



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume 1

1st. Session

Number 76

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 2, 1976

SPEAKER; THE HONOURABLE GERALD RYAN OTTENHEIMER

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. T. V. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I could say, "At ease everybody.

"Settle down!" There are a couple of statements, Sir, I want to first of all inform the House of the latest on Newfoundland's goodwill Ambassador abroad, the Norma and Gladys.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: I have a report which I will go through very quickly, a brief report. The vessel arrived in St. Malo, France May 14 and left on the 16th. Among the functions that were sponsored, the press conferences, dinners and all of that - the important thing, Mr. Speaker, of May 16 a television crew boarded the vessel for a journey to Amsterdam. The result was a thirty minute film concerning the Law of the Sea featuring the Norma and Gladys. This film was shown on Dutch television May 25. A copy of this film is being forwarded to the Department of Tourism. Something more than 4,000 visitors during the two day visit to St. Malo. Amsterdam it arrived on May 20, it departed May 23. And the same with regard to press conferences and luncheons, and the rest by the dignitaries. News coverage was exceptional in Holland, television, radio and newspapers. A German television photographer joined the vessel in Amsterdam for a voyage to Hamburg. Approximately 5,000 people visited the vessel in Amsterdam.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: It arrived in Hamburg on May 25, and departed May 30. And the usual receptions and press conferences were held there. May 29 a film taken by a German photographer who boarded the vessel in Amsterdam shown on national German television, approximately eight minutes, exclusive Norma and Gladys, an exceptionally fine film, a copy being forwarded to the Department of Tourism. News

Mr. Hickey:

coverage was excellent in Hamburg, television, radio and newspapers. And, Mr. Speaker, I think this is the important thing, the people who were visiting the vessel increased from port to port. Somewhere between 10,000 to 12,000 people visited the vessel in Hamburg.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement -

AN HON. MEMBER: Fabulous!

MR. HICKEY: - to make on the black bear hunting season -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You sit down first and let them respond to your first statement. Do you want to respond to that?

MR. HICKEY: - for the benefit of my friend from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) especially people in Labrador.

MR. SIMMONS: Want to let us respond to the first one first?

AN HON. MEMBER: They want to respond to the first one.

MR. HICKEY: Oh, I see, I did not think that anybody would want to respond to that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I do not think we ought to let this opportunity pass without responding to the good news that the minister brings us about the continuing saga of the Norma and Gladys and "Tom". It is good that the Norma and Gladys at least is still above water. And the minister is in fine form today, and it is good to see him very much above water.

The news is good, the news that the Norma and Gladys continues to spread goodwill on behalf of the country and the Province I would think. One question comes to mind, and it really rises out of my own lack of knowledge of the details of the undertaking, and the minister is certainly familiar with it I am sure. What kind - apart from the obvious identity of the boat with Newfoundland in the minds of the people who visit - what kind of promotional endeavour is being done from a tourist standpoint, if any? Is there any direct effort being made to attract the German, the Dutch, the French tourist who think about visiting here, or is that not part of the

Mr. Simmons:

assignment? Would the minister care to respond to that? Otherwise I would like on behalf of my colleagues to thank him for his updating us from time to time, and I share the enthusiasm which he has exhibited again today. I think it is a tremendous idea. We have had comments about some of the details, but the overall idea of having a goodwill ambassador aboard, one which so represents our marine tradition. I have always felt it a good idea, and I am delighted to hear it is meeting with such a tremendous response in the various ports that he has mentioned, St. Malo, and Hamburg and the others today.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, may I just respond briefly to the comment by the hon. gentleman. There is little or no promotion from a tourism point of view done in Europe, certainly not by way of expenditures of funds from this Province. Of course, wherever the vessel goes the Federal Department of External Affairs, the Federal Government issues brochures of the vessel, which is almost total Newfoundland with the exception of the issue of the 200 mile limit in the Law of the Sea. But there is no doubt about the effects and the educating of the people, wherever the vessel goes, with regards to this Province. Pins of the Province are issued, and that is where we get our count of the people who visit; posters on the vessel, but apart from that that is about it, with the exception of luncheons which are provided for by the External Affairs Department, and even then those are to specific groups and dignitaries and that kind of thing. The main promotion from a tourism point of view that we will make will be in Great Britain when the vessel arrives there before she leaves for the crossing to come back to Newfoundland. And, of course, prior to going to Europe we did extensive promotion from a tourism point of view along the Eastern Seaboard, New York and Boston.

MR. ROBERTS: What about the museum, "Tom"?

MR. HICKEY: Well naturally, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the vessel is in itself a floating museum is an obvious promotion of Newfoundland. But, of course, everything about the vessel is Newfoundland, and from that point of view it is not costing us. But what I was referring to especially in response to the hon. gentleman was special efforts costing the Province and so on. And my answer to that is really none.

MR. SIMMONS: The minister mentioned brochures made available.

MR. SIMMONS:

Could the members of the House see copies of these, or have copies just to get an idea of what is being handed out abroad?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did the minister say she is going to put into some Irish port on the way back?

AN HON. MEMBER: Not the Republic I will wager.

MR. HICKEY: No, Mr. Speaker. She crosses to London, Bristol and probably one other port in England, but not to Ireland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, but she has got to come back across the Atlantic. Why not put into Waterford or some seaport.

MR. HICKEY: We wish to get her back, Mr. Speaker. The plan is to -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes but not that anxious. Is it too late to change it?

MR. HICKEY: No, I suppose not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, put her into Ireland for one port.

MR. HICKEY: That is a matter that certainly can be considered, Mr. Speaker. With regards to the question posed by my hon. friend, certainly I will make a brochure available. I do not have a great supply of them, but I am sure I can come up with half a dozen. They were put out by the federal government and I will be glad to make them available.

MR. PECKFORD: Another statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, with regards to the black bear or the black bears. When I informed this House of the 1976 big game licensing system I made no reference to the black bear hunting season. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that there will be no black bear hunting on the Island part of the Province this year. During the next several months the black bear hunting data of the last several seasons will be reviewed and a new policy will be developed with respect to the hunting of this species. In recent years - and especially in 1974-1975 - the sale of black bear licenses increased significantly. At the same time, however, the kill of black

MR. WICKEY:

bears remained virtually constant. The reported kill has been in the vicinity of thirty animals annually while the estimated harvest, making allowance for non-residents, had not exceeded 100 animals.

In 1974-1975 the number of black bear hunting licenses sold exceeded 4,000. In 1966 just more than 500 black bear hunting licenses were sold and the reported kill was thirty-five animals. That year the adjusted kill figure, allowing for non-residents, was sixty animals. This data suggests, Mr. Speaker, that black bear hunting licenses are not being purchased for black bear hunting. Other big game hunters allege - and they may be correct - that individuals purchase black bear licenses so that they can carry fire arms to help their hunting partners who have moose or caribou hunting licenses. I might add here that moose and caribou harvest, population data, do not show evidence of over harvesting. But I must acknowledge that this use of the black bear hunting license might contribute to over-harvest if it is permitted to continue.

As I have indicated above, Mr. Speaker, the black bear hunting season will be thoroughly assessed during the next several months. I anticipate there will be a black bear hunting season again in 1977, but under totally new rules. I also want to inform the House at this time that there will be a black bear hunting season this year in Labrador. The Labrador black bear hunting season will be similar to those of 1975. Residents of Labrador take black bear annually for meat and for the hide, as well as for recreation purposes. The black bear hunting season in Labrador is as follows: In the Northern zone, essentially the Northern coastal areas, the open season will be June 7 to October 30. The Eastern zone, essentially the Southern coastal area, South of Hamilton Inlet, the open season will be June 7 to June 30 and September 6 to October 30. The Central zone, essentially the area surrounding Goose Bay-Happy Valley and Northwest River, open season will be June 9 to June 30 and September 6 to October 30. In the Western zone, the area from Churchill Falls west to Labrador City but excluding the area around Ashuanipi and Shabogamo Lakes, June 7

MR. HICKEY:

to June 30 and September 6 to October 30.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What was that the last word?

MR. HICKEY: Shabogamo. That is close to Outer Cove.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this clears up any fear of residents of Labrador who attach some significance to the black bear hunting in the Province, I hope that those fears are put at rest today.

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

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Labrador and the coastal people of the district I represent, and myself included since every year in the Spring I usually obtain black bear for meat, we welcome the news. I have explained before that Labrador coastal people especially obtain black bear meat at a time of the year when they cannot obtain other types of meat, especially the Spring of the year.

I notice the season is open from June 7 to October 30. I should indicate that generally on the Labrador coast people only hunt the black bear at the end of May, beginning of June. The latest one would hunt black bear on the coast for meat purposes would be June 30 or the first week in July and no one hunts black bear again until well into September or October. The reason why the July and August period the black bear is not hunted is because, first of all, as they say there, the animal is too ugly to kill. The hide is too poor. It has got no value at all. And secondly, when the black bear leaves the ice and starts to feed on the beaches and starts to feed on sculpins and caplin and so on, the meat then becomes very strongly fishy and he loses the earlier meat taste he has in the Spring of the year. In the Fall of the year he goes on berries and when he is on berries the meat is very sweet. But during that big block during the Summer he is not hunted. So maybe possibly in future one may consider extending the season earlier and closing it during the Summer because nobody kills them anyway, and open it again in the Fall.

MR. STRACHAN:

The other point I would like to make is that we did bring this up a couple of weeks ago and, as I understand, there was some confusion about the black bear hunting. ~~many~~ families have already left for outside places on the Labrador coast, places in which they have no radio or no news. Many families have left on the last ice. The last ice in around Hopedale is now very bad. Davis Inlet and Nain is getting that way. So many families are at the outside places where they will kill black bear and, as is often the case, they may start to hide the skins or destroy the skins, eat the meat and destroy the skins and not bring them back in because they do not know and, as far as they understood there was a ban on killing black bear.

The black bear skin reaches a value of \$100 to \$120 to \$150 a skin. So in essence they are throwing away a fair monetary value to especially someone who is living off the land or hunting off the land. So possibly maybe in the future we should think of maybe an earlier time in considering these kinds of things so that people will know before they leave outside the village and outside the communications, before they leave what is going to occur as far as hunting black bear is concerned.

I would also just like -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Besides the black bear and besides the polar bear are there any other bears down there?

MR. STRACHAN: No; the only bears are black bear and polar bear. The white bear or polar bear is banned totally from being killed. Occasionally a hunter does get one, only in a case where a polar bear may come at his boat which quite often happens during the ice flow season. But very, very occasionally, very rarely and generally they report it to the RCMP when it does occur. I have only known of two cases since 1971. As far as any other bear is concerned, the only other bear is a barren land bear some of which move over from the Hudson Bay area into the barren lands off Quebec. But it certainly does not bother us. It is not a bear we use commercially.

MR. STRACHAN:

I would like to indicate one other point that people will be - and I can tell you now - will be breaking the law. They will be killing geese and ducks. They will be killing other food stuffs for which they may be arrested and they will be doing it if they are living in outside places. And they are now concerned greatly as they have started digging holes and hiding the bones now whereas before they did not care very much. So I think the whole aspect of the Wildlife Act-and the black bear is only one aspect of it - needs to be revised and reviewed. Again I would like to stress to the minister that I would think a committee maybe should be set up, or his department set up a committee to discuss the Act as it applies to areas like that, where people still do live off the land.

I myself, if there were

Mr. Strachan.

restrictions against myself for killing black bear, I would accept that quite happily. I have sufficient money that I can buy meat, but many other families do not. And I make differentiation here between a sports hunter, which I would be, even though I do do it for meat as well, but I am essentially a sports hunter, and people who kill animals for meat, because they need it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, if I can just provide some information for my hon. friend and suggest that I would be more than happy to get together with him to discuss it further. I certainly agree with him that there is a need for more appropriate application, I suppose, of the Wild Life Act to certain Labrador residents. And I want to say to him that I am more than willing to sit down with him to discuss those areas. I want to suggest to him, too, and first of all to advise him that there is an advisory board established. I do not believe it is functioning. I do not believe it has met yet. But at least that part of it has been attended to. And maybe he would like to get together with me, and we can discuss the issue as to when it should meet or might meet, and present before it, or have the people make representation to the board so that they indeed can let us know exactly what they would like to see happen in Labrador. I certainly agree with him that there is a problem with regards to understanding the Wild Life Act; and I have told him, I believe earlier, that I have taken steps, and I have informed my staff that I want the Wildlife Act made available. I want it also made available in their language appropriate to the areas of Labrador so that indeed they will understand. Because I agree that if there is a language barrier then certainly there is a strong case against punishing people for breaking the law that they indeed do not understand.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition signed by thirty-seven residents of the community of Purbeck's Cove in my district. I would think, Sir, or I am almost sure, that thirty-seven residents is every man and woman in the community of Purbeck's Cove. It is a very small community, one of the smallest in the district.

And the prayer of the petition, Sir, is that something be done within the very near future to upgrade the mile and one-half of road between Westport and Purbeck's Cove. Now they are not asking for a major reconstruction job or a major paving job or anything of that nature. It is a very short piece of road, but, Sir, it is a very treacherous piece. It runs along the hillside. I do not know if any members have been over there or not. It runs totally along the side of a hill. It is cut into the side of a hill and consequently with the drainage, the natural drainage from the hill and so on the road, every Spring washes out and it is, therefore, in very poor driving conditions, and in fact it is very hazardous. A small school bus takes the children over that road into Westport every day, and, of course, the rest of the people have to use it also. It is not much money we are talking about. It is not a major job. It is just some repair work be done to ensure that that road is put in a safe and proper driving condition during this Summer.

So, Sir, I present the petition on their behalf. I ask that it be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like just to say a word of support to the petition presented by my friend and colleague from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout). The community of Purbeck's Cove is one that I am quite familiar with, it having been in my school

Mr. Simmons.

district during my period in the Green Bay school district. Purbeck's Cove is a small community. As the member said, thirty-seven signatures would represent just about every adult person in the community. The community is just less than two miles from Westport, but it is connected to Westport by a very treacherous road, particularly during run-off periods, and where you have a run-off during the day and some cooling off at night you can have a pretty hazardous condition. This time of the year I would imagine it is pretty soft, pretty mucky. As the member has mentioned the younger element in the community depend on the road for school bus transportation on a daily basis. All the residents depend on the road to get to Westport for shopping reasons, and to Baie Verte for health and business reasons generally. Some of them commute indeed to Baie Verte for job reasons. So it is a vital road link. It is a road that to my knowledge nothing has been done about in a number of years. And the cost would certainly be minimal, but the need is fairly urgent, and I have much pleasure in giving support to the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition from approximately 250 people who are employees in my constituency of Kilbride, who are employees of the Waterford Hospital. And I will read the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, because it is very short. And it says, "We the undersigned request that during the sitting of the House of Assembly that the members of the said House enact or amend legislation to provide those employees of NAPE Unit 6901, Waterford Hospital, who have continuous patient contact, with a pension plan comparable to that of the warders at Her Majesty's Penitentiary. We feel that we are working under great risk to our physical and mental health just as the warders are, if not more so in our case." Then the signatures follow.

MR. WELLS:

This petition, Mr. Speaker, arises out of a matter of concern which has been a matter of concern in the Waterford Hospital among those employees who have to deal directly with mentally ill patients. And this has been on the go in the sense of concern and asking for extra pay, etc. for that reason for some time. Now it is a subject that generates strong feelings. There is a certain school of thought that feels that this sort of work does not justify increased pay or pensions or anything else. But on the other hand, those who have experience of this type of work point out - and I think, Mr. Speaker, point out with considerable clarity - that it does impose a strain. It is not a physical strain all the time. Occasionally it can be very physical, but usually it is a mental strain or an emotional strain which, I think, we would have to agree exists there to a much greater extent than if you were working in a shop or an office or certainly in Confederation Building or something like that. So there is no question: Caring for sick people is onerous at the best of times, and caring for mentally ill people does impose certain strains and stresses which, as I say, are not common in most occupations or walks of life.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have explained to a representative of NAPE Unit 6901 to whom I spoke earlier this afternoon that I would present this petition. I explained to the representative also, and I will be seeing them later, explained that things like alterations to the Pensions Act have got to be discussed at the Treasury Board level and the Department of Finance level, and government has to take advice on such matters from actuaries and people who are involved in financial advice on pensions, because pensions in the Civil Service, and in related public enterprises such as hospitals, there is a lot of meshing that has to be done, and to consider this or do anything with it government would have to consider and take advice on the warders of the penitentiary and other related classifications within the public service generally. It is not something that can be done

MR. WELLS.

in a matter of four or five days or even two or three weeks. But it something that we recognize, Mr. Speaker, is deserving a very careful consideration, I certainly give my assurance to these constituents who have presented this petition that I will immediately ask the House to refer the petition to the Department of Finance and to the Treasury Board for study and advice, and that their advice may in turn be given to the government, and that we can accept representations from the employees themselves or anybody representing them and that in due course, Mr. Speaker, a satisfactory result be achieved.

So I have pleasure in bringing this petition to the House, Mr. Speaker, and placing it on the table and asking that it be referred to the appropriate department.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me say a word or two in support of the petition which the member for Kilbride just presented to the House. I think the request of the petitioners is one which should be studied and I agree with the procedure suggested by the hon. gentleman, the member for Kilbride District (Mr. Wells).

The question is not a new one. I would hazard the guess that it has been on the go now for ten or fifteen years really in one form or another and as I understood what the minister said, not having the chance, of course, of seeing the petition as yet, the concern of these attendants and staff members at the hospital is that they are in contact—and I do not like using that noun as a verb, but for this purpose let us do it— they are in contact with the patients at the hospital who in many cases are dangerous, and that is one of the reasons why these particular patients are confined to the Waterford Hospital. And some of the patients at the Waterford Hospital of course are there not under operation of the Mental Health Act, an Act that is a medical act and that provides that when people require medical treatment they either seek it voluntarily or they can be made to seek it by the procedure set out in that Act, but some of them are there either before trial, remanded for a period of time, or after a trial and held there at the Lieutenant-Governor's pleasure. You know, there is a legal process and there are reviews on it, but these people are there, some of them for quite long periods, some of them, I would venture to say, will be there for the rest of their natural lives, no fault of their own but they just cannot be allowed to circulate freely in society again. And the attendants at the hospital, the nursing assistants are in constant daily communication with these people because they work with them every day looking after them and doing their job in the hospital.

