but what I was trying to focus attention on was the fact that this would be an excellent make-work project, the kind of a project that you would not have to put a deadline on, it would not have to be carried out efficiently, it would not make any difference when it was completed, it is the kind of a project, Mr. Speaker, that would take care of the miners on Bell Island and the miners in the hon. Member's District of Green Bay who have been economically marooned by shut-downs at Bell Island, Gullbridge and the Whalesback, and the hon. member is nodding his approval, Mr. Speaker, because I think he is beginning to see the point that I am making. It would also take care of all the unskilled workers that we have in this province. It would give them an alternative, Mr. Speaker, to the curse of ill-forced idleness that goes with welfare.

Another thing, Sir, it would not subject our people to the humiliating and embarrassing experience that they are having now

in having to submit to academic training, retraining or upgrading. only when they are finished, Mr. Speaker, to become unemployed welders or become unemployed heavy equipment operators, or trained unemployed electricians, instead of just plain, ordinary unemployed miners or labourers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to hon. members of this House that the concept that I have put forth here today of government creating work is not an original idea and there is nothing revolutionary about the idea of government providing funds to employ the jobless. The opportunities for youth programmes and this winter's local incentive projects recognized the logic of government recognizing employment trends, Mr. Speaker, and creating make-work opportunities to off-set these trends on a year-round basis.

I would suggest, Sir, that if the Honourable House will agree with my proposal to set up a select committee, that the proper approach to be made to the Government of Canada would be to have these year-round make-work projects cost-shared on a ninety ten basis or some other formula agreeable to both the federal and provincial treasuries.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion may I ask members of this Honourable House that in future they distinguish between industrial development and economic development which includes the provision of labour-intensive projects as two quite different facets of our economy but both equally essential for continued prosperity and to a continually rising standard of living.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, members may feel that I have oversimplified the problem of unemployment and what I feel are the real solutions to these problems. Well, I sincerely hope, Sir, that I have provided a framework within which members on both sides of this Honourable House can see somewhat more clearly that industrial development is absolutely essential to increase our gross provincial product, but only government through economic development can create

April 26, 1972, Tape 87, Page 3 -- apb

jobs on a mass scale using the wealth generated through a steady increase in the gross provincial product and the gross national product.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I have convinced all hon. members of the House of the urgency of setting up this select committee and I ask for the unanimous decision of the House in support of my resolution.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to support the motion so ably put by my colleague the honourable member for Bell Island. He is to be congratulated for putting this extremely important motion and for the obvious thought that he has given to it.

Mr. Speaker, inspite of the great strides forward that have been made in this province over the past twenty-three years we still have to accept one rather important fact and that is we are not exactly in the centre of things as far as industry is concerned, as far as production is concerned and as far as high employment is concerned.

These centres of industry tend to be rotated mainly in the great cities of the mainland of Canada and, of course, in the United States. They were established there, Sir, even before we became a part of the great Canadian Nation.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the situation regarding employment in these great centres. We note that productivity has increased because of this new technology, because of the use of computers and because of the use of machines. However the rate of employment in these areas did not keep pace with the increase in this productivity. In other words, people in these great centres which I am speaking of, on the Mainland of Canada and in the United States, have largely been replaced by machines and by computers.

I can never forget the expression on the face of one of my friends who happens to be working with a national electrical company when he visited one of their plants on the Mainland and he came back in utter amazement over the fact that he went into this great plant and there were only two or three people that he could see and still there were thousands of T.V. sets, refrigerators and radios and vaccum cleaners and what have you being turned out by this plant without a person or hardly a person to be seen.

So we see that even in these great centres we have people largely

MR. ROWE (F.B.): being replaced by machines. This was and is the fact in spite of the spin-off benefits that were accruing from computerization. For example, in these centres on the Mainland people were and they are employed in the design and in the testing and in the manufacturing and the installation and in the maintenance and in the repair and in the programming of these machines and these computers.

Now if we look at the results of the age of technology from the employment situation in Newfoundland we see an even more drastic and dismal situation. Like our Mainland counterparts the machines and the computers have and they will continue to replace people. To further compound our problem, however, we do not have these great industrial centres here in Newfoundland, as they do of course on the Mainland. Where we do have some medium sized industry, we tend to have outside ownership of these industries and this is the sort of a situation you quite often find on the Mainland of Canada where you have a foreign ownership of industry set up in certain areas.

So, Mr. Speaker, what does all of this mean? It means that many of our Newfoundland people are being replaced by machines but we do not get any of the benefits at all from the spin-off from such computerization and mechanization. In other words, in Newfoundland we do not plan, we do not design, we do not test nor do we manufacture, we do not install or maintain nor do we service or repair the machines that we do have and the computers that we do have in this province. This is simply because we do not have in many cases the industrial centres here in this province and, of course, we are not near all of them and we do not have the training centres to train people for the types of jobs that you would expect of them in the machine and computer age.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, that is where we in Newfoundland suffer doubly from the new technology and, the facts are, on job creation. In other words, we are having people replaced by machines and we gain no spin-off benefits whatsoever from the machine and the computer age. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, there is a great need for this honourable House to study

MR. ROWE, (F.B.): ways and means of creating employment in this province through special works programme on a year around basis.

Sir, I am afraid that the day has come when we shall no longer have seasonal unemployment. Seasonal unemployment now sounds almost like a luxury. We almost feel like praying for seasonal unemployment. It seems to me that unemployment will be a problem at all seasons of the year. No matter what season you look at, there are usually some segments of our society looking for work. For example, when the summer and the fall fishermen return to their boats after a winter of unemployment they are immediately replaced by the return of university, college and high school students looking for work. One season is just as bad as another.

Although we have unemployment throughout most of the year, too much unemployment, so many of the basic things that our Mainland counterparts take for granted are still lacking here in our province. This is especially true in the many small communities that we have in our province, both the mainland and the island part of our province. It seems to me that our situation is ideally suited for an extended and an expanded emphasis on special all-year works programme. Such things as protection of water resources, even from the sea gulls, installation of small waterlines, the restoration and the renovation of abandon school houses and churches for recreational and meeting centres and for art centres and museums. The planning and building of playgrounds and community parks, soccer pitches and hockey rinks. I could go on, Mr. Speaker. These projects are ideally suited for such special programmes.

The situation was dramatically demonstrated to me just earlier here this morning when I opened my mail from the constituents in the district of St. Barbe North that I have the honour of representing, when no less than seven people out of ten pieces of correspondence were looking for employment in that district. In fact, they were

MR. ROWE, (F.B.): looking for employment with the Department of Highways. These people had no special training. They had no special skills but they wanted to work with the Department of Highways. I was told by officials from the Department of Highways that they are hiring less and less people who consider themselves to be just labourers and I understand in the St. John's area the Department of Highways over this past year, at least this is what I am told, has not hired one single labourer during the whole of the year.

So in districts such as St. Barbe North and there are many others like it in this province, the restoration of schools and churches and this type of thing that can be done by people who consider themselves to be labourers would be of great benefit to the communities as well, of course, providing employment for the people involved.

Sir, great progress has been made over the years. However, so much still needs to be done. I think we in this province do have the available manpower but we need the kinds of incentives advocated by my colleague, the honourable member for Bell Island. Therefore, Sir, I wholeheartedly support without any reservation whatsoever the resolution that a select committee of the House be appointed to investigate and report on the feasibility of a year-round programme of special works sponsored by the federal and provincial governments.

MR. R. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, we have heard the honourable member from Bell Island and we have heard the honourable member for St. Barbe North outline their views on unemployment. I may say that the honourable member for St. Barbe North has outlined his views on unemployment very lucidly. But no amount of words, Mr. Speaker, are going to do anything about unemployment and we realize that we have high unemployment and serious unemployment here in Newfoundland. The only thing

MR. WELLS: that is going to do anything about unemployment is action, action by the private sector in the normal course of business and action by government.