So the matter has often come up. When I was Minister

MR. ROBERTS: of Health the matter was reviewed. I remember meeting a number of delegations and representations were made, and the attendants at the hospital feel, I think with a considerable degree of reason, that they are exposed in many ways to duty that is no less hazardous than that to which our policemen are exposed or our firemen are exposed, and in fact it has often been said to me by representatives of these particular employees that their duties are more hazardous than the average duty of a policeman. I remember once a man saying with some heat that he would rather be walking up and down Water Street or Duckworth Street passing out tickets than he would be in what was then the old Justice Ward, the old 3C Ward in on the back of what was then known as the Hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases, where you had ten or fifteen men, some of whom had committed, I do not know if they committed murder, that is a legal definition, but had killed, had taken life, and lacked the degree of mental ability to be able to control themselves and quite conceivably could take life again. These men of course are under the regular Civil Service Pension Plan, just like the secretaries in this building or the employees of other government services, while the police and the firemen have a different pension plan, a recognition of their services, of the different types of activity which they do in their work, and the police and firemen's pension scheme is much more generous. It allows a much earlier retirement and it provides different and more generous benefits because of the peculiar and particular nature of their work.

These attendants at the Mental Hospital or the Waterford Hospital feel that they deserve similar treatment. Obviously it is a matter that should be studied carefully because there are precedents and there are many ramifications that must be looked into and I would think the Minister of Finance is extremely reluctant to have the pension plan opened, the whole question of pensions which I believe NAPE wished to make a matter of negotiations and which at present is not a negotiable matter, is a matter which I am sure the Minister of Finance and his officials

MR. ROBERTS: and the Treasury Board staff feel is a very attractive green field but sown with mines and great danger to those who do not walk warily across that field.

But I think these men have a case. I think the minister is doing the right thing to refer the matter to the appropriate members of the Public Service to ask them to study it and to advise the Cabinet. I hope a way can be found around it. It has gone on for many years now. The need is there. The need if anything is greater than ever because we now have much better legislation in the mental health field, much more advanced, and I believe the need must be met. So I hope this petition will see the granting of that need. I hope the process which was begun here today will lead to the recognition of the need and the granting of it. We support the petition, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to add my support to this petition. A lot has already been said on it by the House Leader and the Leader of the Opposition but the words that strike me in the petition, Mr. Speaker, are the words, "We feel that we are working under great risk to our physical and mental health."

Now if anybody saw the movie, "One Flew Over The Cuckoo's Nest," which I happened to see, I think they would certainly give their full support to this petition and for this and for other reasons I lend my full support to this petition.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear! Hear! Hear! Hear!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answers to question nos. 424 and 425, asked by the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), that were first asked to - they were asked to the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications but they did not

MR. PECKFORD: come under his department so they were sent to me for reply. And then question no. 476, asked by the hon. member for Port de Grave.

Question 424 concerned the definition of a protected road, question 425 asked how many protected roads there were in the Province and what was the total mileage. The former answer is 26 and the latter is 1,373. And the question asked by the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Dawe), which might be of interest to all hon. members of the House, had to do with the statement showing the grand total capital sum expended on the Shea Heights Municipal and Housing project, number of miles of new streets built, number of miles of paving done, the number of units provided with water and sewerage facilities and the sources of the said capital. And the answer was the total amount spent on Shea Heights was \$7,897,659 for the installation of municipal services, the construction and paving of approximately five miles of streets and providing water and sewer facilities within three feet of approximately 250 homes and other related expenses. In addition sixty-eight subsidized rental housing units were constructed at a cost of \$1,788,000 -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that over the seven point something?

MR. PECKFORD: Yes. Of this amount the provincial share was \$444,000 of the \$1.7 million and the federal was the balance which was \$1.3 million. Of course the ongoing subsidized rental costs are shared also fifty-fifty with the federal government and the provincial government, so it is an ongoing operational cost on the subsidization of the rents. So I am pleased to table the answers to these questions, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It brings it up to around \$9 million, does it not? It seems to be a lot of value for \$9 million.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table answers to questions no. 610, asked by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), 621 by the member for Fogo (Captain Winsor), again question no. 754 on the Order Paper in the name of the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to answer question 442, as placed on the Order Paper by the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood). The question was with reference to the work and plans of this government to build aircraft landing strips around the Province and our intentions for the future in this regard.

The situation is, Mr. Speaker, that this year there will be a new airstrip constructed at Cartwright and that is a contract now let - \$440,000-and for the first time we were successful this year in obtaining financial input from the federal government, under

Mr. Morgan.

a programme that assists in the construction of airstrips in remote parts of our country, mainly in the Northern regions. So, therefore, we have now requested assistance for the construction of an airstrip at Makkovik, at Mary's Harbour and Nain. So in my recent negotiations with the hon. Otto Lang in Ottawa, he indicated that there is a strong possibility that additional funds will be forthcoming for these strips in Labrador. This leads us to go on for additional assistance if at all possible to obtain same, so we are now requesting to obtain assistance for the construction of an airstrip at Burgeo, in the hon. gentleman's district. That is a priority with the department at this time. So hopefully if the federal government will co-operate financially, we will carry on with the programme we have now commenced.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did not the federal government help at Deer Lake and St. Anthony, at least, and maybe others? Did they not?

MR. MORGAN: No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They did at Deer Lake.

And they did at St. Anthony.

MR. MORGAN: For the hon. gentleman's information the federal government has been participating financially in the construction of airstrips in other provinces but not Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Deer Lake and St. Anthony, at least two, at least. I believe they did Winterland.

MR. MORGAN: No, not Winterland. That was strictly ours. Bonavista, St. Alban's, all ours.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer a question that was asked by my friend, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) some days ago with regards to advertising of the Province, and with reference to the omission of the word 'Labrador'. I want to confirm for him what I advised him that day that I felt sure it was an error, and I can now confirm that it was.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: I have instructed my staff to contact the agency and to ensure that it does not happen again.

MR. ROBERTS: What is the agency? Is it McConnell?

MR. HICKEY: McConnell.

I want to assure my hon. friend further, Mr. Speaker, that not only are we strong in the position of promoting or using the word 'Labrador' in promotion, but indeed we promote Labrador specifically in terms of certain areas such as the film Ocean Heritage with regards to the Torngat Mountains, the Moravian Missions, with regards to the film on architecture, and in many other areas. Those films, Mr. Speaker, are being circulated through the United States. And our efforts have been accelerated and will continue to accelerate with regards to promoting Labrador in future, because we do believe, and certainly agree, that it has a fantastic potential. And as facilities become available, we will certainly be increasing our efforts in terms of promotion.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, earlier in the week I undertook for the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) - it was in response to a question about two stadiums, one the stadium at Whitbourne, and the other at Placentia.

MR. CALLAN: Was that Placentia?

MR. WELLS: Placentia. Well, Whitbourne as well, because I was going to tell him first that I have the information now on Whitbourne, and that I have not had much of a chance this last day or so to pursue it in the office, but I will have the information on Placentia tomorrow. But Whitbourne, I have the file here, and everything in Whitbourne is going along insofar as the government is concerned in a normal fashion, and I am looking at a letter of this Spring in which Mr. Fred Squires, the town manager, was sent a cheque from the Province in the amount of \$60,000 representing the second installment due on the \$300,000 commitment given under the Recreation Capital Grant Programme for an indoor ice arena.

MR. WELLS.

The government owes the town of Whitbourne a further \$180,000 under this commitment, and the letter stated that the funds will be forthcoming in three installments of \$60,000 each over the next three fiscal years. And the same letter the government asked for a receipt and a report on construction. So that is the situation at Whitbourne, and I will have the Placentia update tomorrow.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. E. M. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. We are all very pleased that he has ordered the city police to launch crackdowns on vandals, in particular in light of the quite disgusting incident which occurred over at Hillview Terrace Apartments Tuesday evening, or overnight Tuesday-Wednesday. Could the minister be a little bit more specific though as to exactly what steps are going to be taken? It is all very well to issue an order, and that is right and proper and appropriate and necessary and desirable, and somewhat belated because the minister often told us vandalism was not a problem in this city. But could he tell us exactly what steps are going to be taken or is this just another cosmetic move?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

HON. T. A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, you know the hon. gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition, should pay more attention to what goes on around him. Last year the Newfoundland Constabulary implemented what is known as the booster shift which was designed primarily to try and curb vandalism which is a senseless crime that plagues every Canadian city. The results - and most of the acts of vandalism, so statistics show, occur during when the snow is not on the grounds -

MR. ROBERTS: It is easier to get around when there is no snow on the grounds.

MR. HICKMAN: It is easier to get around. The result of this very scientific and intensive policing of hot spots around the city had a very satisfactory affect with respect to vandalism in the city of St. John's. I have never said that there is not vandalism in the city of St. John's. I have said, and I repeat, that the rate of increase of vandalism in St. John's is below that of any Canadian city. That does not mean that is good enough.

What the police will be doing-not only for this particular area where there were these senseless acts of vandalism the night before last- but again the booster shift will be moving to these trouble spots, and there is no question that they have had -

MR. ROBERTS: So you are reintroducing the same plan we had last Winter.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes. In fact it never really died out; you know, it was always available whenever it was needed, but the need is greater in the Summer than in the Winter. You know, the men agreed to this last year. The second thing is that we do have two men patrol cars during that time of the evening, and they too are instructed to pay more attention to particular areas of the city where trouble is likely to break out.

But while I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, there is another point in answering this question I should like to bring to the attention of the hon. House. A lot of these offences, particularly offenses of vandalism against public property are -

MR. ROBERTS: But these are private properties now.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, - against private property are occurring on private property, a private parking area such as a large apartment building or a mall which is put there, owned by the proprietor, for which under many leases they charge an additional rent for parking space.

MR. ROBERTS: And they clear their own snow. I mean, it is like your driveway.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right. Now it is not the responsibility of the police, nor should the police ever be required to start patrolling private property, in the sense of going in and walking up and down private parking places. And I wonder aloud as to why these larger establishments do not have at least adequate security and/or watchman service.

MR. ROBERTS: You mean hiring Metropolitan or one of those?

MR. HICKMAN: Or even a night watchman may be sufficient to see something happening to summon the police, because the police can be summoned at night to any part of the city of St. John's very quickly. And I often hear statements that would indicate that the public feel, for instance, that the police should parade up and down the Avalon Mall. The Avalon Mall is not a public thoroughfare.

MR. ROBERTS: It is a commercial venture.

MR. HICKMAN: It is a quasi public thoroughfare in the sense that the owners invite people to come in. But if we put policemen in the Avalon Mall, the proprietors of Bowring's would have an absolute right to say we want a policeman walking through the aisles of our shop every day too because people go from Water Street to Duckworth Street via our store.

MR. ROBERTS: It is interesting to see how you get from Water Street to Duckworth Street through Bowring's, come to think of it.

MR. HICKMAN: I mean - no, the Waterfront and Water Street.

Mr. Speaker, I can only ask the Chief of Police, and he has assured me that

MR. HICKMAN: remedial action has been implemented in the hope we can apprehend, and apprehension seems to be the key word here and -

MR. ROBERTS: Certainty of apprehension is the key.

MR. HICKMAN: If there is certainty of apprehension, that is right, and adequate sentencing that will act as a deterrent to those who may in the future decide to commit these rather senseless acts of vandalism.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, arising out of the same question, obviously; could the minister tell us whether any additional members will be taken into the Constabulary to enable them to provide for this extra service? If not from whence do the men come because the men have obviously been fully employed all Winter long. You know, we do not have spare policemen sitting around in St. John's awaiting the coming of Summer and the need for booster patrols. So if extra men are not to be hired, if extra constables are not to be recruited and trained and put in the field, from whence do these constables come? In other words, our other areas, our other types of activity either seasonal, and the demand is less in this season, or will they have less adequate policing than they have heretofore.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is not proposed to add to the 215 men who are now officers and men now in the Newfoundland Constabulary. Last year the booster shift was taken from that same number of 215 men by an adjustment of the shift schedules because during the daylight hours there is not the same problem with offences as you find in the evening.

The other thing that we have been doing and I would hope, I guess I am being a bit premature on this, that we would hope to be able to relieve the police of a lot of their duties of serving summonses

MR. HICKMAN: which takes up hundreds and hundreds of man-hours in the run of a year, and the third thing is that we are actively negotiating at this type to try and provide alternate security measures for Government House where we have been tying up four policemen, maybe five.

MR. ROBERTS: It would be a shame though. I mean -

MR. HICKMAN: Well security is - this is the only one of the Government Houses and His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor is very amenable to this -

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I am sure His Honour would be but still it would be a shame to end the tradition. I am sure as long as the -

MR. HICKMAN: Well it is an expensive tradition.

MR. ROBERTS: Well most traditions are.

MR. HICKMAN: I suppose.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: He is going to keep the place in an uproar about traditions.

MR. ROBERTS: I am glad the hon. gentleman has returned with a ray of sunshine and good cheer, Sir.

MR. YOUNG: Why do you not see if you can get Upper Island Cove?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Justice; could he tell us whether negotiations are underway to remove from the police the onerous duty of passing out parking tickets and having that duty carried out by auxiliary forces of some sort quite capable to do the necessary work but freeing up the highly trained Constabulary members for, shall we say, duties that only they can perform.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, we have had some studies done into that field and, number one, the actual issuance of tickets is not a time-consuming part of a policeman's function, or the performance of his duties. That is not the answer to the problem; the answer to

MR. HICKMAN: the problem, and I believe we may have found it, is the service of the summonses because here is the way it works; a motorist gets a \$2.00 parking ticket or whatever it is, on Water Street and he comes out and he looks at it and he puts it in his pocket and he forgets all about it, or he says it is cheap parking anyway and he does not pay it. So eventually this turns up into whatever control system they have at the Traffic Court, A summons is then issued; a policeman, who most likely will not be the same policeman who put the ticket on the car, has to serve the summons. The fellow takes the summons, he looks at it, by this time he is now running the risk of being charged \$5.00 and he again ignores it. And this is not an isolated incident, this happens quite often, it quite often occurs. Then having done that the matter comes before the Magistrate. We need two policemen, one to get into the witness box to prove that the car upon which he placed the ticket was indeed owned by John Jones, and the

MR. HICKMAN:

other police officer to prove that John Jones was indeed served with the summons. When all that is done Mr. Jones is then written again and told, "You now owe fifteen dollars and if you do not pay we are going to take out a warrant of committal." So eventually a warrant of committal is taken out and given to another policeman who goes up and Mr. Jones says, "I did not realize it was that serious. How much is this going to cost me now." "Well, you owe us twenty dollars." So he gives twenty dollars and we have spent about sixty dollars worth of police officer's time.

With the actual putting of the tickets under the windshield wiper of a car, several of the Atlantic provinces cities are still using the police because they find that other enforcement agencies are not working. One city, I think it was Moncton, switched to security guards or commissioners and/or meter maids and after six months reverted back to the police again.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I would like to ask the Minister of Social Services if he could give the House some information on the federal-provincial proposal, cost-shared proposal to provide for financial assistance to those people in Canada who are under-employed. Would the minister indicate to the House whether or not Newfoundland will be opting in or opting out of that programme that I understand is supposed to come in force by 1978, I think it is?

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, the last meeting with respect to that proposed legislation is taking place in Ottawa right now. The deputy minister of my department is attending the meeting. Our stand is that while this is a very good proposal, a necessary and desirable thing, that we are not able to opt or buy into it at this time. The cost - we do not have an accurate estimate of the cost. We feel that Ottawa's suggestions are way out. I do not

MR. BRETT:

know where they got their figures. But anyway we have decided at this time, as have I believe all the other provinces, that we cannot go ahead with it now. It is too costly.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question. Would the minister indicate what the additional cost would be over and above what it is costing the province now because the Government of Canada, I understand, is going to pay seventy-five per cent of the cost of this new programme? So what would it cost the Province in dollars and cents? Does the minister have any idea?

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

MR. BRETT: It is almost impossible, Mr. Speaker, to determine now what it would cost. Seventy-five per cent, this is not true. They have agreed on a new cost-sharing plan. It would still be fifty-fifty on the income support that we are paying now, which is the welfare payments now. On the income supplementation they have agreed to pay sixty-six and two-thirds. But we have been unable to come up with anything near an accurate cost up to this point.

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

MR. LUSH: A question for the hon. Minister of Education. In view of the fact that the NTA has now announced that it shares the same concern and the same belief as does the president of the university, that is that in the next couple of years that this Province will face a crisis with respect to the supply of properly trained teachers for elementary and secondary schools, I wonder if the minister is in a position to tell the House what he plans to do to offset such a crisis?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, these matters are being discussed at the department level. One of the things I failed to mention yesterday - and I do not know exactly where it started - but it would seem as if the people are suggesting that we are not wanting trained teachers. In no way have we tried to stop people from going to university to take teacher education. So, you know, the faculty is still there, the faculty members are still there and of course there are positions or places

MP. HOUSE:

open for prospective student teachers. They are saying we are only having 200 people per year and that we need 300. Possibly that is true. I was looking at some statistics and we are gathering some more from our own department to see if it is indeed our own estimate also.

One of the things they are not bearing in mind of course is the fact that while there are 200 people per year enrolling, say, in education, and we need 300, they are not taking into account the fact that there are a lot of people going to university enrolling in bachelor of arts programmes and bachelor of science programmes who will revert to education programmes when they finish their bachelor programmes. They are not counted right now. So we are not

Mr. House:

anticipating a shortage of teachers in the next two years. But statistically if we need 300 teachers per year and, of course, we are only getting 200 trained, statistically it may sound that we will be short. But there are a lot of teachers now, and I do not think we could use up in two years, with 200 coming out per year, we could not use up teachers that are available now.