Now I think that what we are concerned with here today is a resolution, Mr. Speaker, a resolution proposed by the hon. member for Bell Island and I think that we should forget the flood of words that has gone on this afternoon and examine both the resolution and the preamble to it to see what he is really asking this House to do because, if it makes sense, if it is reasonable and worthwhile, if it will make any contribution to the alleviation of unemployment in Newfoundland then it should be done but if it does not, if it is just a smoke screen, if it is just a mass of words to pretend to do something, then of course, Mr. Speaker, it would be a waste of time of this hon. House.

Now the hon. member says in his preamble, "whereas despite vastly increased productivity in Canada over the past fifteen years, there has not been a proportionate increase in the total number of people employed in industry over the same period"; We know that, we all know that. The members of the House know it. The members of the public know it, the children in school know it. He says again in his preamble, "whereas every indication for the future is for an acceleration in geometric ratio of the takeover of production and many clerical and even selling job by machines and computers;" Well I had to read that three or four times, Mr. Speaker, I suspect it might have been written by a computer but I believe what the hon. member means is that in future clerical, sales jobs are going to be taken over by machines and computers. That may be. Certainly they are going to take over some of them. He mentions a point which of course is of concern to every member of this House, about the young men and women who are coming out of high school, university and vocational training school without any real openings for them, and how the province has increasing unemployment at all age levels. Then he goes on to say that it should be the responsibilities of government at all levels to provide work for the unemployed.

You see there is a failure of logic somewhere here, Mr. Speaker. Of course government is concerned with employment. Of course government is

concerned with ensuring that insofar as it is possible people are employed and private industry is assisted in helping people to become employed. But it is no good, Mr. Speaker to say that government must employ everybody. It is no good to say that the taxpayers dollar is going to employ everybody. The taxpayers dollar in certain instances can help with unemployment. There can be programmes to build up - "infrastructure" I think is the modern word - in a country where the taxpayers dollar is extremely important. But there is a failure of logic if you say, Mr. Speaker, that the taxpayer should step in and do what private industry may not be able to do and employ everybody in the country. That is ridiculous, because the taxpayer has a tremendous burden on him, a tremendous burden to provide the services that government at all levels is providing, and it is silly and nonsensical to say that the taxpayer can employ us all or employ all of us that cannot be employed or are not employed by private industry.

Now what is the view of many of us who have taken part in politics in recent years, not in this House but outside it? The thing that we have been saying and the thing that now is very clear which should have been done and which ought now to be done for Newfoundland is not to employ people at the taxpayers expense necessarily and in every case but to concentrate on helping the private sector establish industries in Newfoundland which will employ more peoples.

I heard the hon. member for Bell Island talking about Come By Chance and it is obvious that he has heard what critics of that project have said for some years, that for the vast amount of money spent, for the vast amount of guarantees that were necessary to take that project off the ground, that there are not enough jobs that have been provided nor will be provided. I think the administration of the past twenty three years have done a very ruthless thing, Mr. Speaker, in that it has pledged both the cash, or, well the credit of this province for many years to come, very ruthlessly so that short term construction jobs could be provided without regard to how many long-term jobs are at the end of it. It was thinking Mr. Speaker, that originated back in the twenties and thirties. I read

a look by an honourable gentleman who has sat in this House and sat here for twenty-three years and sits here no longer. It was called, "The New Newfoundland." He talked then about the establishment of the pulp and paper mills in Corner Brook and Grand Falls but what that gentleman failed to see over the years, with I think disastrous results for Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, is that the conditions attained in the 1920's and the 1930's with regard to unemployment when you invested monies or guaranteed monies for private industry, that the conditions have drastically changed and that the 1960's and 1970's bore no relation.

You see what happened was the policies which proved so successful in establishing paper mills in the 1920's and 1930's were tried with Come By Chance in the 1960's and 1970's and of course they failed, Mr. Speaker. They put the industry there but the jobs were not there.

The hon. member for Bell Island talks about the woods industry and who were employed in it. I have had considerable professional contact with the woods labour industry over the last eight years, Mr. Speaker, and he is wrong in his figures. He is wrong when he says 3,500 people are working in the woods industry for the two paper companies. It is more like 1,000 people right now and the number is going down.

So that obviously there has got to be a new type of thinking and a new policy toward industry and this of course is the policy which I and other colleagues have been talking about for some months or some years. There has got to be a policy of helping private industry establish labour intensive industries here in Newfoundland and it is no answer, it is no answer at all to start talking in terms of having government employ people, yes government can step into the breach, government can help people at times by works programmes that will provide something for the country, "infrastructure" I think they call it, government can help at times but government can never, if we are to be successful inject itself into the situation so that government is the only employer and the taxpayer is the employer and you forget private industry and you say, "well boys you are out of work, the government will employ you."

That will never make this country or this province powerful. It will never make it rich. It will never make life worthwhile in it. As an English writer said and I recall reading last year, "only a very wealthy country can afford socialism and that not for very long."

So let us examine this resolution, Mr. Speaker. It says, "be it resolved that a select committee of the House be appointed to investigate and report on the feasibility of a year round programme of special works sponsored by the federal and provincial governments." Is the resolution Mr. Speaker, telling us anything new? As long as we need a road in Newfoundland, as long as we need paved roads, as long as we need a forest programme to protect our natural resources, as long as we need things built and things done, then it is feasible to have a programme of doing them. If it is a proper case for government either federal, provincial or municipal to spend money, then it is feasible and proper. But the hon. member with I suggest a failure of logic, Mr. Speaker, is suggesting, he is suggesting that this House investigate and report on the feasibility of something which of course is feasible as long as we need something done and the government

MR. WELLS:

has money to pay for it and in a list of priorities decides that it is proper to do that particular project. Every member in this House knows that there is unemployment in Newfoundland. Every member in this House supports policies of the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland to alleviate unemployment by bringing in policy or projects of winter work, summer work, whatever they are. It is all the tax payer's dollar and the tax payer's dollar has to be spent to the best advantage and where the tax payer's dollar can be spent to build something or do something and in the process employ people then that is excellent and it is feasible and this House, I am sure, unanimously agrees with that.

Do we have, Mr. Speaker, do we have to have a select committee appointed to tell us what we already know and know very clearly. I think the honourable member in his resolution has confused, Mr. Speaker, the deliberative job which is the job of this House with the executive job which is the job of government. Government carries out policies based on legislation formulated and passed in this House. This is a deliberative institution which assesses and argues over and passes legislation ultimately to decide the course which this province will take. It is the job of the government, the executive branch, to carry out policies.

Now we all know, Mr. Speaker, that there is unemployment in Newfoundland, a bitter, bitter pill after twenty-three years of Confederation and the money that has been spent by the federal government in this province. It is a very bitter and sad thing to see policies that have failed and have not altogether caused the unemployment but have played a great part in causing it and it is bitter but it is a fact. Now the members of this House on all sides know and we know that it is feasible whenever there is a federal

MR. WELLS:

dollar or a provincial dollar available to do it that it is feasible to have programmes of public works which will employ people in the execution of them.

We do not need to be told what it suggested that a select committee can tell us but what we need and what I am confident we will have, Mr. Speaker, is government that will, through the federal-provincial department that is to be established and through other departments that are properly and capably run that we will have a government that will know and find out from Ottawa what is available, that will tell Ottawa something of the priorities that are necessary in Newfoundland, both special works and public works, so that when a dollar is spent here it will give the maximum effect and the maximum employment. I also hope and am confident, Mr. Speaker, that we will have a government, not that will say; "It is our job to employ everybody who happens to be out of work" but "it is our job to help private industry and private enterprise to get going in areas where they can employ people, not just physical areas but areas of industry and work which are labour-intensive so that our people can be employed insofar as is possible by productive industry not by the tax payers dollar which in the end is never going to make a country great or wealthy."