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

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. In view of the fact that government hospitals have cut-back on their operating budgets, and in view of the fact that it appears that hospitals have been asked to do this without creating any loss of jobs, without any layoffs, can the minister tell the House how hospitals are in fact expected to achieve their specific budget cuts?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

HON. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, there have been many meetings since my last report to the House on this matter, and all of the hospitals have indicated to us that certainly for the Summer months they can bring about the savings which we have asked them to bring about through attrition, through rearrangement for vacation etc. There is no indication of any layoffs.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary to that.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Have any jobs to this point been lost yet as a result of the cutbacks?

MR. H. COLLINS: No, not to my knowledge.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well a further supplementary. Have hospitals cut their budgets back enough yet to equal the saving equivalent to the close down of 200 hospital beds?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to take notice of that because I am not on top of it, you know, hour by hour. But it is my understanding from the most recent meeting which I had with the

Mr. Collins:

officials downstairs, which was on Monday, that we got the agreement of the hospitals which I mentioned here before, the larger hospitals, to the extent that they will be able to bring about a rate of savings. We cannot bring about all the savings which we are looking for in a week or two weeks. But certainly they have implemented measures to bring about the required rate of savings. And, of course, as I said before, the Review Board which has been established will monitor the situation week by week, month by month, to let us know how they continue to make out.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I will recognize the hon. member for LaPoile for a supplementary.

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Health tell the House if it is possible for the government, for his department to implement other economies rather than to shut down twenty beds at our only children's hospital in Newfoundland, the Janeway Hospital, at a time of year when the hazards are greatest for children in this Province, in the month of July, and in the Summer months? Is it possible to implement other economies rather than close down twenty beds at the Handway Hospital?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, we have got to look at every area of expenditure, and when one thinks back to the estimates which were approved by this House not too long ago, it is obvious that because of the high cost, a very considerable cost in the operation of hospitals that that is the area where we must try and bring about saving. The other programmes which my department sponsors and manages, it is really impossible to save anything there. In fact, we would like to have much more money for home care which we are getting involved in now.

I have had several meetings with the Board at the Janeway, with the medical people who work in the hospital and are there, you know, frequently, and there is no doubt that the implications for the

Mr. H. Collins:

Janeway is of great concern to all of us, to me as minister, to the government, and to the medical professional, and the hospital administration. Here again the most recent meeting we had was agreed that the Review Board would watch very carefully the situation at the Janeway because the Janeway is, as the hon. member said, a provincial institution dealing

Mr. Collins:

mainly with children, and there is also the very real possibility that during the Summer months there could be added pressure on the hospital in terms of children whose parents might elect to have surgery done in the Summertime, and for another very real reason and that is that with their kids out of school there is a greater chance of injury and so on. But we are watching the situation very, very carefully. And I might tell the House that we are getting the maximum in terms of co-operation from all the people involved. And I can assure the House that the Janeway particularly is being watched very carefully.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that the administrator, the board, some time ago expressed grave concern because the Janeway Hospital then was already bursting at the seams? And is the minister aware that you can look after chronic patients in nursing homes, but you cannot put children in nursing homes? And would the minister undertake to review this decision of closing down twenty beds at the Janeway Hospital and try to find the money under some other subhead?

MR. COLLINS: There is not forty being closed.

MR. NEARY: Twenty beds are being closed at the Janeway in July, right at the time of the year when this Province needs twenty children's beds most, because of the hazards when the children are out of school?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, it is not unusual for the Janeway to close beds during the Summer months. As I have said before, and I will repeat again, we are concerned with the situation at that particular institution, and I can give the House my assurance that the situation is being monitored daily, and I am satisfied that in the event that some different types of action have to be taken that we will be in a position to do something.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am dissatisfied with that answer, and I want to debate the matter during the Late Show on Thursday afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, followed by the hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health on the same subject but perhaps a new line of questioning. The minister gave notice earlier that with the objective for economy reasons to shut down 200 beds, can he indicate now whether that objective has been achieved at this moment or when it will be? And also can he indicate where those shut-downs are occurring? Can he identify the hospitals and the numbers involved at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: I do not know if I can identify them all, Mr. Speaker, but the General Hospital in St. John's - I do not know if they are making an announcement or not, but they probably will. They will be announcing some bed closures momentarily. St. Clare's have agreed to our budgetary restraints, and it is going to mean some beds closing at St. Clare's. I had a meeting with the Grace Hospital Board, and the chief of medical staff on Monday. They have some problems, but they have agreed that there is a need to restrain, and they have agreed to close twenty beds.

MR. NEARY: They have started to close them?

MR. COLLINS: They have started to close them. That is right.

The Janeway, as I just mentioned, are about to close twenty beds. Gander Hospital, James Paton Memorial, have agreed to close twenty beds. Grand Falls, Central Newfoundland Hospital, have agreed to close eighteen, I believe it is. The Curtis Hospital in St. Anthony, Dr. Curtis Hospital - is it not? - in St. Anthony, they have outlined again to us some of the dangers of the restraint programme, but the most recent communication with Dr. Thomas and Dr. Roberts indicates that they, too, appreciate what we are up against, and they are doing their best, and they will be closing out in the order of twenty beds.

MR. ROBERTS: A good fellow, that Dr. Roberts.

MR. COLLINS: Dr. Peter Roberts. I wish I could say the same -

The Christopher Fisher Hospital in Corner Brook, we are continuing to meet with them. It is a little different problem over there in that they are moving into a new hospital. I mean, they know what their budgetary restraints are going to be. I do not anticipate any problem, because I do not see how it can be possible for them to be able to open and indeed use all of the beds during the Summer months. They will have geared up or staffed up later on, but we do not anticipate any problem. Whether that amounts to 200 beds or not, Mr. Speaker, I do not know, but certainly the restraints which I am talking about do meet the figures.

MR. SIMMONS: Stephenville.

MR. COLLINS: And Stephenville. I am not sure of Stephenville. I believe it is ten or fifteen. They have agreed to our proposal anyway.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: The minister has identified a number of hospitals throughout the Province. Are we to assume that these hospitals in particular were requested to consider closing beds, or was it a general request to all hospital boards in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: The hospitals I just mentioned, Mr. Speaker, are the major hospitals across the Province. We have reviewed the budgets. The budgets which the boards presented earlier on in the year were cut and slashed and cut and slashed again, as was always the case. Eventually they said they could not accept any more and we imposed this additional \$2 million restraint programme on them.

We met with the larger hospitals because we wanted to make sure that the programme was implemented fairly and equally. It could never work, and everybody keeps telling us that they are going to watch the situation and monitor the situation to make sure that all of those hospitals are treated equally and that is very important to us if we are going to succeed with the programme.

With regard to the other hospitals in the Province, some operated by boards which I have not mentioned, and the hospitals which are operated by the government, better known as the cottage hospitals, we have not closed beds because it is not practical to close beds in those institutions by reason of the size of the institution. But they are feeling the pinch of the restraint programme just the same.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow one further supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I believe we are getting the answer now to the questions that we pursued a long time ago. Would the minister agree then that in view of the cutbacks in the budget and his discussions with hospital boards, certain hospital boards in particular, is it not true to assume, it is not correct to assume that the government knew from the beginning exactly where the hospital bed close-downs were going to take place?

MR. H. COLLINS: Do you mean from a geographic point of view or within the hospital point of view?

MR. SIMMONS: I will put the question this way, Mr. Speaker. Did the government, did the Department of Health have any list of hospitals in mind where it hoped to achieve the objective of closing down 200 beds at the time the programme was announced?

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, as I just said, if you have \$2 million to save you naturally look at the areas where most of the money is being spent, and certainly in this case we would look at the major hospitals across the Province. We looked at the regional implications also because all the hospitals which I have mentioned are regional type institutions and it is much easier of course to spread the load there and equalize the restraints than it would be any other way.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am dissatisfied with the answer and I would like to debate it tomorrow evening as well.

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

MR. W. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications. Could the hon. minister tell this House if the Hansen Memorial Highway will be reconstructed this year and the section of road in Coal Brook? I think this one is one-eighth tenths or eight tenths of a mile. Will that be paved this year as well? The equipment is still out in that area.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge these projects will not be carried out this year. There is a limited amount of funds that we can spend on road projects around the Province and unfortunately we cannot include all the needs for to carry out reconstruction and paving of roads around the Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEAPY: Mr. Speaker, the government House Leader undertook some time ago to try to get the options on the MacPherson property from Mr. Robert Morgan, the gentleman who apparently made an excessive profit overnight on the MacPherson property. Has the minister been

MR. NEARY:

successful in getting the options or has Mr. Morgan refused to give the minister the options? If the minister has the options, will he table them in the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: I mentioned that matter to Mr. Morgan's lawyer and I have heard nothing since.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question. Would the minister undertake to see if the minister can get an answer before the House closes from Mr. Morgan's lawyer, whoever he may be?

MR. WELLS: Well, I can ask again whether he is going to do it, Mr. Speaker, but I have no power to compel him to give it. These are Morgan's private documents. If he wants to give them, he can. If he does not want to give them, only a court would have the power to subpoena them.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Do I interpret the minister's answer as meaning that silence on the part of Mr. Morgan's lawyer is being interpreted by the minister as being a refusal to give the minister the information requested by the House?

MR. WELLS: It was requested by me, Mr. Speaker, not by the House.

MR. NEARY: Well, do I interpret the minister correctly? Is that the answer.

MR. WELLS: Well, I presume he is not going to send them.

MR. NEARY: He is not going to co-operate?

MR. WELLS: Well, I presume so. I do not know. I have heard nothing further anyway.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition, followed by the member for Bellevue.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Public Works to whom I-

MR. ROBERTS:

no, he may not have seen it - I sent a note that I would be asking this question. Perhaps the Minister without Portfolio could accept it on behalf of his colleague. It relates to Mr. Allan Evans of Isle aux Morts, formerly a member of this House. I would like to know whether Mr. Evans is presently an employee of the government of this Province.

MP. NEARY: Were you not here the night I congratulated him?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I could repeat the question. I would like to know whether Mr. Evans is an employee of the Province at present. If so, by what authority he was hired, or by whose authority or by which authority? I would like to know his general service range, the general range of his salary, the classification of the position. I would like to know what are his duties and I would like to know as well whether he was hired after a competition administered by the Public Service Commission. Perhaps the minister, if he does not have the information, he might be able to get it for me. I see his colleague is back now but his colleague may not have the information, may want to get it, take it as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, it is with great joy that I am able to announce that we have hired Mr. Evans.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. FARRELL: We obtained his services -

MP. NEARY: Competition for the job was very keen.

DR. FARRELL: Very keen. Great difficulty was experienced in obtaining his services. He was a bit unwilling. But after much discussion we did obtain his services - I am very proud to announce that - in his job as building inspector.

MR. NEARY: Chief inspector.

DR. FARRELL: Not quite yet - building inspector. His job will consist of fishery buildings, public works and some environment work. I know he will be giving very valuable service to this government in the coming years.

AN HON. MEMBER: On a contract basis?

DR. FARRELL: Hired on a contract basis.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary. Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his informative and jovial answer and I appreciate both. He said in closing that Mr. Evans had been hired on a contractual basis. Could the minister tell us the amount of the payment each year. I think that is -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Do you want his income tax deductions and his CPP.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the minister of Industrial Relations may think this House has no right to information but I happen to disagree. I think the House disagrees. Mr. Speaker, if I could ask the amount of the contractual payment each year and if I could ask also the length of the period of the contract.

DR. FARRELL: I do not know exactly, but I will take that as notice of the question, Sir. The contract is for one year.

MR. ROBERTS: Renewable?

DR. FARRELL: Yes, renewable.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue. This will be the final question.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Rural Development and Industrial Development. In view of the fact that there is a large percentage of unemployment throughout the Province, and in view of the fact that the situation seems to be appearing to get worse every day with, of course, no foreseeable opening up of Come By Chance, and yesterday we heard the announcement of the close down of Gull Island and so on, in view of all these things, could the minister tell me whether or not his department has given any thought or have any plans for possibly introducing some labour intensive programmes? I am thinking for example of something similar to LIP. It does not have to be called that. Or OFY, Opportunities For Youth, or perhaps OFYO, Opportunities For Young and Old. Does his

MR. CALLAN:

department have any plans for projects like that?

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

MR. LINDRIGAN: My department does not have any plans along these lines. This is not the mandate of the Department of Rural Development. It is a development department concentrating on small industry, basically, designated rural development, of a development nature, of a manufacturing nature, as the hon. member is aware, which he has experienced in his riding, and I do not think there are any such specific plans of government in any department that I am aware of. But maybe my colleague in Manpower and Industrial Relations might have some comment. But certainly that is not the mandate of the Department of Rural Development at all. I would hope that the member is not serious in his suggestion that the department institute a programme, LIP programmes. I was hoping that at some point in the future the federal government maybe would divert their LIP monies that they have spent and have unfortunately in some ways curtailed, into government departments across the country, such as the development departments in this Province to help us create employment of a more permanent nature based on resource development rather than just to throw money at the economy doing a patchwork job hopefully to take the sting out of unemployment for a very temporary period and being lost as a result of the fact that the work has dissipated at the end of a few weeks.

So consequently I have never been a very great, strong participant among the people who say that LIP projects are the answer to our economy. The answer to our economy lies in developing our resources. I think we are making certain gains in that direction and hopefully when the major issue which was talked about yesterday and alluded to by the member today is properly resolved, we will see a major spurt ahead of a development nature that will have a great deal of permanency in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: I am dissatisfied with the answer. I would like to debate it on the Late Show.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Today is Private Members' Day, or it is traditionally by the orders of the House, and I would automatically call Motion 15. I have been informed that there has been unanimous consent to proceed as on any other day. Is that agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 9.

On motion of the hon. Minister of Health, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Hospitals Act, 1971," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (Bill No. 82).

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 10.

On motion of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, a bill, "An Act To Amend The City Of St. John's Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (Bill No. 84)

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 11.

On motion of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Assessment Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (Bill No. 81).

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 12.

On motion of the hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Co-Operative Societies Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (Bill No. 83).

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 13.

On motion of the hon. Minister of Justice, a bill, "An Act To Repeal And Replace The District Courts Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (Bill No. 80).

MR. SPEAKER: Order 6.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act To Adopt A Mineral Emblem For The Province." (Bill No. 2).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I will introduce this act in the absence of my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy. It is a very simple act,

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, with only two clauses, and I will read them because I think this is a very historical act, and an act that I am sure will be received with pleasure by all citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador. "This Act may be cited as The Mineral Emblem Act, 1975-1976. (2)"The mineral known as labradorite is hereby adopted as, and is deemed to be, the mineral emblem of the province."

Now this is, as I say, a very short, very much to the point act, Mr. Speaker. It certainly, I am sure, will give every member of this House pleasure that this act is brought in, introduced, and certainly I think it will give the people of the Province pleasure that this beautiful stone, originating in Labrador, and so attractive and decorative for jewelry and for any decorative purpose, should be the mineral emblem of this Province. More especially I think and more to the point than anything else, is the fact, Mr. Speaker, that Labradorite is a stone from the Labrador part of this Province, and to find that stone, and to have that stone as our mineral emblem I think will please everyone in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS: As I say I am very pleased today to introduce this act, and I am sure that there will be other hon. members who will want to have a word on it. But it gives me great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to move second reading.

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

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly involved in Labradorite now for six or seven years. And since we are going to adopt it as the mineral emblem of the Province I thought I would like to say a few things about this stone, about this gem, and its history so that we would know in this House, the members of this House would know a little bit more about the emblem that we are adopting as the mineral emblem of the Province. I had hoped at the same time that the Minister of Rural Development and Industrial Development would have been in the House, because I was going to express some points which may have been of interest to him, as we looked

Mr. Strachan.

at the picture in trying to develop this semi-precious stone as a possible small industry on the Labrador Coast. However, Labradorite is a felspar which is found in eruptive rocks, generally volcanic rocks. It is essentially a potash felspar, that is, it is a felspar which has potassium and, therefore, that gives it its green, blue or purple colours.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Could not some of your colleagues come in and listen to this?

MR. STRACHAN: I do not know if I got many colleagues left.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STRACHAN: Anyway the stone is not only found in Labrador but it is also found in Greenland. It is also found in Sweden. It is found in small quantities in the USSR. It is also found in Mount Etna itself in Sicily, on the volcano. But the major deposit of this stone is around Nain, on an island ten miles south of Nain, on an island called Napotulagatsuk Island, actually. I can see Hansard having trouble with some of the names that I am going to bring in. Napotulagatsuk Island is now changed, as it is traditional in our history to change all native names, it is now called Tabor Island. But its original name meant an island which had a shining light. I should indicate here that this is quite common in Labrador, that many of the names common to the area, native names, have always been changed or commonly been changed. Both the church and explorers and so on had the constant habit of attaching their names to islands or peaks or mountains when they came and explored these areas, disregarding totally the local names. It is quite common in Labrador, too, of course, to change personal names as well. So many times Apponote would become Simon or we would give English christian names to native people. I know many friends who have had their names changed by the church or by government or even a system of giving them numbers, instead of giving them a name.

However, to get back to the point here, the deposit is on this island, Napotulagatsuk Island, with other deposits on Taktok,

June 2 , 1976

Tape no. 3117

Page 4 - mw

Mr. Strachan.

and Kikkertavak Island which is a very long island, and there are some deposits further south around Port Hope Simpson area.

Mr. Strachan:

As I said, it is a felspar in which the potassium predominates over the sodium, or the potash predominates over the soda, so we get this blue green and purple colour, especially the purple which is favoured by most people rather than the red and yellow. The yellow and red sometimes comes out when the sodium predominates. It was first discovered by the Western World in 1774 by a missionary called Wolfe, not the soldier Wolfe, but a missionary called Wolfe who came over with the Moravian Mission, the Unity Brethren and he discovered this stone in 1774 and brought it back to Europe. For the next few years there was a great demand for the stone, and there was a great deal of excitement in Europe about seeing for the first time this very beautiful, semiprecious stone. Then the excitement died out as no one continued on with the supply and it disappeared for a long time.

Now on Napotulagapsok Island, Tabor who discovered the Island, for all intents and purpose to the Western World discovered the Island, started a small quarry to quarry the stone. And this was carried out by the Moravian Mission quite vigorously and they made a great deal of jewelery out of it, and they also attempted to make stone slab similar to marble. What happens is when the stone is cut at ninety degrees it has a property called the property of schillarization or the property of refracting and reflecting light which gives it this depth, this beautiful colour when polished. The cleavable masses then can be cut and one can get very large masses cut, certainly big slabs as three feet, four feet, which could be removed and cut very thinly, and give a very beautiful decorate of stone. It has not been done that way. Small experiments were started but it requires a fair amount of equipment to cut that type of - to get the cutting equipment to cut that stone out. It is a very hard rock.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It will not stand blasting?

MR. STRACHAN: No. Brinex or Brinco took over the rights to this quarry, and they started to blast it out. Now unfortunately what

Mr. Strachan:

happens with Labradorite is it has fractures running all through it, and as soon as one starts to excavate it or remove it by blasting, what happens is the blasting shatters the rock, not only for the rock you pick up from the blasting, but also shatters the rock for quite an area around. So as one moves on you continually keep shattering the pieces, and you also find that when you try to make jewelry out of this shattered or blasted rock that the jewelry will often fracture or often crack or fracture lines will develop in it and your gem or your stone will fall apart.

What happened then was the surface area of, and I will use the correct name of the Island, Napotulagapsok Island. Tabor Island in English - that the surface area has now become blasted and there is not a great deal of good gem quality rock left on the surface. One would have to clear of the debris and get down lower in order to get at new rock which was not damaged by the blasting process.

I became involved when Brinex gave up quarrying rights to the islands seven years ago, and they surrendered their quarrying rights saying that they were of no commercial interest in them anymore. They had removed sufficient quantity, there was a backlog in Montreal and in various other places. And I became involved because many companies outside of this Island are, outside of Labrador and the Island specifically, many companies outside tried to gain the quarrying rights, the quarrying permits for the labradorite in the region. Now what happened for three or four years with no quarrying rights being given there, people would fly in from Maine, United States, the Eastern Seaboard, United States, from Montreal, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, people would fly into Labrador North, land in Nain, hire local people, take the boats and quarry the rock during the Summer, bag it all, bring it back to Nain, ship it out on the coastal boat and this rock was then shipped to Nova Scotia, Montreal, or the United States. We objected intensely to this because we felt that people were coming in and for next to nothing

Mr. Strachan:

removing what was a semiprecious stone from this Province and taking it all elsewhere to develop it into a gem which they would reap a great deal of profit from.

So what we did was that I, with the assistance of Leo Barry who was then the Minister of Mines and Energy, and he gave us a great deal of assistance here, and his Deputy Minister, we formed this corporation called the Labrador Innuvit Development Corporation, it is just a name, and we applied for the quarrying rights for all labradorite in the area, and we marked it out, and we applied for the quarrying rights, paid the permits, and we obtained it in trust, and I should indicate this, the Labrador Innuvit Development Corporation obtained the quarrying rights for all the known labradorite deposits in trust for the people, the residents of the Labrador Coast.

MR. SMALLWOOD: For the whole of Labrador?

MR. STRACHAN: Essentially yes. Essentially. The idea was first to try and develop on the Labrador Coast some kind of small industry, and we were afraid at that time that if we allowed it to go elsewhere and within the Province, I mean either to Goose Bay, as well as to St. John's or Corner Brook, that what would happen we would see exactly the same quarrying process and which the local people were never giving any encouragement, incentive to get into a small industry. So we very specifically made it in trust for the people of the Labrador Coast.

We then went to try and get the next stage, the next step forward which was to set up a small industry and with the help of the Labrador Services Division there was some equipment laid aside to be sent into Nain. Unfortunately the division and the people involved did not know very much about labradorite and the equipment they sent in to Nain specifically was almost hobby equipment; it was equipment that one would outfit one's basement with if one were interested in a weekend picking up occasional rocks. It certainly was not equipment which could be used

Mr. Strachan:

commercially, intensively, five days or six days of a week to produce gems, or for setting in silver settings or rhodium plated settings or for getting into any other decorative kind of work.

So with the result then without any equipment the people tried to set up a small industry themselves, and this has struggled and failed really because of lack of development, lack of training, lack of equipment. It is not because the people have no interest; there are many people who are interested in setting up a small business and getting employed in producing labradorite jewelry. They understand they need training because these stones or jewelry that they were preparing was often very poor quality, not because of their fault but because the equipment they were using was extremely primitive, and they had no expert training as to how to make the actual settings or how to prepare the whole setting before the stone was added.

So in the end, and last year or so, the last two years, this thing has almost died. There are some labradorite cut in Nain, but the equipment is not being used, and nobody is preparing anything locally. We have resisted a number of jewelry stores, and people interested in the Province have come to Nain, and we have resisted supplying them with any labradorite. And the reason is not purely a selfish reason; the reason is that the people wanted to get into this business, they have no capital, no money whatsoever, they want to set up a small industry, and they feel that as long as they are supplying the raw material to a commercial venture somewhere else regardless where it be, then obviously the market will be filled and there will be no need for someone to set up the industry there.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the Reverend Haddash?

MR. STRACHAN: Well, yes, Reverend Haddash did try for many, many years, he tried to get this going, and it worked quite actively. The only problem was at that time he was living in a community in which

Mr. Strachan:

communications were very poor, where you would never see anyone from one year to the next, and so he never got in very far off the ground.

But I think right now if we are going to establish labradorite as a mineral emblem of this Province, and I take it that this is a sincere gesture and a sincere move, that if we are then let us get beyond the stage of just tokenism of the labradorite, and let us try and get into this and develop a small industry on the Labrador Coast which may employ only five or six or at the most ten people, but they could

MR. STRACHAN: produce jewelry which could be sold, exactly the same as the Pitcher Plant is sold, on lapel pins or various other things, it could be sold, there is a very good market, the market demand is excellent for good quality gems and a small industry could be set up here. An effort needs to be made into the marketing but the demands, as far as we are concerned, the demands, the amount of letters we get, the amount of calls we get, the amount of people visiting who want supplies of the stone or of the gem, certainly outdo any of this supply we can do. We cannot keep up with the demand.

I think the whole thing needs to be put together now and I think that if we are seriously interested in making it a true mineral emblem of the Province then this would be an excellent venture for the Department of Rural and Industrial Development to get involved in, to spend some money on, to get into proper equipment, proper training, and give the people assistance in making a commercial venture. I am not talking about any future government subsidized businesses. We had enough attempts at that on the Labrador Coast and most of them failed because initially they take away the initiative of the people -

MR. MURPHY: Paternalism.

MR. STRACHAN: - they turn them down. It is paternalism. They turn them down to be just pure civil servants, employees of a department or a division with headquarters somewhere else. I am talking of making a proper, small, little corporation in which government contracts for the stone, and contracts from other places could be given to them since we are going to make it the mineral emblem of the Province. And I would hope then that if we do officially recognize the rock, that we also recognize the people and try to develop their skills so that we can create a small and worthwhile industry. I support the bill.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): The hon. member for St. John's Centre.

MR. MURPHY: I am just wondering, a statement that the hon. gentleman.

MR. MURPHY: made, you started this Inuit Association, and you started it and failed, was there any effort made at that time, as you suggested now for Rural Development that someone get in, advise you as to what kind of equipment you should buy, this type of thing. I am just wondering where something like this is what we want, and if we had one thousand of them it would be better than a Come-By-Chance or anything else. Was there any effort made at that time, I am just wondering, for help in that way?

MR. STRACHAN: I do not want to get into the nasties of the business and so on, but people did come in to try to train the local people. But as soon as they saw the equipment which had been shipped into Labrador, and to get specific the equipment was ordered by people within Confederation Building, or people within St. John's who just saw it in a catalogue and ordered equipment. It was shipped to Labrador, pulled into a house and when they came to look at it it was all hobby equipment which one would build in a basement.

MR. MURPHY: Like you get in manual training.

MR. STRACHAN: It was not the type of equipment and especially if you are going to get into the slab thing, which I think is an excellent idea, to get into the decorative slab of which there is a very high market, especially for people wanting to either do their basement floors or floors for recreation dens or a wall. For instance, you can have an extremely beautiful wall - I started on one which will probably take me the next ten years to finish because it is just hard work - but it would be a wall in a house or a living room or a den of Labradorite slabs, it could be extremely beautiful and of course extremely expensive too. But many people are prepared to pay that kind of money -

MR. MURPHY: It is a lifetime thing, of course.

MR. STRACHAN: - and it is certainly comparable with marble and I would say that the Labradorite polished slabs are far more decorative and far more beautiful than marble.

MR. MURPHY: Do they come in different colours?

MR. STRACHAN: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the government on their decision to make Labradorite the mineral stone of Newfoundland. I think it is excellent. I think it is a splendid idea.

I was fascinated indeed by the account given to us now by the hon. gentleman from Eagle River District (Mr. Strachan). He lives down there. He knows about what has happened down there. I can add a little to what he has said.

I was interested to hear the names of the other parts of the world in which what we call labradorite and which has another name, a scientific name, is to be found, including the Soviet Union. The House may be interested to know that the body of Nikolai Lenin, the originator of the Communist Revolution in what is now the Soviet Union, his body, so marvellously preserved, is in a tomb in Red Square, where you can see it, a queue a mile to a mile and a half long every day of the year, every day of the year, including Sundays, lines up, get in line to get in and just walk slowly past the bier containing the body of Lenin, the father of the Russian Revolution.

I got in that line, I was with a very distinguished man - at least he was distinguished at that time, he is less distinguished now; he is almost, you may say, extinguished now - I got in line with him and the authorities in Moscow put us back just a couple of hundred feet from the entrance to the tomb so we did not have long - but even then you are creeping along at a wonderfully slow pace, and this great line behind you. And we went down, Richard Nixon and I, together down one flight of steps into the tomb where Lenin's body is and I was, as the House may well imagine, I was rather flabbergasted to discover that that tomb is lined throughout with labradorite. And I explained to - you are not supposed to talk loudly in that tomb, to the Russians it is a very sacred place, the body of the father of the revolution,

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nikolai Lenin, I suppose one day if in the People's Republic of China they decide to make a place for Mao Tse Tung it will be even more holy there than Lenin's tomb is in Moscow. So you are not supposed to talk but I explained to Nixon, I said, "Look, this is labradorite." I touched the wall. Now I hear from the hon. gentleman that Russia is one of the places where it is found and that suggests to the thought to me that it would be perhaps a good idea if somebody went over to the Soviet Union, first of all arranging with the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa, having prior arrangements made, so that when he arrived in Moscow he would know the right people and they would be expecting him, go over to the Soviet Union and find out how they process labradorite, how they get it out of the bed in which it is; is it by saw and if so what kind of saw, how can you get the labradorite out the substantial quantity, quantity not too big to handle, but -

MR. MURPHY: Could I interrupt for a second? When you say labradorite is that our labradorite?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. It is the same mineral.

MR. MURPHY: Mined in Labrador?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is the same exactly. No. No. Labradorite in Lenin's tomb was obtained in the Soviet Union.

MR. MURPHY: I see.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What part of the Soviet Union is the particular source of labradorite in that vast nation which is the world's biggest country -

MR. HICKEY: What do they call it over there?

MR. MURPHY: We call it labradorite because it is mined in Labrador.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right. Labradorite is only a name.

MR. J. CARTER: Would the hon. member like a similar tomb?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, I would be less interested in the tomb in which my body will lie than in things before I need a tomb.

MR. NEARY: You could make a button for the hon. member's mouth.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think it might be well worthwhile, somebody going to the Soviet Union by prearrangement, to learn what he can learn about the process there, what they use labradorite, or whatever the scientific name may be, for; how they process it; into what products it is turned and how and what kind of equipment is used.

MR. MURPHY: Does the hon. member mean a little river that puts money into private companies?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I was coming to that. That is exactly what I was coming to. If the development of it in Labrador is to be done on a non-private profit basis, if it is a non-profit thing - hopefully it would be profitable, but not the dividends will go into the pockets of individuals;

MR. SMALLWOOD:

it is a social movement I take it, something like a co-operative. If that is the case I do not see why the government could not underwrite the expenses if the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) was willing to do it, and he would be an ideal one to do it for a number of reasons, one of which is that he has a sort of scientific background. True that scientific background in particular has been in fish but it is a scientific background, then because he is there where the Labradorite is, and thirdly, because he is tremendously interested, and as there is no profit in it for him, why could not the government defray the cost of his visiting the Soviet Union to see what he can find out from people who are actually using Labradorite?

MR. J. CARTER: Would the member permit a question?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, who was it who gave away the Labradorite to Brinex and Brinco? Under whose administration was this asset given away?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was under my administration, but I did not give it away nor did my administration. It belonged to the Moravian missionaries and the Moravian missionaries or the Moravian Mission, the Moravian Missionary Organization of Labrador who had the concession - or was it Grenfell?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, it was the Moravian Mission.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I believe it was the Moravian people who had the concession and they had got it 100 years before, ceded it, probably by sale or in some way to Brinex. It was not the government's to give. If it has been the government's to give at that time and Brinex had expressed a desire to work it, I do not think my administration would have hesitated for a moment to give them the right to develop.

When they dropped it, I then tried to persuade a certain well known industrialist in Newfoundland, on the West Coast of Newfoundland, to take a personal interest in it. I suggested to him that he go to Italy and see the way they treated marble because, like the hon. gentleman who just spoke, I believed then and I believe now that there

MR. SMALLWOOD:

may well be a magnificent future in the use of labradorite for decorative stone for buildings, for the lobby of a beautiful building. If the lobby of this building were finished in labradorite it would be extraordinarily handsome indeed. It should not be used for ordinary building purposes, but it should be used only in buildings for the decorative effect of a rotunda, of a lobby, of a hallway or of a special room in a building because I do not suppose the quantity is inexhaustible. I do not suppose there is enough in the deposit there, or the deposits because there is more than one deposit, I do not suppose there is enough altogether to stand a great amount of quarrying and export of labradorite in an unpolished condition to be processed and used up and down the continent. I do not imagine there is that much. The hon. gentleman wanted to ask something?

MR. STRACHAN: The only deposit which is being commercially mined is the deposit in Napotulagatsuk. There are six other deposits that we know of and there are many more which have never been looked at or people have never gone to. In fact one of the largest and best deposits is also one of the most inaccessible and is called by local people and everyone on the coast, it is called the Pearly Gates, and when one starts to go in from the river bed and rises to a height of approximately 800 feet up to 2,000 feet, one goes up through a very narrow ravine in winter and on both sides of that narrow ravine, a very dramatic ravine, is pure labradorite. That is why it is called the Pearly Gates, not because it seems as though you are going to heaven going up through here but also because it shines. But you cannot get in there in the summer, so therefore nobody has ever touched it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is very obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman from Eagle River constituency (Mr. Strachan) is extremely well informed on this matter of one of the most interesting of this Province's natural resources. It is one thing for the government to declare it, or ask the House to declare the mineral token - what is the

MR. SMALLWOOD:

word? - emblem of Newfoundland. That is good. That is excellent and we are going to vote for it I am sure. But if some of the ideas suggested by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) could be put into effect it would be excellent.

I, by way of comment on the question put to me by the hon. gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), I may say that I did take some personal interest. Before Brinex, or Brinco it was really, showed any interest in it, I got permission from the Moravians to have small quantities of the labradorite brought or taken, removed and had it brought to St. John's and the late William Bond Taylor, known to all his friends as Billy Bond Taylor - he was called after Sir Robert Bond - from Carbonear who lost his life very tragically indeed with two of his grandchildren, they went down all three of them in a boat on a pond during a holiday - Bill Bond Taylor started a little business here of polishing the labradorite into jewellery and that operated for quite a number of years. If I am not mistaken I think the government gave some kind of small financial assistance to that little venture.

MR. WELLS: Where do people get their present supply?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well I do not know if anybody gets any present - whether there is a present supply. The hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) says that they frown down there on the idea of people coming in and getting any supply because they want the thing done right. So there may not be an existing supply or a continuing supply right now.

Another thought that occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, is this: In Portugal they have a great talent for the manufacture of silver - what do you put jewels in, what is it called?

MR. STRACHAN: The setting.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The setting. The Portugese are famous for their skill at settings, making this wonderful filigree and other very fine and very beautiful settings for jewellery. Why should not somebody

MR. SMALLWOOD:

go to Portugal, try there to find someone who would come and go down to Labrador and spend a year down there as an instructor with the right equipment and with whatever knowledge might be obtained in the Soviet Union and really take this thing very seriously, not merely making it our emblem, mineral emblem, but turning it into a small industry which might, as the hon. member says, employ only eight or ten people. But I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that every eight or ten jobs created in this Province today is a mighty triumph. It is a sad fact, but it is a fact nonetheless.

I am delighted with the government for having introduced this. I am humiliated that I did not think of it. If I had thought of it believe me there would have been a bill in here asking for the approval of the House. But now that the bill is in from the present administration, I see that the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) is eager to participate and as I want to hear what he has to say, I will now forebear any further comment.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today also to add my support to the comments from the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), particularly as they relate to this present bill to adopt a mineral emblem for the Province and that mineral being labradorite. I do not pretend to have any near the amount of knowledge which was expressed by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). And if the suggestion which one other gentleman made falls through, that the hon. member is sent to Russia to explore the possibilities, I am for that all the way.

AN HON. MEMBER: With a return ticket?

MR. GOUDIE: Right, with a return ticket, yes, obviously.

MR. MURPHY: With the Newfoundland and Labrador emblem on it?

MR. GOUDIE: I do not know how many hon. members of this House have seen labradorite but I would suspect that most hon. members have.

I was just thinking while the comments were being made that if hon.

MR. GOUDIE:

members have not seen that mineral in it's polished state perhaps something which may be comparable, at least in terms of the colour spectrum would be the delicate tints, if you will, of the Northern Lights. I am sure that most hon. members have seen that particular phenomenon.