So, Mr. Speaker, we have been told the obvious, This afternoon we have heard the obvious, The obvious has been suggested to us but I think, Mr. Speaker, that this House has more important business than employing and selecting and appointing select committees to tell us what everyone knows.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion put by my friend, the honourable member for Bell Island. I am not going to dispute at any length any of the comments made by my learned colleague, my learned friend the member for St. John's South. I am

MR. ROWE (W.N.):

sure that the member for Bell Island will deal with a number of those items when he clues up this debate. Suffice it to say as far as the remarks of the honourable member are concerned, suffice it to say that when he makes statements concerning the involvement of governments into the work force these days and shows a certain fearfulness of government involvement he displays what to me is a, and I may be wrong, but to me is a typical conservative attitude which if carried to its logical conclusion in the years to come will threaten to doom this country and other countries, the United States, Canada and Newfoundland as part of the great North American Continent, doom us to a sad and sorry economic situation where we shall have mass unemployment and a sad distribution of the national wealth.

I will not go into any of his other remarks any further. I agree with a number of things which he had to say there obviously, but I just wanted to make that point here of the attitude, this typical conservative attitude, which I think will doom us, if we do not watch out in the years to come, in this country.

In support of the motion, Sir, I would like to say a few remarks. I think it was Thomas Jefferson who stated nearly two hundred years ago that all men are created equal and I believe that that saying when it was first made was a cruel joke in many ways and it is a cruel joke today. I know that I say this at the risk of offending those who relish a pious platitude disguised as a penetrating political insight. But I have to say it is a joke because taken literally it is so obviously untrue to be almost funny were it not for its sad and sorry implications. People, Sir, it is quite obvious, are not created equal. Some are bright and some are dull, some have boundless energy and some are filled with sloth and laziness. Some are born in a city, for example, with its assets and liabilities and others of

MR. ROWE (W.N.):

us are born in the country or rural areas with its shortcomings and benefits. Some people in society have talent and some seem to be devoid of any spark whatsoever. The list of these extremes, Sir, is endless and the variety of things between these extremes is infinite.

I have said that Jeffersons remark about people being created equal is cruel because it can and does blind us to a basic reality. It can make us believe that if certain people do not have a fair share of the national wealth in a free and open society such as ours where everybody supposedly has an equal opportunity to strive and succeed, then if anyone fails in that situation it is really nobody's fault but the person who in fact failed. It can make governments and it can make people who have achieved a measure of success under existing circumstances fail to sympathize with the less fortunate who may not have the ability or perhaps more important may not have the opportunity to compete successfully even at a very low level in our present day society.

If Jeffersons words about people being created equal have any meaning or truth at all, Sir, it can only be that precisely because people are not created equal, there ought to be a duty on governments and society generally to make certain as far as possible and as far as humanly possible that everyone is accorded a basic equality under the law, that everybody is given at least a rough equality of opportunity and that there is a fairer and more equal division of the national wealth among the persons and the regions of this country. It is this possible meaning of Jeffersons words that I would say has come closer and closer to reality over the past couple of hundred years. During that time and especially over the past few decades governments have moved rapidly away from the old idea that they existed

MR. ROWE (W.N.):

merely to preserve order and security in a country and governments have become involved in more and more matters that vitally affect the prosperity of the country and the economic and social well-being of its individual citizen.

Many factors contributed to that process of more individual equality in our society. I would say that most important has been the realization by a relatively small number of socially-aware businessmen, by labour leaders, by enlightened politicians and economists and other people in society that simply because men were not created equal nor had anything like equality of opportunity,

MR. ROWE (W.N.)

measures had to be taken by governments themselves to get rid of the gross inequalities and the glaring unfairness which existed between the economic conditions of one man or woman and another man or woman in the same country. The simple extension, to give a few examples, of the vote to every man and woman, rich or poor, put everybody on a more equal political footing and brought new pressures for equality on politicians, which they could ignore only at the peril if they wished to be elected. Laws were passed to help protect the economically weak from the financially strong and laws have been passed to save the silly or inexperienced person from the brilliant or unscrupulous persons in our society. Tax laws have been enacted on what you might call a rough Robin Hood principle. Schools and hospitals and medicare legislation and this type of thing have been brought in to diminish the differences between standards from person to person in our country and various other social security measures have been brought in: unemployment insurance, pensions to the aged, all these things. A host of other enlightened measures have been brought in to make the condition of our people a little more equal and to rid ourselves of outrageous disparities and to share our national wealth a little more fairly today.

I am sure that Jefferson who made the statement I mentioned earlier, I am sure that his mind would boggle if he saw us in Canada today. I am sure he would say that he did not mean this equality thing to get out-of-hand as it has.

Sir, we have come a very long way in Canada in the past few decades, in spreading our burdens more fairly and distributing our benefits a little more equally. I believe we still have a long way to go in many respects before we can even think about being even a little self-satisfied with the job which we have done or are doing. I think that the idea expressed in the present motion will, if ever realized, push us a little further along this road of basic equality in our society. Because, Sir, one of the gross and disturbing inequities which exists in Canada today can be found in the field of employment and unemployment.

MR. ROWE (W.N.)

In dealing with this subject, I am not criticising the present federal government for the high rate of employment which we have had over the past couple of years. They had to deal with problem of galloping inflation in a quick and efficient manner to stop the massive erosion of the dollar in Canada. They did this job with what you might call existing tools and by orthodox methods just as any Canadian Government would have done in its place. Nevertheless, Sir, quite frankly as a member of this House and as a politician and as somebody who hopes to do something for the province, quite frankly, I find it insufferable as a Canadian especially that this great country, one of the wealthiest in the whole of the world for population, should have any unemployment problem whatsoever. I am not talking about the six, seven or nine per cent which exists during abnormal periods like now. I am also talking about the three or four per cent of unemployment which exists during so-called normal times in our society. I find it intolerable that any or all governments in Canada should be forced to use the forced employment of a group of people as a tool in a fight against a particular economic illness which may be confronting the country. It is completely outrageous to me that one small segment of the work force in Canada should suffer utterly and make the supreme economic sacrifice of losing their jobs during such a fight against inflation while the rest of us remain relatively unscathed in the battle, remain untouched and sit back and enjoy the fruits of winning a battle against inflation nor, Sir, can I accept the present situation where one or two richer parts of the country derive most of the benefits from a boom which causes inflation while the poorer parts like ourselves or Quebec, and other provinces in Canada, suffer more in terms of unemployment during the stop to fight inflation when we did neither much to cause nor got any of the possible benefits from it.

Sir, I find it difficult to accept without protest the notion that even under good economic conditions, there need be even three or four per cent of the work force on the average across Canada, representing several hundred thousand of our fellow Canadians, with no jobs when at the same time the bountiful wealth of this country of Canada staggers the imagination.

MR. ROWE (W.N.)

Now, Sir, I think that nearly everybody will agree with all of that on principle and on humanitarian grounds the sum total of human misery caused to families, whose bread winner is forced to go on unemployment insurance, if he is lucky and then perhaps on welfare, is enough to arouse anybody's sympathy. The slow, insidious destruction of a person's dignity and self-respect as he or she is turned down by employer after employer is a sad spectacle. The image of persons on chronic abled-bodied relief, sometimes spanning two or three generations in this province and elsewhere, is completely distressing.

Certainly, there is ample emotional justification for ridding our country of this remaining gross inequality. But what, it might be asked, are the rational and unemotional answers? Some people have proposed a guaranteed minimum income to be effected by a negative income tax and certainly some such measures should be brought into play for families without a bread winner or for the disabled and all who are physically or mentally unable to earn a living. It should be set at high enough a level to raise such people well above the grinding poverty where many now try to keep body and soul together. I personally do not honestly think that the guaranteed minimum income approach alone should be used in respect of people who are not prevented by some disability from working. The guaranteed minimum income leaves out the fact that the vast majority of people want to earn their own way, to earn their own money and pay their own way if they possibly can. It also forgets the fact that any guaranteed minimum income would certainly still be much below the average income derived from gainfull employment, if for no other reason that there would be those in our society who would say that it has to be lower or individual initiative would be killed. Minimum standards might be raised by such a system but poverty is a relative thing and the indignity and undermining of morale for persons to have no employment would still probably exist.