Mr. Goudie.

That, I think, would be some sort of a comparison, although I believe the more common solid colour of Labradorite is blue as opposed to any other particular colour, but there are greens and yellows and so on, which lie within that mineral. I had some very short discussions with the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development, and he has assured me - and I would like to take the opportunity on his behalf more or less if that is permissible - to assure the hon. member from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and any other interested hon. members that that particular department is more than interested in lending any type of assistance to individuals or businesses located particularly within Labrador they will be given every assistance possible in helping to develop the products which make use or utilize the mineral of labradorite. It is my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to support this bill, and I commend the administration and the government for this move.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young): The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if I can just say one word on the principle of the bill, and I might be a tiny bit irrelevant, but I will try to be thirty or forty seconds. There is a deposit of ore on the Baie Verte Peninsula, which is classified as virginite. That is not the right technical name for it - which can be used for making various things. It is a kind of semi-precious ore. The only other -

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is of the marble family.

MR. PECKFORD: It is of the marble family, right.

I have seen a number of pieces of this ore in its polished state as well as in its raw state. There are a number of outcroppings there on the Baie Verte Peninsula. To my knowledge from experts in the field of minerals, there is an outcropping, or there is a known ore body of virginite in Africa, and there is also one in Northern China, but from the records -

MR. STRACHAN: Port Hope Simpson.

MR. PECKFORD: Port Hope Simpson has some? That is the only ones that I know of in the world, and I checked this out a couple of years ago, and it is just interesting that now we are talking about labradorite, and there is also another rare ore available in the Province that can be utilized for -

MR. SMALLWOOD: The minister must be aware that in Newfoundland we have a favoured haven in different semi-precious stones.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But not all as beautiful as labradorite or the one that the minister mentioned.

MR. PECKFORD: Right, right!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young): The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support to the principle of this bill to adopt labradorite as the mineral emblem for the Province. I had not intended to speak until the hon. member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) mentioned the virginite. I do not know if he has done any research into it, but I think you will find that it is a kind of labradorite actually, except that it has the green tinge going through it rather than the more predominant blue of the felspar type. It is a very beautiful mineral and maybe we could think in terms of having a further look at that and having something done with it. But for our part, Sir, we certainly support the principle of this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young): The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words in support of the principle of the bill. I find it a very agreeable idea and commend the administration for choosing labradorite as the mineral emblem of the Province. The Minister of Municipal Affairs brings to mind the subject of virginite and perhaps it is the appropriate time just to expand for a moment on the thought that he raised; namely, the commercial possibilities of virginite.

MR. SIMMONS.

I was in Ireland on one occasion, and I was presented with a set of cuff links made of what they call over there, Connemara marble, and the retail price of the cuff links - I think the cuff links would command \$15 or \$20 in our money, and here it was just a little, a very small amount of this marble that had been used for this purpose, and the fixture in which the cuff link was contained I would not think would not be that expensive an item. But here was a case where Connemara marble, which I would think again belonged to the same family as Labradorite and virginite - indeed the virginite which the minister has mentioned I have some bookends, when we were involved with the Green Bay Development Association, we did some experimental work on this and some experimental cutting done, and I have at home a set of bookends made from this virginite. And I compared it with the cuff links in terms of looking at it, and there does not seem to be much difference. I think the Connemara from Ireland is probably a slightly lighter green than is the virginite. Otherwise it has the same visual characteristics which one normally associates with rocks or stones in the marble family. The stone cutters who looked at the virginite in Green Bay told us that it has the properties required. I do not have again the vocabulary to discuss it at any length, but it has the proper fracture patterns or qualities -

MR. STRACHAN: Schillerization.

MR. SIMMONS: The term?

MR. STRACHAN: Probably Schillerization.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, exactly. It stands up to cleavage in my vocabulary. But I know that a jeweler at Corner Brook actually, Mr. Speaker, has been using this virginite for some time.

MR. MURPHY: Is that Mr. Rogers, is it?

MR. SIMMONS: I think so. I believe that is the name of the jeweler. One of them has been using it, coming in quite regularly. He has been doing it against the law, but that is not for quoting. It is

Mr. Simmons.

against the law in the sense that a company has a concession on that entire body of virginite .

MR. PECKFORD: Not all.

MR. SIMMONS: Not quite all, eh? I see. And that was a matter of some contention, too. But I did not want to prolong the work of the House, Mr. Speaker, but just to interject that it is perhaps a good time to say once again that we ought to be looking - and I say this to the Minister of Industrial Development - we ought to be taking another very close look at the commercial potential of the rather unique minerals we have here. Labradorite is certainly one, and it is one that is coming into its own commercially, I understand. But virginite is another, and it is a very rare one. And as the minister has indicated it has only been identified in three or four parts of the world. I say to the Minister of Rural and Industrial Development I would be happy to talk to him about it, and I believe the Minister of Municipal Affairs has had some firsthand knowledge of it as had my colleague from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout). And I could refer him, as could the minister to two or three people in Springdale, including and in particular Mr. Fred Goudie who is a good friend of the minister's, and a good friend of mine, too, as a matter of fact. Indeed at one time he wore at least two hats very successfully, the presidency of the P.C. Association in Green Bay, and one of my vice-presidents from the Green Bay Development Association, a tremendous worker and he made a good job of both, and a fellow who knows a lot from a firsthand point of view about minerals, and in particular about this virginite, because he was one of the persons that we involved in doing some of the experimental cutting. I know that he went on to investigate it from a commercial standpoint. They ran into some snags. I do not think it was any fault of theirs, but they did run into some snags from a financial standpoint, I believe.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Are you talking about a heavy financial requirement?

MR. SIMMONS: No, no, no!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Are you talking about a heavy financial requirement?

MR. SIMMONS: No, no!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The amounts?

MR. SIMMONS: Sorry, the amounts?

MR. PECKFORD: About \$20,000 or \$30,000.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, there were two or three items of fairly specialized cutting equipment that was required basically, and then polishing it, but there were two items, some kind of a cutter, to use a vernacular term, and a polisher. That is basically what we were talking about. And obviously a small facility to house it.

MR. PECKFORD: The facility is there.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, really, because these same people have the facility right at the proper - indeed the gentleman I have mentioned is involved -

MR. PECKFORD: He is still involved in the lab.

MR. SIMMONS: He is still involved in the lab, is he? He is involved in what was the Brinex lab, about two miles outside of Springdale.

Anyway without prolonging, Mr. Speaker, I believe the minister has shown an interest in this and I am glad to see that, because the point needs to be made again and again that perhaps in our unique mineral resources in this Province we can find some commercial possibilities. It is kind of off the bill, but I just want to say in closing I want to give my wholehearted endorsement to the bill. I am delighted to hear that Labradorite will be the mineral emblem for the Province.

MR. STRACHAN: If I understand this virginite, I never heard it called that, if it is the same green type of stone as is found in Labrador South and the Port Hope Simpson area -

MR. NEARY: Where about is it?

MR. STRACHAN: As far as I know it is up behind the hill, further up towards the Rattle behind the hill. Now I have never gone to see it.

Mr. Strachan.

I never had the time there to go and see it, but I intend to. But it is called green labradorite, but I think from your description that the virginite would be exactly the same. It is a felspar which is high in calcium, which gives it a green colour rather than the potash that gives a blue in the case of the Labradorite. So it is essentially the same rock, the same base.

MR. PECKFORD: It is hard to hear. What do you mean up behind the hill? Is that right behind the settlement?

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, up around the Rattle.

Yes, up around the Rattle from the community, behind the hill, as far as I understand.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young): The hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have already communicated, and I will only take sixty seconds, I have already communicated to the member who introduced the issue of our willingness to co-operate with any reasonable people, business people who have got some credentials, naturally that is a requirement with anybody that we deal with to be of assistance in the sense of our capability. That is why I raised

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

the question of the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay D'Espoir (Mr. Simmons). Our rural development programmes enables us to look at loans and grants. Given certain conditions it might amount to \$20,000 in loans. Notice, the member, I am saying \$20,000. Also in grants, \$12,500 unless it is a particular type of industry relating I believe to logging where there is equipment involved, we can actually look at \$30,000.

But certainly we do have a small amount of capability to respond to any reasonable business proposition in this area. That would presume some lease arrangement or grant or ownership of a property that had some kind of deposits of the nature described and would also presume that the business people involved would have some market for their product which I think would be easily identified. I would welcome, very much welcome, anybody coming forward with any reasonable proposal. I have indicated to the member there my desire and my willingness to do this sort of thing.

AN HON. MEMBER: A good question for Mr. Jawe.

MR. STRACHAN: In any case I know you were out of the House, but I was talking about a particular group who have no capital, who have no deep expertise but who want to get that expertise. I think that what we are talking about here is that if we are going to create an industry, for instance, in the community of Nain or in Hopedale, we are talking of something more than just funding a private organization. I think we are talking of a whole training programme, a whole development programme in developing the market. So I think we are talking of more than just the normal grant to a company to get going. They do not have that kind of business expertise. That will take a number of years to build.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, the member is quite right about the number of years to build. I know he was pleased to hear from his public comments of just appointed Mr. Mike Martin, who has broad terms of reference to bring about a particular structure that will be able

MR. LINDPICKAN:

to respond to the challenges and also the capabilities and the great potential of the people of his area and the people of the Labrador coast generally.

One of the things Mr. Martin is already looking at - and I have read up on it recently myself and I believe the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing is conversant with this - is the Northern Manitoba Development Fund - what is it called?

MR. PECKFORD: North-Land Development.

MR. LINDPICKAN: Yes but the particular fund which addresses itself to the management and the exposure to training and technique. This particular fund is called the Communities Economic Development Fund, I believe it is. As a matter of fact that is what it is called. That is a very exciting programme. I am disappointed to a certain extent that we have not already progressed further on these things. But we will have Mr. Mike Martin, for example, investigating that. And hopefully in a short term we can put together - I am talking about the end of this year - some kind of a structure or board or corporation or whatever one might want to call it, a system that can develop programmes of this nature.

In the interim, I would still like to hear from people who have the interest and some capability, at least they have an interest. That is a capability in itself. We might still be able to work out some kind of an arrangement within the existing programmes, especially Labrador Services or the Handicraft Division to be able to assist the people in some way or another. We have already under the ARDA programmes and the various funding programmes in Rural Development, we have made funds available precisely already without broadening out the thing into a broad programme, we have made funds available to have people travel to areas where they can avail of some knowledge or specialized knowledge that can assist them in developing a small industry.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

There are little small things I can mention and I have mentioned to the member in Greenspond that we had some people and we brought them in and we exposed them to the Fisheries College, the smoking expertise that is required. We have had people travel to Nova Scotia recently looking at fish farming that are already involved in it under our funding capability of the day. There is no reason why we could not do the same thing for somebody in the particular field the member is suggesting.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before the hon. minister takes his seat, would he tell us, (a) did he hear the suggestion I made while he was outside. It was while he was outside that I made it and therefore perhaps he did not hear it - and it was very brief - that as in fact one of the countries of the world that is a source of labradorite and makes excellent use of it - Lenin's tomb is lined with labradorite produced in -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I do not think it is labradorite as our type.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, exactly the same.

MR. PECKFORD: You were there, were you not?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I was there and saw it, yes. I was in the tomb and saw the labradorite. Now labradorite is only the name by which it is known in Newfoundland. It is not known as labradorite in other -

MR. PECKFORD: What do they call it over there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, it has a generic name which is the same all over the world, in all countries. I suppose it is Latin or usually these - however the minister, and I suggested that the government, as this thing down in Labrador is a non-profit thing, it is a social thing, not a private company out to make money, you know, that the government might be willing to send, say, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), two from that part of Labrador, to Moscow and see what they do there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They would have to come back. This would not be to let them stay over there. We want them here in this chamber. To see what they can find out and no salary just the bare expenses of travelling over and back. They would go as a labour of love to see what they could find out. Would the minister think about that?

MR. LUNDFIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not as anxious to get rid of the hon. gentlemen as the suggestion might suggest. If I were inclined to send anybody to Moscow I would be inclined to send the people that might get involved in the development of the resource. I do not think politicians should try to become experts in a variety of fields, particularly a field which might require some specialized knowledge. The suggestion is certainly worth considering but I would not want to take it too seriously at the moment.

MR. STRACHAN: I would say that I attained more specialized knowledge in Labrador in labradorite than anyone else.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The member has already chosen his destiny, temporarily at least.

MR. SPEAKER: If the minister speaks now he closes the debate.

The Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly the government appreciates the wholehearted support of members of the House of this bill and I think everything that can be said has been said. I have much pleasure in moving second reading.

On motion a bill, "An Act To Adopt A Mineral Emblem For The Province," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave. (Bill No. 2)

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act To Provide Retiring Allowances On A Contributory Basis To Persons Who Have Served As Members Of The House of Assembly." (Bill No. 14)

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, this is an act to in effect update and make more reasonable the present pension act for the members of the House which was passed in 1962. It is a more realistic Act based on criteria

MR. DOODY:

which are probably more in keeping with modern pension philosophy, especially as it applies to members of the legislative assemblies. This Act is in effect replacing the old Act. The provisions of that 1962 Act are completely inadequate. The new Act revises many of the provisions and adds others which were totally lacking. So we drafted an entirely new Act.

In conducting a review of the present Act, a survey was made of the various pension plans in force in legislative assemblies across Canada. As a result the provisions of the new Act are more in line with these plans. Of course it is nowhere close to the benefits of the plans of places such as Ottawa, but then again this Province is not in a position to go that far, unfortunately, for the members and potential members of the House.

In the eligibility area, Sir, a member becomes eligible for a retiring allowance when his age and service as a member added together equals sixty, provided that the member was twice elected and served at least five years in the House of Assembly. Formerly the eligibility period was based on ten years service in the House or nine years service provided he was elected three times, and it was payable at age sixty.

MR. DOODY: The new act, Sir, proposes the establishment of a final average salary base for purposes of calculations of pension.

Formerly the average salary implicit in the formula used was a career average salary. In addition the base income to which the revised accrual rates will apply and which consequently forms an integral part of the average salary has been enlarged slightly to include a portion of a taxable allowance. The net effect is a raise in the level of economic benefits. There are in this pension plan also survival benefits. There is a small portion of the taxable allowance, that is district allowance. There is a \$4,000 non-taxable portion, but there is a \$3,500, which used to be \$2,400, have got a piece of that added on to your indemnity, as much as is possible and still have it as a registered pension plan to raise your level of eligibility.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not want to interrupt the minister's train of thought but could I ask a question on that point?

MR. DOODY: Yes, because it is a very technical one and if I cannot explain it to you now I will certainly get the information for you.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister and it is just simply whether it would not be a good idea to lump the district allowance, which is taxable, for all purposes lump it in with the \$8,000 or whatever it is we are paid as MHA's, you know, as opposed to our \$4,000 tax free portion and then the effect of that will be under the Income Tax Act of Canada, one third of that \$3,500 will be tax free and two-thirds will be taxable and also I would think that under the Registered Retirement Pension Plan provisions -

MR. DOODY: That is the difficulty there.

MR. ROBERTS: - two-thirds of it would be able to be taken into account in calculating your average benefit or whatever the term is that is used. Has any consideration been given to that point?

MR. DOODY: Yes, that is certainly the idea and that is the area to which the pensions people are applying themselves. They are in contact with the federal government, the National Revenue people

MR. DOODY: to see at which level, how far you can go with that before they will accept it as a registered pension plan in terms of the amount.

MR. ROBERTS: It also has the Income Tax effect as well.

MR. DOODY: That is right. So they are trying to balance it out and find out exactly wherein the level can reach.

This particular act also has survived the benefits that are - this was an area which I do not think was at all included in the previous act, but the eligibility requirements have been reduced. And the survivor's allowance is payable immediately on the death of the member, provided the deceased member was twice elected and had served for five years, a minimum level of pension has been set for surviving spouse of a deceased member and that is set out in the act. And in addition, ample provision, or at least in terms of the previous act, it is not ample I suppose in terms of the present day cost of living, but provision has been made for the children of deceased members for the first time. And unlike the present plan this new plan has provision for a member who becomes disabled.

This new act, Sir, also introduces two new provisions which should provide a bridge for persons entering politics for the first time insofar as pension is concerned, and this is a rather interesting area, an income bridge for a member retiring prior to age sixty-five, when he would become entitled to receive Canada Pension and Old Age Security benefits. He can elect to take a larger portion of his pension at the beginning and have it reduced when he becomes eligible for his Canada Pension -

MR. ROBERTS: In effect take a form of annuity.

MR. DOODY: - and Old Age Security Pension. I think the draftsman in this particular area is a great deal more optimistic about our chances of survival than I am. Of course as I look across at the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) I get awe inspired. I think we may all.

MR. DOODY: Continuance in a registered pension plan or a registered retirement savings plan, a person entering politics for the first time, Sir, perhaps on a trial basis, or perhaps at the whim of the electorate, may wish to have his own pension rates under his present plan protected while he serves as a member for his first term. To this end the new act permits a member to have his first term's contribution paid over to the member's former pension plan. However, should the member become elected a second time he is required to participate in the House of Assembly Pension Plan.

And there is the level income option, which I mentioned a few minutes ago. It is possible for a member to retire prior to age sixty-five. Because of the eligibility requirements of the Canada Pension Plan and the Old Age Security Act, full retirement benefits do not become payable until age sixty-five. In order to provide an income which would be constant from the date a member retired to the date of his death, provision has been made whereby the actual member's retiring allowance could be increased on actuarial basis for the period to age sixty-five and reduced accordingly when Canada Pension and Old Age Security benefits come on stream. This remains an option for those retiring members who desire it. It is made possible by the fact that the number of members retiring in any one year is small, and once again that is an optimistic view from the draftsman and it is not necessarily true in terms of the casualties of elections, as I remember them.

MR. ROBERTS: Public Service security.

MR. DOODY: I think that is probably what it was based on.

MR. MURPHY: Do we have any danger pay?

MR. DOODY: No there is no danger pay either.

MR. NEARY: Do we pay Unemployment Insurance benefits now?

MR. DOODY: I am afraid you are not eligible. You have no stamps, nothing to look forward to with hope and nothing to look backward on with pride. I am afraid you had better take the cash

MR. DOODY: and let the credit go. We do not have stamps.

Those of us who do not are constantly reminded of the fact that we are not eligible for unemployment insurance are inclined to try a lot harder.

The new act contains provisions also, Sir, for the negotiation of reciprocal agreements with the Government of Canada, another province, a municipality in this Province, corporations for institutions and so on; we can have reciprocal agreements with the supportability clause in effect is a separation of a member's retiring allowance from the minister's retiring allowance. In effect it is divided into two sections so that the minister's area of allowance is determined and the member's is determined and these differences are set out in the act. For full possible benefits under the act the member must have served a total of seventeen years in this hon. House. It sounds incredible but -

MR. ROBERTS: Seventeen years as a member, I guess.

MR. DOODY: As a member.

MR. ROBERTS: Seventeen years as a minister to get the -

MR. DOODY: Yes. And the total or maximum benefit of course will not exceed seventy-five per cent of the three best years that you have, and I mean best years in terms of income not necessarily in terms of comfort or security.

DR. FARRELL: Is it retroactive?

MR. DOODY: That comes from the heart of a Finance Minister.

DR. FARRELL: Is it retroactive?

MR. DOODY: That is what makes it such an unusual portfolio for me.

DR. FARRELL: Your Honour, is it retroactive?

MR. DOODY: No, I am afraid it is not retroactive.

DR. FARRELL: . The members who served in the past?

MR. DOODY: Those people who have served in the past and who have been defeated and are re-elected at a later term apply their previous service, and to that effect there is retroactivity. If they have withdrawn their pension -

DR. FARRELL: They can repay it, yes.

MR. DOODY: They can buy back that service under the act and apply it to their present tenure of office. Unfortunately it does not help those members who are gone on in a greater cause, or whatever, and are not with us today.

MR. MURPHY: That sometimes happens -

AN HON. MEMBER: But those who come after.

MR. NEARY: But those who come after.

MR. DOODY: But those who come after will get the benefits, Your Honour. Still, as I say, it is not a great plan in terms of welfare and in terms of income. I think it is a step in the right direction and it does provide some small measure of security for an otherwise very insecure profession and I would recommend and endorse second reading of the act, Sir.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I think that every member of the House will go along with the minister's request or his recommendation that the act be endorsed. That is what I believe and that is what I think. Hon. gentlemen will say as they wish, of course, but I think the plan embodied in this act is a distinct improvement over the one under which members of the House of Assembly in the past have drawn their pensions. And I do not mean just an improvement in monetary terms; it is an improvement in monetary terms and so it should be, I do not feel the least bit apologetic about that, Mr. Speaker, The Public Service have had their wages improved over the last, well really it began about five or six years ago, the big leaps forward when I suppose the medium salary in the Public Service must have been improved one hundred per cent

June 2, 1976

Tape No. 3123

NM - 6

MR. ROBERTS: in the last six or seven years. Their pensions, they have quite a good pension plan. I know NAPE would like to negotiate it up and more power to them but, you know, the increase in the material side, the increase in the dollar side, the monetary value, is not unique to this House and I do not think we as members should be the least bit apologetic and the minister is not and I think that is properly so.

Mr. Roberts:

But the new Pension Act, Sir, that this bill would bring into law is an improvement in a number of other senses which I think are of more significance, and of more value even than any monetary improvements, and most of these I think the minister touched upon. I think it is a matter of some scandal or, not scandal, a matter of concern that we up until now have not had in this House a provision whereby a man or a woman who serves as a member of the House and is disabled can get any protection at all. We have had a number of other iniquitous provisions. Take for example my friend from Burin-Placentia West who served with distinction as a member of this House for twenty-one years, was seven times elected a member of this House, on his eighth trip to the electorate met with an unhappy accident and was not returned at that time as a member, and after having contributed for twenty-one years of service, and having served with distinction for twenty-one years as a member, was not eligible to draw any pension at all because he was not sixty years of age.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nothing at all?

MR. ROBERTS: No, the gentleman from Burin-Placentia West drew nothing at all from the pension plan for that entire period. Ironically, if he had not been re-elected last Fall he would have drawn it because he is now I believe reached his sixtieth birthday and thus, you know, qualifies for the pension. This new Act, Sir, removes that feature, I think it is a step forward because now in effect it recognizes years of service and age taken together, and when a certain combination is reached, I think it is sixty except in the case of the Premier whose onerous duties are recognized by a little lower combination I think, fifty-five is magic number in the case of the Premier of the Province or any man or woman who has served as Premier, then, you know, when that magic total of sixty is reached a member may qualify for his pension.

MR. ROUSSEAU: It is exactly the same principle as the NTA.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture reminds

Mr. Roberts:

me it is exactly the same principle as the NTA. I think their number may be higher, but their profession is, you know, the career is of longer duration in teaching.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sixty.

MR. ROBERTS: Sixty is it? In the NTA - I thought it was ninety-two when your years of service -

MR. RIDEOUT: No they have brought it down.

AN HON. MEMBER: Years of service plus age.

MR. ROBERTS: Well in the NTA it is years of service plus age, but what is the number?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Ninety-two.

MR. ROBERTS: Ninety-two.

MR. SIMMONS: Because it is the old Act.

MR. ROBERTS: Whereas our is sixty in this Bill here. And what that would mean if a member was elected at fifty, and was re-elected, you have to be elected twice before you can get a pension under this legislation, was re-elected and served for ten years - I am sorry, if he was elected at forty and was re-elected and served for ten years, at age fifty he would qualify for his pension. Interestingly enough, the minimum age at which anybody could possibly qualify, I think is about thirty-nine, if you were elected at eighteen and re-elected for twenty-one years, and when you reach thirty-nine your age and years of service together would have totalled sixty. But I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that anybody who has served twenty-one years in this House may have the chronological age of thirty-nine but has paid his dues, Sir, and in my belief is entitled to a pension from the public chest of this Province according to some reasonable and rational standards.

The Act also clears up another inequity one which, for example, the family of my late colleague and very dear friend Bill Keough. Bill Keough served with very great distinction as a member of the National Assembly and as a member of the House, died, a relatively young man, I believe he was fifty-five or fifty-six at the time of his death. He had served for twenty or twenty-one years as a minister

Mr. Roberts:

as well as a member.

MR. DOODY: No survivor benefit.

MR. ROBERTS: Well there was a survivor benefit, I say to the Minister of Finance, but his widow, Mrs. Gertrude Keough, did not qualify to receive the survivor's benefit because according to the terms of the present law you do not receive until the deceased member would have been sixty, which meant that she would have to wait I believe four or five years until -

MR. MURPHY: You could starve to death while you were waiting.

MR. ROBERTS: That is just it, you know. The Minister of Provincial Affairs says literally you could have starved, and it is true. No recognition was paid, and again that is completely different from all pension plans, and what we now propose is very much in line with the modern thinking, the present day thinking in pension plans.

Mr. Speaker, I like this Act. I do not think it is overly generous. I think it is a fair Act. I think it recognizes the fact that members of the House of Assembly are entitled to a pension, and I think it recognizes the fact that that pension should be related to their salary, and to their years of service, and a combination of the two gives you the amount of the pension. That is an improvement over the old one which related only to the amount that one had paid in, and I think that was iniquitous. It may have been acceptable, it may have been the right thing twenty or twenty-five years ago when the present pension plan was adopted, but it is not a plan we should follow today.

I want to say as well one other thing, - well I want to make one minor point and then I wish to say one other point of principle, if you wish. The minor point is that I object, I have, and I still do, to the fact that under, I am not sure what they are, the portability provisions, the tie-in provisions, the Governor-in-Council, or the Cabinet has the power to make arrangements with the Government of Canada, I do not object to that, or any other government

Mr. Roberts:

I do not object to any of that, in effect to meld pension plans so that a man or a woman who late in life is elected to serve in the House of Assembly can get a certain amount of credit for his or her service with the Government of Canada or with the government of another province, and I think that is straightforward. But I do think, Sir, that we should restrict this to members who have served with the Government of Canada or the government of another province or any municipality in an elected sense, because this plan is a little more generous. And I will come to the major point because in my view that is the way it should be. It is a little more generous than the normal civil service pension plan.

AN HON. MEMBER: What section?

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

AN HON. MEMBER: What section?

MR. ROBERTS: Section (34) of the draft bill, the bill before the House is the one which I believe is in point on this. And there are subsequent sections which refer to it as well.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that it would be possible for the Cabinet, any Cabinet, and I am not talking about the present Cabinet, it would be possible for a Cabinet under this to make an agreement whereby say fifteen years of service with the Government of Canada, hold on, it takes seventeen years to get a maximum pension under this Act, and you must be elected twice to this House and that could happen literally in one year if -

MR. DOODY: He has to serve five years.

MR. ROBERTS: Well all right. He serves five years, so he serves five years in this House, and five years as a minister, let us say, and he has had twelve years as a clerk with the Government of Canada, and it would be possible to make an agreement - I do not mean a clerk at a table, I mean an office clerk, a clerical worker- and an agreement could be made and those twelve years could be recognized as if they were service in this House, the result would

Mr. Roberts:

be that after five years only that woman or that man would be qualified to receive the maximum pension.

MR. MURPHY: Providing he is sixty.

MR. ROBERTS: Well actually he could get it at forty-three.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, but his twelve years would be -

MR. ROBERTS: Oh he would still have to be added to his age to make the magic total sixty. But what I am saying quite simply, I may not be putting it very clearly, but what I am trying to say is that I do not think that elected service should be equated with non-elected service, and this fact gives elected service, you know, it is a little more generous because it deals with men and women who serve in elective life with all the hazards and difficulties that that entails. I do not think that other service should be given as great weight. And, you know, I do not think it is an objection going to the root of the Bill but I think it is a point which should be made. And I would urge that the minister look at the possibility of amending it in Committee, to put some rein on it, because otherwise it could literally happen, and if you had seventeen years in at age forty-three, so let me take my example through, At twenty-six Mr. Smith goes to work with the town council of -

AN HON. MEMBER: St. Anthony.

MR. ROBERTS: Well all right, St. Anthony, a small town, and they have a retirement allowance plan, for the purpose of my example, so the man spends twelve years there and contributes -

MR. PECKFORD: A lot of them are getting that now.

MR. ROBERTS: Right, and so they should, - spends twelve years with that town council as a very minor clerk, doing fine work, but I mean not running the town of St. Anthony, but a clerical worker; and then at age thirty-eight that Mr. Smith runs for and seeks election to the House and is elected, and then subsequently he is re-elected and serves a total of five years. So at age forty-three Mr. Smith has seventeen years of credit, five years in the House, twelve years with the town council of St. Anthony, if he has put in his five years

Mr. Roberts:

as a minister he has those to his credit as well, and he is qualified to receive his pension. And he is qualified to receive it on exactly the same basis as if he had spent seventeen years in the House of Assembly.

I do not object to credit been given to service with the Town of St. Anthony or the Government of Canada or anything else, I think that is essential to attract

MR. ROBERTS:

men and women from the public service back and forth or from the House of Commons to here or the House of Assembly back, but I do think it is wrong to give it quite the same weight. That is the point I make. I think it would be a better piece of legislation before us, Sir, if some recognition were given to that principle, if some limitation were placed upon the power of the Cabinet. That is all I say. But I think it is a point well worth making and I would urge the minister to have a look at it and see if it is possible to - I think the minister would agree with me. I mean we are giving ourselves a little better pension plan because we are elected and we have a shorter career span, not I hope a shorter life span. Indeed some politicians in this Province give every prospect of enjoying magnificent life spans and more power to them all. But shorter career spans.

MR. MURPHY: It is not actuarially sound.

MR. ROBERTS: No, this plan is not actuarially sound. It cannot be actuarially sound. But I think that we should not - and the minister may have put it much better than I could. We should not compare it or allow it to be melded Even Steven with an actuarially sound plan.

Mr. Speaker, the other point I wish to make is a much broader one and I have adumbrated it in my remarks just now. This plan is a little more generous than it might be if it were actuarially sound, or than if you were looking at a normal work situation as in the NTA or in the public service or in private industry where you look to a work career of going to work at twenty to sixty-five, forty-five years or forty if we look at the age of sixty as retirement.

Mr. Speaker, the profession of politics, the art and the science of politics, is very hazardous. I have not counted up recently but there are not more than a half dozen members of this House, including my friend from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) who was absent and returned and my friend from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Canning) who was absent and returned to the House, I do not think there are a half dozen members of this House, Sir, who have been here

MR. ROBERTS:

any longer than I have and I have only been here - what is this, 1976? - ten years. My friend from St. John's Center (Mr. Murphy) has been here, my friend in the parliamentary sense from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has been here -

MR. NEARY: Thirteen years, fourteen years.

MR. ROBERTS: - thirteen, fourteen years, 1962 the gentleman was elected, November, 1962. The member for Fogo (Capt. Winsor) has been here since 1956. I think that is it. The member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey), the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Hickman) and the member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) and I have been here the same time. The member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) and I entered the House at the same election although he had a brief interruption in his career. But my point is that political life in this Province or elsewhere - we are no different here than anywhere else. The fact that we are no different was obscured by the somewhat unusual political circumstances of the first twenty years after Confederation. But those I do not think will be repeated. I think in the normal course of political life now even if men choose to reoffer themselves for election time and time again, you know, the electorate, I think, will tend to shorten careers. I do not think you will see, you know, long - I think ten or fifteen or twenty years is as long as any man or woman will serve in this House of Assembly in the normal run of events. There will be exceptions.

I think therefore it is entirely right that within a seventeen year period a member can qualify for a maximum pension. I think that is important because in the public service I think you have to be thirty years - or is it thirty-five? - to qualify for the maximum pension I think it is worth saying why we have, you know, shortened it here from thirty to seventeen. I make no apologies for that. I think it is a right recommendation, a right provision of the law for the reasons which I have outlined.

Let me add to that simply one other thought that any man who has been involved in trying to recruit candidates to seek election as

MR. ROBERTS:

I have, as the Premier has, as many members on either side have, realizes that it is difficult indeed to persuade people to stand for election in this Province. Some people come forward quite readily to run but many others do not want to. It is obviously in the public interest that the best possible candidates offer themselves for election. It is in the interest of the parties, it is in the interest of the public, it is in the interest of the House of Assembly. One of the things we have got to do to make it possible for candidates to come forward is to give them a reasonable degree of income protection, a reasonable degree of security. We are not talking about salaries so I will not go into that except I say we have got to have a reasonable income as well, because in politics, Sir, as in anything else, you only get what you pay for. If you pay little, you get little. If you are prepared to pay reasonably and fairly, then you will get a reasonable and fair return.

But I think, Sir, a pension plan is a very important part of the whole scheme that will help to attract the best possible candidates in the public life. I think that is something, Sir, that the minister did not touch upon but I think he would agree with it. I think it is something that should very much commend this bill because it is not just a bill to benefit us. It will benefit many members of this House. I suppose it will benefit all of us, almost all, in one way or another. It will benefit some by apparently quite large sums if you were to do that sort of exercise. But, Mr. Speaker, it is a bill which I believe will benefit the people of this Province because it will protect members of the House of Assembly. It will enable Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to come forth to serve in the House of Assembly with an assurance that they will have at least a modicum of security at the end of a reasonable period of service in public life. Sir, I think that is something this House should do and so I support the minister's call and I say that this bill should receive the support of every member of the House, Sir. We in the Liberal Party in the Opposition, Sir, we shall support it. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. J. CARTER: I am not getting up, Mr. Speaker, to dispute this bill. It is reasonable. But there are a couple of points that I think should be made. The first is that I would hope that this - obviously this is not an actuarially sound bill. However, I would hope that rather than any increase be made in the years to come that it should be possible for a member of his own volition to increase his own contribution so that, let us say, instead of getting fifty or sixty per cent of his present or average salary that he might be able to increase that by a certain amount on an actuarially sound basis. I suggest this because I feel that the public deserve to have a guarantee that although this is a generous pension bill that it is not the thin edge of the wedge or rather just the beginning of a very, very generous and expensive programme for members of this House.

I certainly sympathize with other members who have spoken who have said that - they have referred to the precarious nature of political life particularly in Newfoundland.

MR. MURPHY: That does not worry the hon. member, does it?

MR. J. CARTER: I wonder if there should be any difference made between the recompense for a Liberal and that for a Conservative and perhaps an independent should get least of all. However, that is a matter that the minister might like to address himself to.

MR. NEARY: Go on, you big brute!

MR. J. CARTER: The hon. member for Burgeo-LaPoile reminds me of the two men who were lost.

MR. SIMMONS: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has come up.

MR. SIMMONS: Never was a member of this House more deeply insulted than by the remark the member just made. I nor that member and not the member for Burgeo-LaPoile. I am the member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir. He is the member for LaPoile. We are as different as can be, and long may the distinction last.

MR. J. CARTER: Shall I clarify the situation by saying that the hon.

MR. J. CARTER:

member, the former member for Bell Island (Mr. Neary), reminds me of the two men who are lost in the woods in a snow storm and as night came on they realized that they were going to have to face the prospect of spending the night in the woods. So one said to the other, "Well, we are going to have to erect a rude shelter." "Fine", said the other, "you put up the walls and I will write on them." If ever I want a rude shelter erected I know who to go to.

However, in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, I will add my support to this bill. But I would like the minister to address himself to the possibility of a member increasing his own contribution and thereby increasing his recompense.

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

The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, on the point raised by the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) as to the ability of the willingness or the desire or right of a person to increase his own savings or his own pension amounts, I would think that that is a choice which he can make himself. He can take all or any part of his income that he does not need and deposit it in the registered savings plan and use it in future years. For those of us who are not so fortunate as to have huge chunks to put aside from time to time we will have to depend on what the people vote us in this hon. House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: As for those parties and those people of various parties whether there should be a distinction between them as to their pension-ability, I think perhaps the pension could perhaps be based on the numbers of hours spent in the House rather than on the party they represent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Well, I have earned my keep then.