I believe, Sir, that the answer to some of these questions lies in taking steps like the one proposed in this motion today which would lead

MR. ROWE (W.N.)

toward full employment in the literal sense of the word. The answer lies not so much in a government guaranteed minimum income for abled-bodied persons but in approaches leading towards a system of government guaranteed employment in this Country of Canada. In a country as rich as ours, Sir, all governments both federal and provincial ought to be planning towards the time when, as a matter of national policy, every abled-bodied citizen willing to work at a job, equalled to his or her skills and ability, ought to have a guaranteed right to gainful employment. The idea proposed in this motion of special year-around work projects by government is one step, I believe, in that ultimate direction that we are tending. This means that federal and provincial governments ought to be working in concert towards the objective of providing a source of employment for all surplus labour which is not hired by private industry or public institutions in the normal course of events. It is a pretty bald

statement by itself Mr. Speaker, and by itself it may not seem to be too sensible by many traditional and orthodox economists. However, Sir I am not suggesting that such a system would simply be imposed on a country without reference to other factors. It would have to be linked up to other plans and programmes in the private sector which I will mention briefly later.

First I would like to mention one or two features of this idea of government guaranteed employment. First I should like to make clear that I am in no way suggesting that the surplus labour in a country should be employed on useless make-work projects as I believe the honourable member for St. John's South tend to or was intimating or giving some indication of. Like the old notion of digging holes and filling them up again, I think that is a notion, as he stated quite rightly, which died with the 1920's and 1930's.

On the contrary Sir, governments should institute various projects which while perhaps not absolutely essential in our society today would be at the very least useful and beneficial to this country and to this province. The germ of the idea can be seen in the various special works programmes already brought in by the federal government in the past year or so. The work would range from youthful and constructive labour work, as mentioned by my colleague from St. Barbe North, to various so-called white collar jobs depending on the skills and abilities of the applicants for work. There would have to be a genuine attempt to provide at least the variety of choices open to job applicants of different skills in private industry.

Similarly the emphasis would be on providing people with jobs as near their homes as possible without any idea of a forced mobility programme. Nor, Mr. Speaker, I must stress, am I talking about any senseless or destructive notion of people working for their dole or unemployment insurance benefits. under such a plan? The wages and salaries paid by the governments on such projects would have to be equivalent to those paid in private industry or

normal government programmes. In fact the ideal to be aimed at would be to make such projects and the jobs produced by them totally indistinguishable from any normal on-going government programmes. The structure of the plan would have to be such as to allow labour to be fed back into the private sector easily and quickly when the need for that arose. Thus the governments role under this ultimate plan that I am mentioning, which would probably come into effect after a great number of years of which we should aim towards, the role under this plan would be to serve as a - for the government to serve as a back-up to normal labour demand, to prevent unemployment by soaking up the surplus labour when the need exists and to provide for transfers to the private sector when the need for more personnel arises there.

Of course the natural question to be asked about such a comparatively massive programme is whether or not the cost would be prohibitive. Of course such a programme would have the effect of ending many social security measures which now exist, simply because these social security measures would no longer be needed. Able-bodied relief and other transfer payments needlessly made to higher income groups could be saved and the revenue used for this purpose.

Moreover, Sir, as the number of members of this House know, the incomes resulting to people under such a programme would be subject to normal income tax like other incomes and, for example, fifteen per cent of every dollar which the provincial government presently pays in wages sooner or later comes back to the provincial treasury through various tax sources and the situation is undoubtedly similar for the federal government.

The amount of additional revenue needed would not be as great as one would expect especially when you realize that there is a tremendous pressure to increase the present social security measures in effect to day, to increase those payments to higher levels. As I have stated, this guaranteed employment plan would have to be coupled with other programmes designed to decrease

unemployment in private industry.

Now, Sir, I would probably not be too eager to see this ultimate programme and plan, this total long-range programme put into effect under our present circumstances where unemployment is at best three or four per cent of the labour force because the cost factor and other economic factors might be impossible to overcome. There would have to be Sir, some other far-reaching policy changes by the federal government and more long-term fiscal and monetary planning on the part of all governments. All governments would have to devote more planning to job training and projections into the future something which we are very lax on now, projections into the future to determine the likely labour needs and trends by private industry in the years to come.

Normal unemployment would probably have to be brought down to a much more manageable level with fewer fluctuations in unemployment from year to year and from season to season, before governments could reasonably bring into operation this programme, this ultimate long-term programme of guaranteed employment.

The idea proposed by the motion under discussion in the House today, of a year round special works programme, if it is implemented on an ever-increasing scale from year to year with the effect of the programmes studied closely during that period of time, this could well lead, Sir, finally to this scheme of full employment with a minimum of disruption to our economy in Canada today.

Certainly, Sir, Canada can also well afford to study some of the ideas which have been brought in in some of the European countries. Canada should take a leaf from their book from these countries who have managed to keep unemployment at very low levels over the past few years. For while Canada has experienced some of the highest unemployment rates found in the industrial world, a country like Germany had unemployment between the years of 1960 and 1968 of less than one per cent of the total labour force. In Japan the unemployment never moved above one point

three per cent. Also in France and Sweden, for example, it is usually well below our low figures, for example, four per cent unemployment in 1965. Certainly Canada can study some of these countries and try to duplicate their successes here in this country and in this province.

 In addition Sir, other matters such as vocational training can be stepped up to a considerable degree in this country. In Germany in 1968, for example, sixty per cent of the young people between the ages of twenty and twenty-three took part in vocational education programmes before they had reached the age of eighteen years, while the comparable figures in Canada are less than twenty per cent, one-third. Again, Sir, little has been done in this province, in this country of Canada to cope with the fact that lay-offs resulting from seasonal fluctuations in agriculture construction and other industries that count for roughly one-fifth of all unemployment in Canada.

MR. W.N. ROWE: In most European countries unemployment during the winter months has been drastically curbed by various financial incentives which are made available to firms who keep down dismissals during these months. Other incentives are designed to encourage projects by firms and governments during the winter months. In Sweden as in most other countries this objective is achieved, not by propaganda, Mr. Speaker, but by hard cash.

In Sweden where natural and regional problems are very similar to our own, the unemployment rate from 1961 to 1968 has been between one and two percent of the labour force. That forward looking country has a system of public and emergency work financed entirely or partially by government which may be started at short notice whenever the employment situation demands it. The works are chosen from among projects which can be easily interrupted when the general employment situation improves. This system, Sir, is much the same as what this motion advocates. Of course, I am proposing that ultimately Canada ought to go further, not tomorrow but in years to come go further perhaps by using this Swedish method and the method proposed in the motion to try to eliminate unemployment altogether.

These, Sir, are only some of the methods employed in other countries but I think I have said enough to indicate that we in Canada have a long way to go in instituting some rational long-range programmes to solve our problems of continuous boom or bust in the labour market. Such long-range programmes aimed at cutting normal unemployment to an absolute minimum, coupled to a programme whereby all levels of government would co-operate in trying to guarantee the provision of employment to the small remainder of the labour force who might still be without jobs, would put Canada in the forefront of the Western World in social education and in trying to equalize opportunities for all people in this country while at the same time retaining and fostering the individual initiative which is so important to the success of the free enterprise system.

Putting this plan into operation would mean that the traditional economic method in times of inflation of taking it out of the hides of one relatively small segment of the population by throwing them out of work would have to be done away with. In its place would be a policy in serious cases of such things as across the board restraints and severe restraints on the increase in the quantity of money without getting into the technicalities of it. Such policies would at least have the effect of causing this burden to be shouldered on a broader and more equal basis in our society. It would require a considerable amount of political guts for governments to make everybody in a country feel that pinch a little more in the fight against inflation rather than forcing a relatively small number of the electorate to be squashed completely as happens today by depriving them of their jobs.