MR. J. CARTER: Perhaps from the number of words spoken.

MR. DOODY: With respect to the point raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition on section 34, which I think is the only section that he

MR. DOODY:

seriously questioned or had a problem with and that is subsection (d), the authority of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to enter into a reciprocal agreement with a corporation or an institution,

Mr. Doody.

we will certainly have a look at that, Sir. I do not really see anything wrong with it. I do not really think that the House is giving anything away to these people. We are simply giving them the right to have their previous service or pension time allowed for and added to their time when they are elected. It seems to me to be a reasonable way or at least a slight incentive to entice people into public life. One of the big problems, I think, that the hon. Leader of the Opposition alluded to was the difficulty in persuading people to leave a secure institution or a secure organization, a teachers' organization or corporation, and perhaps in a small way this might be some way to help or to get them involved in public life. Certainly there is little enough security in the situation as it is now, and there is relatively little income compared to the incomes in other parts of society today and in terms of the responsibility which elected members choose of their own volition to accept. So I do not really think that that is a very serious problem or indeed a very great privilege to extend to elected members of the people's House. I will undertake to look at it, Sir, and I am most happy to move second reading of the bill.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Provide Retiring Allowances On A Contributory Basis To Persons Who Have Served As Members Of The House Of Assembly," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave. (Bill No. 14).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I hope that I have the concurrence of the House in moving that the House when it rises at six o'clock can resume for this evening, and we will put some of these bills then through the Committee stages by leave, if necessary. If that is agreeable I would so move.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister has asked whether there is leave that when we rise at six o'clock we return at eight o'clock. Is there unanimous consent?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. WELLS: Order 11, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 11.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department of Transportation And Communications Act." (Bill no. 43).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: This is a relatively minor but important piece of housekeeping legislation. The explanatory note makes it very clear. " This Bill would amend The Department of Transportation and Communications Act to provide that wires and cables crossing a highway are not less than eighteen feet." Now apparently the present law requires that it be specified, the height that is, by the Canadian Standards Association, and the association has apparently reduced the minium recently down to somewhere around fourteen feet, six inches, and it is the intention of the government by introducing this bill to make sure that in no event shall the clearance be less than eighteen feet. And it is all very clear both in the explanatory note and in the bill itself, and consequently, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, this is clearly a piece of housekeeping legislation. I think it is a good move. Eighteen feet is not unreasonable, with the type of traffic we have travelling our highways today and for our part we certainly support the principle of this bill.

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

MR. FLIGHT: I am curious about one thing in this bill in how the minister proposes to get an eighteen foot clearance under an overpass for instance such as the Roaches Line overpass which now has got sixteen? Is he going to raise the overpass or lower the road?

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

MR. WELLS: Does the minister wish to speak closing the debate on the wires across the highway and cables?

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Minister of Transportation speaks now he closes the debate.

The hon. minister.

MR. SIMMONS: Before the minister does, could he yield a moment?

MR. SPEAKER: Right.

MR. SIMMONS: Further to the point raised by the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) - it may be my lack of knowledge on the matter - but what is the implication to existing wires and so on? Is there provision in the bill that would require these to be raised over a period of time or is this just for new installations?

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

The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I was outside the Chamber when it was introduced. The regulations governing the height for cables and wires across highways was always being regulated by the Canadian Standards Association. But because the Standards Association of Canada reduced their minimum - or maximum height, I should say - from eighteen feet to fourteen and one-half feet, and in Newfoundland fourteen and one-half feet, we feel and the engineering point of view is that is too low; so rather than continue on to follow the regulations of this federal regulatory body, we decided to bring in our own amendment

Mr. Morgan:

to the act to make sure it is not less than eighteen feet rather than stick to the regulations of the federal association which is now down to fourteen and one-half feet.

So in the past it was eighteen feet, but now if we carried on with the regulations set by the federal body, you can go down to fourteen and one-half feet, which is too low for us, so we are going to stick to eighteen feet all the way in the future.

MR. PECKFORD: How low can you go?

MR. FLIGHT: May I ask a question before the hon. minister closes the debate?

MR. PECKFORD: That is a great piece of legislation. Reform!
Reform!

MR. FLIGHT: Would the minister permit a question before he closes the debate?

MR. MORGAN: Sure!

MR. FLIGHT: I realize my first remark was facetious. It was meant that way. But why is it necessary - I am glad that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is in good humour today. I hope he is in good humour all Summer and next Fall.

MR. PECKFORD: I am in good humour all year.

MR. FLIGHT: Why is it necessary, Mr. Speaker, to have an eighteen foot clearance of wires crossing the highroads when most of our overpasses are less than sixteen feet? The one on Roaches Line is sixteen. So now we are going to have an eighteen foot clearance on cables.

MR. DOODY: What have you been doing on Roaches Line?

MR. FLIGHT: That is one in particular.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, wire is a flexible medium.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. N. WINDSOR: Sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: With the consent of the House the hon. member may speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Mount Pearl.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, wire is a flexible medium, if you are aware of our sleet conditions here, many times during the Winter, when you get a lot of ice built up on that, that wire will stretch, and you will get it down perhaps to sixteen feet where an overpass will not stretch, and will not come down. And that is the difference in wires than in overpasses. Now also if you do hit a wire you got a live electrical circuit running around the ground which is a heck of a lot more dangerous.

MR. FLIGHT: I am deeply grateful to the Member for Mount Pearl.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Transportation And Communications, read a first second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave. (Bill No. 43).

MR. WELLS: Order 19, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 61.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 19.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Livestock(Community Sales) Act." (Bill No. 61).

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which is evidently explained in the explanatory note and in the bill itself. Previously all sales of livestock had to be by public auctions. These were in the early days, in the 1960's. Now there are people who sell livestock at various places, at railway depots, sidings, off cars or at the dock side. And it is merely an enlargement of the areas where livestock can be sold, and it is purely a means of legalizing just what is going on in the Province today, and not only have it at public auctions but anywhere where livestock is gathered for that purpose.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. George's.

MRS. MACISAAC: Mr. Speaker, I am quite happy to support the bill. In my area, and I believe in other agricultural areas in the Province, public auctioning of livestock is either a thing of the past or they have not yet caught on. Other methods of

MRS. MCISAAC:

of sales are already being used, and I am happy that the legislation is now being introduced to legalize what is already going on, and I commend the minister for his efforts in this matter.

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

The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of the bill.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Livestock (Community Sales) Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave. (Bill No. 61).

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

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WELLS: The Workmen's Compensation Act, Bill No. 47,
Order 13, Mr. Speaker.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend
The Workmen's Compensation Act."

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

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, this is a similar, or a bill that is
similar to one that goes through the Legislature every year mainly
to increase the benefits payable by the Workmen's Compensation
Board to people who have been injured or to widows of people who
have died through industrial accidents.

There is one change I think that I should mention here
this year and that is a redefinition of the word "accident". There
has been some problems with defining "accident" in relation to
covering industrial diseases, compensation for industrial diseases.
We have now changed the definition of the word, or we are proposing
to change the definition, to ensure that industrial diseases
are fully covered either during the workman's active working life
or even after he retires. The wording is similar to wording that
is used in at least one other province, the Province of New
Brunswick, where it has been found that it works fairly well. The
present definition in the act now does not mention disablement
caused by industrial diseases. No provision exists in the
act to allow the board to accept a claim for disablement arising
out of an industrial disease following the workman's retirement,
and there is also some question of the interpretation on the
acceptance of death claims following retirement.

The Workmen's Compensation Board has accepted a number
of claims, especially from St. Lawrence, and here we are talking
not necessarily of physical accidents as such, we are talking of
diseases that have no physical impairment such as an arm or a leg

MR. MAYNARD: or anything like that, but it rather effects the lung or some other part of the body. The Board, as I said, have accepted some of the claims for the accidents but they have been very doubtful as to whether or not they are legally bound to do it and the wording change in the act here now I think will repair that part of the Workmen's Compensation Act.

The act is also being changed to allow the worker to be entitled to accident benefits. If a person has had an accident or is suffering from an industrial disease goes back to work and finds that the disease reoccurs or that the accident still gives the person trouble, after a period of one year with this new change he will be able to again receive benefits; previously it was three years.

The other causes of the proposed amendments, the increases in allowances, such as burial expenses which are being increased from \$400 to \$500; transportation of the body - \$125 to \$150; widows' allowances have been increased and the children's allowances have been increased, or are being increased. There is also an increase proposed in the permanent disability pension. It is now a minimal of \$300. It will be increased by fifteen per cent July 1, 1976, ten per cent January 1, 1977.

The permanent partial disability is being increased by the same percentage points and the maximum compensable earnings, which is the earning level in which the Workmen's Compensation benefits are calculated, seventy-five per cent of the maximum compensable earnings is the maximum amount that the person could get for a permanent disability. This is being increased from \$10,000 to \$12,000. In effect the employer will pay for benefits, rate of benefits, up to \$12,000 to cover the workman's wages up to that point and the worker, if he is permanently disabled, will receive seventy-five per cent of that amount as a total disability pension, or varying amounts within that scope if

MR. MAYNARD: it is listed as a permanent total disability.

I do not think there are any other sections to the act that are significant. These are the major changes. As I say, it is one that comes up every year. I am pleased to introduce the bill. It is not all, I might point out, that the people in the labour movement would like to see. But we do feel it is as far as we can go at the present time and it does come up to within, not on a par with all provinces but certainly very close to most other provinces as far as the maximum compensable earnings are concerned and as far as other benefits are concerned under the act. I move second reading.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this side recognizes and appreciates the increases outlined by the minister, the fifteen per cent increase in the partial disability payment and by a further ten per cent in January. The increases are welcome and we agree with the increases and we accept them. But, Mr. Speaker, the amendments as outlined in this bill just do not go far enough.

I come from a town, Buchans, that is prone to industrial diseases and therein is the problem as I see it with regard to this legislation and with regard to the existing legislation.

Now I took a stab here in some debate trying to point out some of the deficiencies and the shortcomings in the Workmen's Compensation Act as it exists, and as it applies to industrial diseases.

MR. FLIGHT:

I think I did not do a very good job and I am going to take another stab at it. I would like to be sure to have acknowledgement in this House as to whether or not that the injustices as I see them, as I point them out, are indeed accepted and this House is concerned about them.

With regards to the industrial disease, Mr. Speaker, I will use an example. I know, I am working on behalf of a miner who in 1971 had to quit work and was reported to a Workmen's Compensation doctor. His disease was diagnosed as silicosis, but it was not to the stages where the man would have to stop work. He went back to work and he continued to work until 1973, when he finally got to a point where he had to stop. The man was wheezing. He could not work. He could not do anything. The Workmen's Compensation allowed him seventy-five per cent of the maximum payable at the time, \$6,000, and that is \$375 a year. They did not in my mind - and I know I am going to use strong language here because I feel very strongly about it - they did not have the decency to allow him the maximum available when he had to stop work, when he finally stopped. They allowed him the seventy-five per cent of the maximum available when the disease was first detected.

Mr. Speaker, at that time when that man contacted silicosis and had to come off work, he was a top producer in this Province, earning in the vicinity of \$12,000 a year, and but for the fact that he contacted silicosis he would today be earning \$15,000 to \$20,000 a year, one of, as I say, heavy producers and one of the contributors to this economy.

Now the Act as it exists, Sir, and the amendments as they exist are an injustice, a gross injustice to this individual and all the individuals in industrial related diseases who are in the same category. Since 1971, and by this legislation the maximum payable or the maximum by which a man's benefits will be determined has been raised to \$12,000. Now seventy-five per cent of \$12,000, Mr. Speaker, is a far cry from seventy-five per cent of \$6,000. I

MR. FLIGHT:

submit that the Workmen's Compensation Board should recognize the injustice here. Any man today who was used to earning - it does not matter what he was earning, the fact is any man today with a family who has to get by on \$375 a month is next to welfare. As a matter of fact it is conceivable that if he had a big enough family he would be getting more money from welfare than he gets from Workmen's Compensation having contributed to Workmen's Compensation all his life. The man is punished in effect for contracting silicosis.

That is one case. There are others. I am thinking about one in particular but there are more. There are men retired from Buchans, there are men right now who are working in the mines in Buchans who should be on compensation. They should be getting seventy-five per cent. Silicosis is there, but the bureaucracy of the Workmen's Compensation Board, they will not admit it until the man is almost dead. There is no way, Mr. Speaker, that I can conceive of anybody rationally sitting down, I cannot conceive of the rationale that would allow men to sit down and to allow a man to stay on seventy-five per cent of \$6,000, a man who was a top wage earner in his day. And as I say, had he not contracted silicosis today he would be earning \$15,000 or \$20,000. That in my opinion is a disgrace.

That is the disease itself, silicosis, and my hon. friend from White Bay I am sure will have some remarks to the same point when he stands. The same injustices exist in partial disability, Mr. Speaker. I know of men today, miners, who have lost a leg, ten years ago they lost a leg. Their pension is set at whatever the going rate at the time, the ceiling at the time. They are earning eighty dollars a month. When they lost their leg, a leg chopped clean off in the mines by an underground accident, they immediately became not available for employment other than at the good graces of some company who would make light employment available to them. They have to suffer the embarrassment and the disgrace, in a way, of taking a job that when they lost their leg, because they were prepared to work underground and be a

MR. FLIGHT:

miner and take the chance on the type of injuries that miners have to take the chance on, having been injured underground, having lost a leg, they were immediately taken out of the work force, any meaningful part of the work force where they could have been a producer and where their income would have been dependent and related to their ability and their desire to work. Now having lost a limb in the early 1960's, now in 1975 they are drawing a paltry eighty dollars per month in Workmen's Compensation. Again, Mr. Speaker, I cannot conceive of the type of rationale, I cannot conceive of the type of reasoning that will allow this condition to exist.

It would have been amusing but for the implications here. The Workmen's Compensation Board is about to undertake to build in St. John's a great building. Now I have been told - I am not sure - I am told there is no government funds being made available for that building. I am told the Workmen's Compensation have the funds necessary to build such a building. Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Workmen's Compensation that they have their priorities mixed up. I doubt very seriously if there is any more than 100 or 150 people in Newfoundland today suffering as a result of industrial diseases. I doubt if there are any more than 100 or 150 men in the category that I have just outlined. Would it not seem that before the Workmen's Compensation Board would consider going into real estate, regardless of how noble the purpose of the building, regardless as to whether it is going to be a hospital when an ailing comes into St. John's he finds a place to live until he sees his doctor and goes back, when a man who loses a limb comes to St. John's he has got no difficulty in finding a place to spend the night, or a week. I would think the workmen's compensation would be better advised if they first looked at the people who they are keeping on a salary that is no better in my opinion than welfare.

I would think, Sir - you know this may be wasted words I am saying here. I have one purpose in saying this, and that is awakening in

MR. FLICHT:

the members of this House the injustice that is indeed being perpetrated on people who are unlucky enough in this Province to contract industrial diseases. I have lived with them. I have watched them die, and I do not want to be dramatic. I know men right now in Buchans who will be very lucky to live much longer and these men are forced to live on pensions that they could just as well have said, "To heck with the pensions, give me welfare!" And the welfare with their families would be just as beneficial to them. There is no way that that is justice, and there is no way that I accept, and this House should accept, amendments to this bill that would not bring these people up.

What I think should happen is this; that when a man loses a leg or contracts an industrial disease that regardless of the year or the time or the level that existed when he contacted that disease then I think he should be upgraded. In other words, I think the man who lost a leg in 1961, this legislation should apply to him. It would be just. There is no argument against it unless there is a desire to keep the man underprivileged, to keep him living close to welfare conditions. I cannot see any argument against a man who contacted silicosis in 1971 being permitted to draw benefits equal to what is being presented in this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, there is another issue here too. That is the special legislation that exists for the St. Lawrence people, the St. Lawrence miners. I am happy for the St. Lawrence miners and I am happy that legislation exists to take care of miners who are exposed to the type of hazards that the miners in the St. Lawrence area are exposed to. But what I do not understand since it is an accepted fact that in the case of the mines in Buchans silicosis is an industrial disease that every miner who goes underground is exposed to and many have contacted or contracted.

MR. FLIGHT: hon. friend from White Bay (Mr. Rideout) I think has impressed this House many times on the dangers and the hazards of asbestosis in Baie Verte, I do not understand why any legislation covering the welfare of men who work in conditions whereby they are subject to contacting industrial diseases, why that legislation does not cover all people working in conditions where there is a high possibility of contacting industrial disease.

So, Mr. Speaker, basically that is my personal complaint with the legislation. I am disappointed that the people who drafted this legislation, that the government did not see fit to go farther. As the minister admitted, it does not go far enough. It certainly does not go far enough and of course there is a great possibility here that the reason this legislation does not go any farther is that we only have in Newfoundland three or four operations, so to speak, where industrial disease is a very great danger, where is a high possibility of contacting industrial diseases. And maybe since the Workmen's Compensation Board, the people who are contributing to the Workmen's Compensation, there is a very small minority of those people who will ever run the danger of contacting industrial diseases. Maybe the emphasis is not on these people, maybe the desire is to cater to the far greater majority who will not contact industrial diseases but will have on the job injuries. But I would say, Sir, it is time for this government to face its responsibility, it is time for this House to face its responsibility, and to stop sweeping the fact that we have people in this Province who are now walking around having already contacted industrial diseases and who are exposed to industrial diseases and we will have, as long as we operate lead mines in this Province, as long as we operate asbestos mines, as long as we operate fluorspar mines we will have people who will contact and die from industrial diseases. Now either we close the mines and do not permit any more mining-- we have a responsibility to the people who are prepared to go underground and earn a living.

MR. FLIGHT: They do not have to go underground. I could elect today, if I would have wanted, and I worked three years underground, and if I would have wanted to I could have sat back and taken my welfare. I did not have to go down and expose myself to the lead dust or asbestosis as in the case of Baie Verte. And there is no cost involved there. The Workmen's Compensation, we are told, is in a very strong financial position. Why are they abdicating their responsibilities to the people in this Province who have contracted industrial disease? Why is it that in the case of Buchans today there may be five or six people who are kept close to the welfare state by the type of paltry pensions permitted them under the Workmen's Compensation Act? Why?