Sir, if any hon. members here today think that this notion of government guaranteed employment starting off with such a plan as proposed by my hon. friend and more planning and more government control of the labour market is too far fetched, grandiose or froth with difficulties economic and otherwise, I would ask the members of the House, Sir, what the alternative should be?

Nearly one of every three persons hunting for jobs in this country last year was between the age of sixteen and nineteen. While the unemployment rate for the entire force since 1960 has averaged under five percent, which is bad enough, the rate of young people unsuccessfully hunting for jobs and seeking employment has been nearly fifteen percent. If these figures, Sir, do not reveal something to us I think we need help. If we do not realize that at least part of the cause of the social unrest in this country today is economic frustration, then I think we ought to do more thinking on the problem. The approach to the problem which I have offered is one of long-term and intensive planning to reduce and stabilize unemployment in the traditional labour sources, coupled ultimately with a scheme of government guaranteed employment to those who still do not have jobs. I think a modest

beginning to this approach is contained in the motion which my hon. friend the member for Bell Island has placed before this House.

I am convinced that something like this I am talking about here today, something like this is vitally necessary to the continued welfare of this country, to save us from increasing social tension, particularly among the young people, and to provide each of our fellow citizens with as much dignity and self-respect and financial well-being as possible.

In conclusion, Sir, let me say that it may be the opinion of some hon. members that these proposals at the moment and in view of the state of Newfoundland and Canada today that these proposals are pie in the sky and airy fairy and that we should get down (and we will) we should get down to the more day to day routine matters of the House of Assembly.

I do not think there is any single more important problem facing this province or this nation than the question of unemployment because, as bad as it is now, Sir, it is bound to get progressively worse in the future as long as we continue to rely exclusively on traditional ways of thinking and traditional sources of employment in the private sector.

Technological advances, as my friend from St. Barbe North has mentioned, technological advances alone see to it that unemployment increases in the future by continuously reducing the need for manpower in industry, whether that industry be based on manufacturing or resource development or on services. This problem, Sir, is a drastic problem which will not go away simply because we close our eyes to it. It is a problem which requires, I think, revolutionary new thinking on the part of governments including this government and the Government of Canada. I think that Canada has the money, the economic and financial wherewithall in resources to cope with this problem.

There is no reason why this Province of Newfoundland, little Newfoundland and this government should not take the lead in formulating some policies like this along the lines proposed here today,

approaching the federal government with policies of this nature. I commend the hon. member for Bell Island for bringing this motion forward and offering it to the House for debate and I support it wholeheartedly.

MR. CROSBIE: Thank you. The hon. member is showing very good spirit welcoming me like that.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is not pie in the sky it is just hocus pocus, it is just a lot of words which all together do not mean much. If we analyse this resolution, first of course it asks for something that can accomplish nothing in this direction, as the hon. member for St. John's South has just pointed out. A select committee of this House is not the appropriate body to investigate or to report on the feasibility of special works, other works or any kind of works. That is the job of the Government of this Province. It should be their job and it has to continue to be their job. There is work that select committees can do but this is not among the things that they can do.

Secondly,

MR. CROSBIE: with respect to special works. If any special works programme is the kind of special works programme that we have had in association with the Government of Canada in the last several years I for one think it has got to be much more deeply thought through. Because the Government of Canada are in the habit of initiating programmes, special winter works programmes, local initiative programmes and this kind of temporary programme and that kind of temporary programme where they lend money to the province or lend it to individual groups without consultation with the province. They do not finance the project one hundred percent. I refer particularly to the local initiatives programme this winter. The federal government encouraged local groups to initiate programmes. They make funds available to them not one hundred percent, not sufficient to cover the whole cost of projects. They do not inquire as to whether the local group can make up the balance of the monies required and what is the result? The local group will get a loan or a grant from Ottawa. They have not got a hundred percent of the money needed and they then come to this Provincial Government, looking for the balance of the money because the Government of Canada have not given them adequate funds.

That is not the type of programmes that I think we should be getting into. If there are going to be federal special works programmes let the federal government finance them one hundred percent. They are the government that have the money. They print the currency. They got far greater borrowing power than we have. But instead of that they adopt these slingey programmes and put the province on the spot and get great kudos across Canada for these special works programmes leaving the provincial governments to have to pony up additional monies that they do not care about because they do not care whether or not the local group really goes ahead with the project or not. That has been the effect of these special programmes in this province, Mr. Speaker, in the last few months. I think, if there are going to be special programmes adopted by the Government of Canada that are really

MR. CROSBIE: to do this and the other less wealthy provinces any good, it is time the Government of Canada faced up to the fact that they should be financing them one hundred percent, not leaving private groups, unable to go ahead with their projects, to come after the Provincial Governments which already have enough trouble to try and maintain their own programmes in this province and elsewhere.

So if this is the kind of the special works that this resolution suggests should be sponsored by the federal and provincial governments - no thanks! We find, Mr. Speaker, in these special programmes that when an announcement is made and I am sure honourable members opposite are used to this, when an announcement is made from Ottawa late in the fall that there are going to be a special programme, a temporary loans programme for winter works or whatever you want to call it, you are not advised of this in sufficient time, there is then a tremendous rush to get projects sent up to Ottawa by the closing date. You have a whole lot of projects sent up there which should have no priority, which are low down on the priority list, which gets sent up to try to meet these deadlines because you have not had enough time and the result is an entire misapplication of public funds. I will not say what some of those projects are but I know that everybody knows about some of them.

This is not the way to alleviate unemployment, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. members opposite will agree to that, they had a considerable experience of it when they were in the government. So if there are to be any special works worked out and the federal government are going to propose or initiate them, I wish, Mr. Speaker, that they will finance them, that they would not make grants to local groups unless they are satisfied that the local groups have the rest of the money to carry out the project or unless the Government of Canada have the funds and will give them the funds to carry out the project because this province just cannot afford to meet the needs of every local group across this province for worthy projects they want to carry out, where they only get part of the money from the Government of Canada. So I hope we will

MR. CROSBIE: not have any more of those.

Now to look at the Resolution, well it is "gobbly-gook", a lot of it.

"Whereas every indication for the future is for an acceleration in geometric ratio of the takeover of production and many clerical and even selling jobs by machines and computers." What kind of "gobbly-gook" is that? Who thought it up? It was not the honourable member opposite who introduced it. "An acceleration in geometric ratio." I hope he will explain that one when he comes to it. What the member is apparently saying is that there are going to be far more jobs done by machines and computers in the future. I presume that is what he means and that therefore he blames this in part, he blames unemployment in Newfoundland partly on this or wholly on this, according to his resolution, which I do not think is a fact not in this province at the moment.

The honourable member for White Bay South calls on the government to give the whole problem new thinking. That is just what the government are doing. The thinking of the last government was exactly the opposite. The last government wanted \$160 million to go into an oil refinery at Come-by-Chance, to provide eventually some 300 jobs apart from the construction. We are totally against that concept. That is the concept the honourable member's resolution appears to be against the use of \$160 million of our credit with the end result of some 300 jobs in Newfoundland.

The honourable member mentioned the gross provincial product that we could skim off from the oil refinery, monies which would help us meet our general revenues and general problems. How can you skim off monies from the money that the oil refinery will make if the oil refinery is not taxable? It is pretty difficult. It will be after some fifteen years when they exercise their option but that is fifteen years away and our problem is much more immediate than that. That kind of policy is not one that helps meet the problem that this resolution points out.

MR. CROSBIE: I would just like to give the House, Mr. Speaker, some figures I had the fiscal studies branch prepared this morning or looked up for me this morning. The gross national product of Canada increased by 193.6 percent from 1956 to 1971 in current dollars or by 97.3 percent for the same period in constant dollars. The gross provincial product of Newfoundland in the same period 1956 to 1971 increased by 233.3 percent in current dollars, from \$393 million to \$1,310 million. In constant dollars, that is using 1961 dollars, our gross provincial product increased 133.4 percent.

In other words in this province our gross provincial product increased at a greater rate than the gross national product did. In the same period the total labour force of Newfoundland increased from 106,000 to 158,000, an increase of forty-nine percent. While the number employed increased from 99,500 to 139,000, that is those actually employed, an increase of forty percent. So the labour force increased forty-nine percent, Mr. Speaker, and those employed only increased forty percent.

I think the Resolution mentions "productivity." Increased productivity

MR. CROSBIE:

does not mean necessarily any increase in employment. Increased productivity means that there is more output per worker and if real income is to grow, Mr. Speaker, as our real wealth is to grow, then you have to have greater productivity if you are going to be able to pay higher wages and salaries.

Now look at our unemployment rates. 1971 in Canada as a whole 6.4 per-cent, Canada as a whole for those under twenty-five 11.4 per-cent; the Atlantic region unemployment in 1971 eight point six per-cent, under twenty-five 14.3 per-cent; Newfoundland in 1971 our unemployment rate 11.4 per-cent, that is higher than the Atlantic region and higher than Canada as a whole, For those under twenty-five they do not give the figures but we have accurate indications, Mr. Speaker, that the unemployment rate in Newfoundland in 1971 for people under twenty-five is over twenty per-cent, the unemployment rate for those under twenty-five. So the unemployment situation is most serious for the worker who is under twenty-five.

We know that the figures for this month show a 15.4 per-cent unemployment rate in Newfoundland. Our indication is that this month the under twenty-five unemployment rate for Newfoundland is over twenty per-cent. Also our figures indicate that the under twenty-five section of a Newfoundland labour force is thirty-seven per-cent, thirty-seven per-cent of our labour force is under the age of twenty-five and of that part of the labour force approximately or slightly over twenty per-cent are unemployed, far higher than Canada as a whole, far higher than the figures for the Atlantic region as a whole.

So the problem that this resolution points out, of course, is a tremendously serious problem here in Newfoundland. I notice that the unemployment rate for this month for PEI is higher than Newfoundland.

MR. CROSBIE:

March, 1972 it was 15.4 in Newfoundland, 16.2 in Prince Edward Island and then the next one after that is 12.6 in New Brunswick, Quebec 9.3 until you get down in Alberta to 4.9. So this is a tremendously serious problem for this province.

Now the minister, I am sorry, the former minister, in his resolution -

MR. NEARY: It will not be long now.

MR. CROSBIE: It is going to be at least four years. I think we can safely promise them at least four years.

MR. NEARY: Can the honourable minister guarantee four years?

MR. CROSBIE: I can guarantee you five years positively. His resolution points out the dangers of increased automation in our economy. Now I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that automation does not necessarily mean increased unemployment because in this province it is the service sectors of our commercial life that are increasing fastest. The data that we have in our fiscal policy division shows that the percentage of the labour force engaged in primary and secondary manufacturing is declining but the percentage in the over all service sector is increasing.

MR. NEARY: Multiplier effect.

MR. CROSBIE: The multiplier effect of the honourable member's policies for the last twenty-three years. So that despite automation, in the areas where we are now experiencing increasing employment are the service areas, they are not affected to the great extent by automation. That is the tourist industry, hotels and so on. They are still employing a great many people and the percentage is climbing. We do not have accurate provincial figures on this but it should be about the same as the rest of Canada.

The figures on out-migration are interesting too, Mr. Speaker. I can just give the House those. The population of Newfoundland in

MR. CROSBIE:

June 1966 was 493,396 people, so 493,000 approximately. The population of Newfoundland in June 1971 was 522,000. That would indicate in- population of 28,708 but in that period from 1966 to 1971 we had a natural increase of 50,000. So this indicates, Mr. Speaker, that during 1966 to 1971 some 21,000 people left this province, out- migrated, presumably could not find employment here or could find better employment on the mainland or for whatever the reason they left the province. That is 21,000

MR. CROSBIE: over a five year period. No, because that is taken into account on the natural increase. The natural increase is the number of births less the number of deaths.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, we have 10,000 people leaving school each year. Not all of those go into the labour force but it is likely that about 8,000 of them try to enter the labour force in Newfoundland each year. This includes university graduates, high school graduates, trade school graduates. Not all of these can obtain work in the province obviously and they have to migrate out of the province.

The labour force of the province has increased rapidly in the last year or so and has outstripped the growth in employment. The total number of persons in the labour force and employed in Newfoundland, for example, in 1968 we had a labour force of 144.3 thousand, 129.8 thousand were employed. Last year we had a labour force of 157.5 thousand and only 139 thousand employed. So the growth in the labour force is at a higher and greater rate than the growth in those employed in the province. These figures are from 1971 because the figures for 1972 have not been put through the computers yet. So that indicates the seriousness of the situation.

The number of cases on short-term assistance is another indication of the serious problem. Able-bodied relief that the hon. member is so familiar with: The total number of cases of able-bodied relief in March 1969, just three years ago, were 5,664. In March 1970 they climbed to 6,085 and in March 1971 to 6,592. I am giving the total social assistance cases.

MR. NEARY: For short-term or long-term?

MR. CROSBIE: Short-term basic assistance plus total special assistance. For example in March of 1971 there were 162 making insufficient earnings from full-time employment and 6,430 who were unemployed and could not get full-time employment so that totalled 6,592 out of 8,814 total cases. The other cases were older people, ill health, disability, widows and so on. But out of 8,814 total cases, social assistance short-term, 6,592 were because they were unable to get employment or were employed and not receiving a great enough income. The figures of this year were higher than that but we

have not got the exact figures. This last sheet here shows that the number of families, heads of families and or single persons in receipt of short-term basic social assistance in February 1972 were 9,850. In the same month last year it was 8,350, in other words 1,500 more so

Mr. Crosbie.

that the problem this year is even greater than it was last year. This is the background, Mr. Speaker, of the problem in this province, a problem that the last administration after twenty-three years were not able to solve and, of course, a problem that I would not say was caused by the last administration. All we can say is that they were unable to overcome this tremendous problem, the problem grew increasingly more difficult despite the fact that the government's budget and spending increased, leaped and bounded over the last ten years. The last administration were unable to solve this problem which grew increasingly worse over the last five years, ten years. This is a problem, Mr. Speaker, that no government have the whole answer to. It would be foolish to pretend that this government have the whole answer to it, we do not. Is there an answer to it? We do not know. We cannot say that there is an answer to the problem of unemployment in Newfoundland. No government could promise that. We hope that if we take a bit of a different direction, if we concentrate on resource developments, with the new development corporation, which has also been approved by the other members on the other side of the House, using that it would help to overcome the problem. But we do not expect that next year or two years time, three, four that we are going to see an unemployment rate here in Newfoundland less than that of Canada as a whole or less or even equal to Ontario or Alberta, Manitoba or Saskatchewan. This is not a problem that admits of easy solution. It might even be a problem that has no solution, if you want to be really truthful about it, Mr. Speaker. There may not be a solution. Newfoundland are not alone in this situation, the Maritime Provinces are in the same fix. There are other countries in the world in the same fix. It does not mean to say that we got to make every effort to overcome it.

Spain, Yugoslavia and many countries in Europe cannot employ their whole populations at home so that thousands and hundreds of thousands of Yugoslavs, for example, Spaniards and the rest work, Italians work in Germany and other parts of Western Europe and send money home each year. It is not just Newfoundland that has this problem. Scotland has the same problem. All

Mr. Crosbie

the Scotsmen cannot stay in Scotland and be gainfully employed in Scotland. They leave and go all over the world and a lot of them do very well. The same is true of Newfoundland. Every Newfoundlander cannot, is unable to stay in his own native province, many of them must go elsewhere to seek employment or to improve themselves and they do well. Naturally no government or no province or no country wants this to continue forever so you must do what you can to overcome it. It would be silly of this government or any government to pretend that this problem is going to be solved over-night or going to be solved in anyway but the very long run and perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if oil and gas are discovered off the coast, perhaps if we can get better use of further power that is developed in Labrador so that more of it is used in Newfoundland and Labrador, perhaps if a new development corporation works out or is helpful or it helps to create more employment here, that perhaps with the changes that we hope introduced will be helpful, Perhaps in five years time, six years, eight or ten, we will have unemployment rates and so on that will be more in line with the rest of Canada or even lower than the rest of the Maritime Provinces.

The minister's resolution points out the problem.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: I keep forgetting that the hon. member is not a minister any longer.

MR. NEARY: If the hon minister would send me over his salary -

MR. CROSBIE: I know what I would like to send over to the hon. gentleman. It would destroy the new spirit of pleasant co-operation in this House. The resolution is worth debating, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member raises the problem that is on everyone's mind that is in the government, and that is : What to do about the tremendous unemployment we have here in this province, what to do about the under-employment, what to do about the tremendous problem of able -bodied relief? We do not have to wear our hearts in our sleeves. The hon. member seems to arrogate to himself the right to be the only bleeding heart in this House and gets

up and says how his heart bleeds for the poor people who are unemployed and the rest of it. While over here other members are not supposed to care about that. I do not go around, Mr. Speaker, wearing my heart in my sleeve, if I have one, I do not go around saying my heart is bleeding for those who are unemployed and so on. But that does not mean to say I am not concerned about this problem, or the honourable gentlemen on this side of the House are not concerned about it, because if we were not concerned about it we would not be here.

MR. NEARY: (inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: A select committee would be a waste of our time. It is the job of this government to produce results whether they are special projects or not. The House cannot do it. There is a place for a select committees. Revise the rules, investigate any particular problem that needs investigation, but it cannot come up with a programme like that. As the honourable gentleman knows, his resolution is really for debating purposes not to have a select committee set up. If one were set up I would like to see how much work that committee would do once the House adjourns or even when the House is in session.

If the honourable gentleman has any special projects to suggest or any suggestions, he can give them to the honourable the Premier or myself or any member and we will certainly have them looked at. I just want to -

MR. NEARY: (inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: I forget - this is - look, by the way that reminds me. I was in England visiting my cousin and lo and behold, he had a cellar crammed full of mushrooms. He had more mushrooms in a barrel in his cellar, Mr. Speaker, he had there perfect mushrooms that he had grown in about three or four weeks. I asked him would he send me over the formula so I could send it on to the honourable gentleman.

MR. NEARY: Who paid for the trip to visit the honourable member's cousin? Was it the public treasury that paid for the trip?

MR. CROSBIE: The trip cost two pounds fifty-two pence. I paid it myself.

MR. NEARY: Did the public treasury pay for the trip to the honourable minister's cousin?

MR. CROSBIE: They sure paid for my trip to London and I came back and reimbursed them \$25 million. I am always willing to have my expense account scrutinized by the honourable member.

MR. NEARY: Well, maybe we will before this session is over.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, there are probably others who wish to speak to it so I just want to end up by reiterating again: If the federal government wants to help this province overcome its unemployment problems or help to alleviate it then it is time for the federal government to come clean and present us with a programme that helps us, not that embarrasses us financially and otherwise. Because that is all that their present programmes have done, is embarrass this province because they are not properly funding them, because they throw them at us quickly so that projects have to be approved, that do not have real priority. Because we have not the funds to match what they put up, they should not be asking us to match them. If they want to tackle the unemployment situation in Newfoundland and the less wealthy provinces of Canada they have to put up more of the funds.

All they are doing is saving themselves money. They get a temporary employment project going that saves them money. If the man is on welfare he gets fifty per cent under the Canada Pension Plan or the welfare plan (not the pension plan, Canada Assistance Plan.) If he is on unemployment insurance they pay one hundred per cent, if he is employed on a temporary employment programme it is not costing as much, certainly not as much as unemployment insurance. They say they will forgive you seventy-five per cent of the labour cost if it is all completed by June 1. It is malarkey. It is only because governments get caught with such bad unemployment problems that it is too embarrassing for them to say to the federal government what they should say to them when they come up with these programmes. I certainly hope that the Government of Canada this coming

year will be prepared to discuss this months ahead and will be prepared to put up some real money so they just do not embarrass us into engaging in a lot of some of the nonsensical projects that are not properly funded and where we have to forget our priorities and use the few dollars that we have to keep these things going. That is not right and I hope it will be changed. I certainly congratulate the honourable member on introducing the subject. He does not expect it to be passed because he knows a select committee cannot do this job properly. I am sure that he is not even going to vote for it himself, that the reasonable rational man he himself is, so turned by the thought, so turned by the thought of the select committee getting engaged in this dancing around the mushrooms that he himself will withdraw that suggestion and allow the resolution to die without a vote.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may have a few words in connection with this motion now before the House. The honourable the Minister of Economic Development has outlined in some detail the problems that are facing this province with respect to these so called year-round programmes, the special works that have been initiated by the Government of Canada. What I had expected the honourable member for Bell Island to refer to today without fear of embarrassment, without fear of embarrassing his colleagues in Ottawa, was a very simple fact that not all of our economic problems not all of our unemployment problems that we have in Newfoundland today can be attributed totally and completely to the geographic situation of this province or the fact that we do not have or do not enjoy the large concentration and density of population that you will find in Ontario and other places.

Because Mr. Speaker, we should never forget that one of the main reasons

MR. HICKMAN: why the Province of Newfoundland today is facing an unemployment, and has faced an unemployment situation that to say the least is staggering. It is because the hon. member for Bell Island's colleagues in Ottawa, with malice aforethought, and with cold ruthless calculation, made a policy decision a few years ago that in order to fight inflation in Canada, the Government of Canada had to deliberately and maliciously create unemployment in this nation and when that kind of policy, Mr. Speaker, emanates from Ottawa the province that suffers more than anyone else in any other province is the Province of Newfoundland.

It has been the failure in Ottawa to recognize that because of the cost of public services, because of the lack of training over the past on the part of Newfoundlanders, that this vicious policy is deliberately creating unemployment, will have a far more adverse affect on Newfoundland than any other province of Canada.

Last year when I was sitting on the opposite side of the House, we raised this question, Mr. Speaker. We suggested that the government of the day if they had any sensitivity toward the problem and any sensitivity toward the feelings of Newfoundlanders, they would put aside political partisanship and introduce in this House a resolution which would have had the unanimous endorsement of every member of this honourable House, condemning the Government of Canada for their ruthlessness in bringing in a policy that was designed to put Canadians and Newfoundlanders out of work. This is one of the problems, the policy of restricting investment capital.

The policy of bringing in a DREE programme and making all sorts of announcements, Mr. Speaker, and up jumped the hon. member for Bell Island and says, "Praise God, praise Pierre from whom all blessings blow." As of what a tremendous programme this is, these labour-intensive programmes, these great DREE programmes that never did reach Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. Programmes that were not designed to help small industry. Programmes that were not designed to help the service industries in this province. Programmes that were designed for parts of this nation that already are heavily industrialized. This is when we wanted to see the members of this House stand and be counted but it was not politically expedient to do it, Mr. Speaker.

Now we have a resolution before this honourable House, fraught with politics, meaningless because it cannot be enforced. Any half-wit knows Mr. Speaker, that a select committee of this House cannot cure the ills of unemployment, of course they cannot, Mr. Speaker. This is not what it is all about. This is why the government of the day went to the people of this province and said; "we want a change of direction, or

MR. HICKMAN: offer you a change of direction." This is why the people of this province responded so magnificently to that call. This is a problem that government will wrestle with and can wrestle with, it cannot find all the answers, but surely goodness, Mr. Speaker, if we can change the main thrust of industrial development in this province from huge capital sums that provide a few hundred jobs and get back to the promotion of the type of industry that is labour intensive and for which we have the resources to supply the raw material, then maybe we have started on the long hard road toward reducing unemployment. I have never heard any suggestion from hon. members on the opposite side or from the previous administration that we should make available a few million dollars per year now that the Kennedy round of tariffs have been relaxed so that we can get fish products in their final processed form into the United States at a competitive price, that by putting or making available to our fish plants a million or a million and a-half dollars that we can provide another two or three hundred permanent jobs.

That is the kind of job creation that I would hope to see and I am sure we will see from a government that is in tune with the needs of the province and a government that is not going to be carried away by spectacular announcements. Sure, Mr. Speaker, we have young, bright university students coming out of Memorial this year and coming out of other places who are facing some of the problems that other university students are now facing everywhere else in Canada.

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, again in our anxiety to promote the university, maybe we are suffering from the attitude of mind that has been created in the past few years toward our resource industry. Maybe we have not spent enough time in this Honourable House pointing out to young Newfoundlanders that if for instance they decide to go the route of the deep-sea fishery that they can join some of the other young Newfoundlanders in their early twenties whose income today is double that of the Ph.D. coming out of Memorial. We have glamorized

the university graduate and I suspect, Mr. Speaker, we have glamorized the university graduate at the expense of the highly educated and educated in a different sense, non-academic education of the young men today who are managing our deep-sea fleet off this coast.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of approach that I expect from this government. An approach that will say to Newfoundlanders "we have not all the answers. We are not prepared to come out with lip programmes that are so designed that you can get money to study the sex life of the lobster but you cannot get money, Mr. Speaker, to put into essential public works."

Because our young Newfoundlanders are too smart, Mr. Speaker, to be fooled by the so-called job creating programmes that are special in their nature but short in duration. This is not what we want. What we want, Mr. Speaker, suely, is a government that is prepared to encourage industry, to encourage Newfoundlanders, to encourage anyone. A government that is prepared to fight against the strong lobby that is developing in Ottawa today to restrict American investment in Canada which again will be done to the detriment of this province, who are prepared to say that we want all the investment capital that we can find coming into this province, that in Newfoundland you will find a friendly climate but we expect something in return. We expect not the kind of industry that will yield millions and millions to one or two investors. We do not expect and we will not encourage the kind of industry that provides two or three hundred jobs and jeopardizes the whole borrowing capacity of this province.

What we will do is encourage any Newfoundlander, any Canadian or anyone else who is prepared to come into this province and invest his money in developing

MR. HICKMAN

our resources which will guarantee not only a labor-intensive industry but will guarantee, Mr. Speaker, that there will be employment that is not special. It will guarantee that we will not have jobs made for a couple of months and then disappear but jobs that will keep our people in this province. A select committee, Mr. Speaker - If the motion were put on the order paper for the purpose of indicating to the people of Newfoundland that we now have a House of Assembly and members on both sides who are concerned about this problem, then the motion was well-worth debating and well-worth putting on the order paper. If the motion were put on for the purpose of creating and appointing a special committee which will result in procrastination and once again arousing the expectations of some Newfoundlanders, then, Mr. Speaker that is not the kind of motion I am prepared to vote for.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to remind the hon. gentleman if he speaks, he closes the debate.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to put the mind of the hon. member who just spoke in this House at ease. I hope that in doing so, he will vote in favour of this resolution because it was not, Mr. Speaker, my intention when I brought this resolution into this honourable House to bring it in just for the sake of debate. It was a genuine and sincere attempt on my part, Mr. Speaker, and on the part of my colleagues on this side of the House to take constructive steps to look into the matter of job creation for those people in Newfoundland and Labrador who are unemployed through no fault of their own. It was a sincere attempt on my part, Mr. Speaker to have a select committee of this honourable House established to investigate and report on the feasibility of year-around provincial and federal make-work projects.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in my introduction of this resolution, I thought that I had convinced even the corporation lawyers in this House of the need for the province to take the initiative in this matter. The hon. Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, in his remarks criticized the Government of

Mr. Neary

Canada for implementing the opportunities for youth programmes and the local incentive programmes that we had this winter, "completely irresponsible" is what he said. "The province had to help finance the projects". Mr. Speaker this is precisely one of the reasons why this resolution was brought into this honourable House so that the province could take the initiative and that we could go to Ottawa and we could ask for the type of special work projects that we wanted in this province and propose a formula of how we wanted these projects paid for, whether it was on a ninety/ten basis or on a fifty/fifty basis as is done now under the Canada Assistance Plan or some other formula that would be agreeable to the province and to the Government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that hon. members on the opposite side of the House missed the point completely. I acknowledged the fact, Mr. Speaker, in my opening remarks that both medium, small and large industries want to increase their productivity. They do it with machines because they want to increase their profits. They also want to reduce their costs. But, Mr. Speaker, the number of labor-intensive industries that are left in this world today, you can count on the fingers of one hand, I doubt if there is one. I doubt if there is one hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House who can think of one industry today that is labor-intensive. It is not highly

MR. NEARY:

mechanized and automated and using machines. Mr. Speaker, the honourable members can scoff all they like at this resolution and about the unfortunate people. They can scoff at the unfortunate people in this province who are unemployed through no fault of their own. We are not all well-to-do people in this province. Mr. Speaker, we cannot go across to England on government business and take our families over and visit our cousins and see how they grow mushrooms in their cousin's basements in England.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the honourable member if he would only just use a little imagination and use his creative mind just to see what recreation facilities are needed in this province, how we need enclosed swimming pools and how we need gymnasiums and curling clubs and stadiums, Mr. Speaker, because we all cannot afford when we feel like it to take our children and bring them down South and let them swim in the swimming pools in Florida or go to Bermuda or go over to Spain.

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable minister is trying to be funny but this is a pretty serious matter. It is a pretty serious matter, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member was throwing out figures right, left and center about the number of people that were in the work force and that were entering the work force, well let me enlighten the honourable member by giving him a few figures, Mr. Speaker, that I checked out only a day or two ago with Statistics Canada. These figures are over a ten year period from February 1961 up to February 1971 and I will only give the figures for three major categories. The honourable member was talking about discovery of gas and oil on the Continental Shelf and all the jobs it would create, hogwash, balderdash, Mr. Speaker. Let me tell the honourable gentle-

MR. NEARY:

man how many people were employed in gas and oil a year ago February past. Gas and oil, Mr. Speaker, ten years ago 103,400 people were employed in gas and oil and this is the big thing today, gas and oil, the big industry.

You know, Mr. Speaker, ten years later how many people were employed in gas and oil, 129,800 for a gain of 26,000. Twenty-six thousand in the whole of Canada, Sir, and the honourable member thinks this is going to be the great salvation of the unemployment in Newfoundland. Gas and oil, Mr. Speaker, as any idiot knows, is highly mechanized. They use all the latest technology.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I explained Come by Chance in my remarks when I introduced the resolution. Come by Chance is necessary. We need industrial development in this province but we have to distinguish industrial development from economic development. We need Come by Chance to increase our gross provincial product and we need all sorts of other industries to increase our gross provincial product.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, do the honourable member wish to adjourn the debate now as it is six o'clock.

MR. ROBERTS: We do not have to adjourn it, we can always let it stand.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that it is six o'clock and I would like to adjourn the debate.

On motion debate on the resolution adjourned.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do adjourn and stand adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at three o'clock in the afternoon but just before I do I would like to point out to the opposition, members of the opposition and to the House that the order of business tomorrow will be we will have second reading of orders number two to sixteen appearing on today's order paper and

MR. MARSHALL:

we will also very likely have second reading of orders number twenty-three, twenty-four, twenty-five and twenty-six as well and then we will proceed to the Address in Reply.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, at three o'clock.

On motion the House at its rising adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, April 27, 3:00 P.M.