Sir, if I were standing up here asking for some consideration that would involve great amounts of money, then I could understand - I might not say it, but I could understand why the majority of this House would not go along with me. But I am not. I am standing up here talking about - I would not dare grab a figure - I am talking probably about 100 people in Newfoundland today. We can get the figures from the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Another gripe about the Workmen's Compensation Board, why does it take so long? We have had cases of men who spend years coming back and forth to St. John's to the Workmen's Compensation Board and Workmen's Compensation doctors, and it was in its early stages when it came but when it was finally admitted that they had silicosis it was in its latter stages. Is this done with an eye to saving the amount of compensation that would have been payable over the years?

All right, Mr. Speaker, I hope I have made my point. I do not want to belabour or kill time in this House, but I think it is time that somebody stand up here and I would like to see someone on the government side who will stand up here and admit that we have been giving, the Workmen's Compensation Board have been giving the men in this Province who are prepared to go underground and prepared to work in an atmosphere where industrial disease

MR. FLIGHT: is a grave hazard, it is time for this House to recognize them and to see that they are protected in the event that they do contact industrial diseases. They are laying their lives on the line, and we have hundreds of men in this Province today who are partially and wholly disabled, and it is not being recognized and will not be recognized by this legislation. If we do not get any better legislation than this, the people who contacted silicosis, asbestosis over this past five or six years will continue to live at a level that we afford to welfare recipients in this Province. I think that is grossly unfair and I think that this House should not condone that situation any longer and I think we should get the level of payment up. I think that whatever is the maximum payable under the Workmen's Compensation Act in 1976 should apply to anyone who contacted silicosis or asbestosis or any other industrial related diseases since the Workmen's Compensation came into being, since that act came into being.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more with the hon. gentleman who just spoke on the bill before the House, "An Act To Amend The Workmen's Compensation Act." I believe that the minister would be well advised to recommend to his colleagues, to the Workmen's Compensation Board, that they review all the cases and bring the level, the standard, the payment of these people up to present day standards, so that at least they will be living a little better than if they were on welfare.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) referred to the new building that the Workmen's Compensation Board have in the planning stage at the present time, and my hon. friend was wondering why the Workmen's Compensation Board was putting up this

MR. NEARY: building. Well if my hon. friend would just refer to the annual report of the Workmen's Compensation Board he would see why they are in a position to erect a new building.

The Board, Mr. Speaker, as the House probably knows, invests its reserve funds in securities and under a provision of the Workmen's Compensation Act they are authorized by the law of this Province to invest their money in trust funds, and the book value of the Board's long-term investments at the present time, according to the annual report, amount to a whopping \$26 million, almost \$27 million, almost \$27 million, Mr. Speaker, which makes the Workmen's Compensation Board probably one of the wealthiest organizations in Canada, probably on the North American Continent and that is why the Board, if nothing else, is in a financial position to stick up a building. Maybe my hon. friend is right; maybe instead of erecting a memorial, a building, getting into the real estate business, maybe they should concentrate more on payments of benefits to survivors and widows and to people who are disabled through industrial accidents.

Well, Sir, I believe the minister should tell us a little more about this building. Is it just going to be a building to house the Workmen's Compensation Board? Is it going to be an investment on behalf of the Workmen's Compensation Board? Is it going to be an investment whereby they will rent or lease office space to private companies or in the public sector? Will the Workmen's Compensation Board be putting up a building that will be utilized by the provincial government and the government will not have to draw on the resources of Mr. Craig Dobbin or Mr. Andrew Crosbie down at Atlantic Place? If the Workmen's Compensation Board, Sir, are going to invest money in a public building- and I put this question to the hon. the Premier one day and the answer was a negative one that I received- it might be a good opportunity, Sir, for the Workmen's Compensation Board to erect a building adjacent to Confederation Building and not only house the employees of the Workmen's Compensation

June 2, 1976

Tape No. 3129

NM - 5

MR. NEARY: Board but also look after the branches and the agencies of this government that are now scattered all over hell's half acre, scattered all over the city, try to get them all back

Mr. Neary:

again under one roof. This indeed, Sir, would be an excellent investment for the Workmen's Compensation Board. The government has to rent the space anyway so why should they not rent it from their own agency, the Workmen's Compensation Board? I can tell the hon. minister and the House it is not the first time, that is not an original thought, it is not an original idea, Sir, because when I was a member of the former Administration there was strong talk at that time that the Workmen's Compensation Board should erect their own building, and that the government would rent office space that they needed from the Workmen's Compensation Board, and at the time, unfortunately, the Philip Building ran into financial difficulties. It was being built by a couple of gentlemen that I believe ran into a little financial trouble.

MR. DOODY: Craig Dobbin, was it?

MR. NEARY: No, it was not Craig Dobbin, Sir.

MR. DOODY: It was Andrew Crosbie?

MR. NEARY: No, it was not Andrew Crosbie.

MR. DOODY: Who bailed him out?

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. DOODY: Who bailed him out?

MR. NEARY: Who bailed him out? I do not know who bailed him out. I think probably one Mr. Lundrigan might have bailed him out. I do not know. But -

MR. MURPHY: Not our minister.

MR. NEARY: Not the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development, I might say. He has not reached that stage in life yet. He is gradually getting there though.

MR. SIMMONS: He is on his way.

MR. NEARY: But, Sir, when the owners of the building encountered a little financial difficulty, and then they tried to pawn it off

Mr. Neary:

on the Workmen's Compensation Board. And I think that is when they ran into the difficulties, into the flak. Under normal circumstances I think I probably would have agreed that the Workmen's Compensation Board would be better off with their own building. But in this particular case the crowd that were building the Phillip Place were just looking for someone to bail them out, and so the thing got shot down in flames, and I am not a bit sorry that it did, and of course Phillip Place eventually fell into the hands of another gentleman who provided the Workmen's Compensation Board with the badly needed space -

MR. DOODY: You are all heart.

MR. NEARY: - that was necessary because up to that time they had been here, I think they were in Confederation Building and working under very overcrowded conditions.

But if they are now going to go ahead, Mr. Speaker, and erect a Workmen's Compensation Building, I believe the government would be well advised, seeing that they are so wealthy they can finance this building, the government would be well advised, the Minister of Public Works and Services would be well advised, to enter into negotiations with the Workmen's Compensation Board, and enter into a long-term agreement, if necessary, to rent office space from the Workmen's Compensation Board, and try to get that building near Confederation Building. If necessary, get them to them to put a wing, put the extension on Confederation Building, and rent the space and then in return that would be a good investment for the Workmen's Compensation Board. They have almost \$27 million. If the minister only had that, the Minister of Public Works and Services only had what the Workmen's Compensation Board have invested in securities and in bonds, the minister would have no problem at all to put another wing on Confederation Building, and get everything back under the one roof, because it must be costing the minister's department a small fortune to rent office space in this city. And just look at the inconvenience it is causing the people.

DR. FARRELL: A quarter of a million square feet.

MR. NEARY: A quarter of a million square feet, the minister tells me, I do not know what that would amount to in dollars and cents, but it would probably amount to, let me see, \$1.5 million a year just to rent office space, around \$1.5 million.

DR. FARRELL: Ample office space.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon. And scattered all over the city. This is the thing that bothers me, because I meet people every day in the lobby of Confederation Building looking for ministers, and looking for government departments, and you just have to send the fool further, and you say, "Well I think they are over in the Viking Building. No, wait a minute now, I am not sure, They are over in the Crosbie Building, no, let me see, the Phillip Building." Honest to God - or over on O'Leary Avenue. If you ask me today where half the branches of various government departments are, I would not know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: And I doubt if the ministers themselves half the time know where they are. And I think this would be a good idea, Sir, for the Administration to talk to the Workmen's Compensation Board about this, because I think if they are going to put up a building that it would be a good investment not only for the Board, but for the government. After all, the government, the minister only answers to the House for the Workmen's Compensation Board; the minister is not responsible for the actions of the Workmen's Compensation Board, it is the House. The Workmen's Compensation Board is responsible to this House, and the Minister of Industrial Relations merely answers the House.

But, Sir, there is something else in the annual report that concerns me very much, and that is the number of man-days that were lost in 1975 through industrial accidents, 200,000 man-days were lost in 1975 through industrial accidents. Mr. Speaker, that figure would be much higher if we had not had 300,000 man-days lost through work stoppages of one kind and another,

Mr. Neary:

strikes both legal and illegal. So although the number of accidents for 1975 were down by about 1,500, I would submit to the House that they are only down because there were so many strikes, so many work stoppages last year. But there were 200,000 man-days lost. And if you convert that into dollars and cents, Sir, multiply it by what—\$20.00 a day?—you are talking about a fair amount of money. And, Mr. Speaker, between the two, between 300,000 man-days lost through work stoppages and 200,000 man-days lost through industrial accidents, I would submit to the House that that has a drastic, a devastating affect on productivity in this Province. I raised the matter one day during the Late Show, and I think the minister completely misunderstood the point that I was trying to make, and the minister could not understand how I could relate the two. Well, Sir, the two have a very direct bearing on productivity in this Province. And, therefore, Sir, I am glad to see, according to the annual report, that the Board is going to increase and place more emphasis on safety education. I think this is a good thing. I think too many accidents, Mr. Speaker, are caused by carelessness on the part of the workers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The minister does not believe that?

MR. DOODY: I believe you. I am just trying to hear you. I was talking business with the Minister of Transportation.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that a large number of the 200,000 man-days that were lost in 1975 through industrial accidents need not have been lost at all, that a good many of these accidents were caused by carelessness on the part of the workmen, were caused by negligence, in some cases, on the part of management, on the part of the companies. And if you take a combination of the two, Mr. Speaker, then I think the Board is right, it is headed in the right direction when it talks about placing emphasis on safety education, and accident prevention, Sir. I think this is very, very

Mr. Neary:

important.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to remind the House again, I do it so often, that Canada is noted, has a reputation of having one of the worst productivity records in the Western World, and in Newfoundland we are even worse per capita than Canada. So you can imagine how bad our productivity, how bad our production is in Newfoundland. And, Sir, I am not an economist, I am not a scholar, I am

MR. NEARY:

not like some of my educated friends.

MR. MORGAN: Is the hon. member's voice changing?

MR. NEARY: I think I am on a change of life, Sir. I feel like fourteen just going on fifteen. But, Mr. Speaker, we have to change our attitudes as members have said so often.

DR. FARRELL: Do you have pain?

MR. NEARY: No, it is not political menopause, if that is what the minister thinks. It is Grand Bruit flu, Sir. But, Mr. Speaker, we have to look at every way, we have to look at every means by which we can increase production and increase productivity in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The rules would require that I point out to the hon. gentleman that the principle of the bill is concerned with, first, really a definition of industrial accident and industrial diseases to make sure that industrial diseases are covered, and also with increases of amount of compensation payable and the time frame in which they are payable. So the subject of productivity or safety education only in that they are intimately related with these matter would in fact be in order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I thank Your Honour for drawing that to my attention. But, Sir, we are dealing with increases that will drain the resources of the Workmen's Compensation Board if we do not curb the number of industrial accidents. As a matter of fact, Sir, if we cut down on the number of industrial accidents by education, by accident prevention, then the minister and the Workmen's Compensation Board may be in a better financial position to be able to lash out a few more dollars to the poor old widows and the children and those who are handicapped and invalids today as a result of industrial accidents.

Mr. Speaker, one thing that concerns me very greatly also about the Workmen's Compensation legislation in this Province, that is

MR. NEARY:

the fact, Sir, that although they have a rehabilitation division in the Workmen's Compensation Board that there still seems to be a very big problem and a very great reluctance on the part of many employers to re-employ injured workmen in cases where partial, or when permanent partial disability results from the accident. This is particularly, Sir, noticeable in classifications where the workers are unskilled or they live in an isolated or semi-isolated community. There is a reluctance on the part of the employer to take back these injured workmen, these workmen who are partially disabled. I would suggest to the minister that in bringing in future amendments in this House that the minister give serious consideration to making it compulsory for employers to find a job for a workman, no matter how skilled he is, put him back on the payroll when he gets his clearance from the doctor, especially the bigger companies, put them back on the payroll Sir, not just force them to go back to school to be retrained. Nine chances out of ten they cannot be retrained and the board finds it impossible to find suitable employment for these people. I think it should be compulsory and right now it is not, Sir, It is one of the problems that the Workmen's Compensation Board draw to the attention of members of this House every year, the reluctance on the part of employers in this Province to take back men who are permanently partially disabled.

I think the minister would be well-advised to bring in an amendment to the act to make it compulsory for employers to take these men back on the payroll even if they have to put them at light work, because it is very difficult, Sir, for these men to find light work, especially if they are living in a small community or an isolated community or a semi-isolated community.

So, Mr. Speaker, the bill itself -

MR. MURPHY: Could the hon. member define light work? You always have that problem, defining light work.

MR. NEARY: Well Sir, I do not know. I could not define it. I could

MR. NEARY:

not really give the hon. minister a definition. I know when I was Minister of Social Services one of the big problems that we had was the Confederation back, and the doctors when they were filling out the application or the medical for a man to go on long term assistance he would always put a little 'c' along side of it so that it would indicate Confederation back. Because as the hon. member for Humber East (Dr. Farrell) probably knows, it is very difficult to diagnose a back injury or a back ailment.

MR. MURPHY: Pensionitis.

MR. NEARY: Well no, it is Confederation back, Sir, we call it.

But, Mr. Speaker, the bill itself is a fairly good bill. It is a sort of a motherhood issue. It provides for increases in payments of benefits for those who have been injured or for the survivors of those people who are unfortunate enough to lose their lives through industrial accidents. But I would like the minister to think about some of the points that I raised. Especially, Sir, we would like to have some information on that new building that is going to be erected by the Workmen's Compensation Board. Have they selected the site? What kind of a building is it going to be? Are they getting into the real estate business? Are they going to rent space in it to either the private or public sector? I think the House is entitled to have this information, Sir.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, we have already gone over the ground of the hot spots in Newfoundland, the asbestos problem at Baie Verte, the dust problem at Labrador City, the problem caused by the occupational health hazards at the phosphorus plant at Long Harbour, the problem of silicosis in the Buchans mine. I believe that is about - there are five - I think that is - is that four or five I named that time? But they are very, very highly dangerous situations, Sir, especially the one in Baie Verte.

I do not know if my hon. friend from Baie Verte-White Bay Mr. Rideout read the report that was released recently by the

MR. NEARY:

Government of Canada -the member has it there?- well the member will see in that report that Baie Verte was singled out as being the location, the community, that was most exposed and where the hazard for contracting asbestosis was the greatest, was in that mine and in the community of Baie Verte. I do not know what else members of the House could say to emphasize the need to step up the surveillance, if you want to put it that way, on these hot spots because, Sir, it will be too late one of these days when we wake up and find out we have got - oh yes the other place I meant to mention was St. Lawrence. There are five spots in Newfoundland - Labrador City, St. Lawrence, the phosphorus plant, Baie Verte and Buchans. These are the five hot spots in Newfoundland, the five danger areas.

Although the Workmen's Compensation Board as far as the safety regulations and so forth are concerned only claims part of the responsibility for keeping an eye on these things, part of the responsibility falls under the Minister of Health, part of the responsibility under the Minister of Mines and Energy, but nevertheless, Sir, I think it is incumbent upon the Workmen's Compensation Board to get a little more involved and to keep an eye on these hot spots before we have another St. Lawrence situation develop in this Province that will bring shame on all of us. Because we had the warning. The warning signals are up. I think, Mr. Speaker, that there is no better time to raise this matter again and to re-emphasize it, to drive the point home if necessary, although it has been driven home time and time again, it cannot be said too often in this hon. House. No doubt when I sit down the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) rightly so will get up and he will have his say on this matter because it is a very, very

MR. NEARY: serious matter and God only knows, Mr. Speaker, in this session of the House that we frittered away enough of our time on foolish nonsense and here we are now rushing to get the House closed. We should be sitting here for another couple of months. We should be. We have not faced up to any of the real problems of the people of this Province yet. We have not come to grips with any of the problems that are facing the ordinary Newfoundlanders.

MR. RIDEOUT: We should not have been off for two and a half months.

MR. NEARY: We should not have been out for two and a half months and we should not be closing up now. We should be carrying on for another couple of months. We should stay here until -

MR. MORGAN: Stay here all Summer.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, stay here all Summer if necessary to deal with these matters, some of these matters that I raised. Because one of these days when we pick up the newspaper and you see the headlines and you turn on your television and you see in the national news right across Canada that one person has died in Baie Verte because of negligence on the part of the authorities or because we, as elected representatives of the people in this House, could not get our message across, could not persuade the authorities that something needs to be done. I do not know if there is any answer to it, Sir. Sometimes I wonder myself. I am like the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) I wonder sometimes if these operations should not be shut down altogether. Maybe, Sir, it is because I am stunned that I cannot see a solution to the problem in Baie Verte. And I am not an alarmist. I am not trying to advocate that we close down the industry. Maybe I am a Doubting Thomas. I cannot see any solution to the problem. The asbestos is everywhere, it is in the air, millions and millions of these little fibres, you are inhaling

MR. NEARY: them into your lungs all day long.

Perhaps some expert, perhaps some - Dr. Selikoff or somebody can tell me, can convince me, can persuade me that this whole operation can be made foolproof, airtight, that the danger can be eliminated entirely. Somehow or other I have grave doubts about whether or not there is any cure at all for the danger that exists in these areas that I mentioned. The situation at Buchans - a little ventilation probably could cure that problem. It is not quite as serious as the situation at-

MR. FLIGHT: The city council -

MR. NEARY: I certainly agree with the hon. member. It takes a little while sometimes. Silicosis is something that you cannot detect in the early stages. The x-rays, perhaps my good friend from Humber East (Mr. Farrell) can verify or deny this, but silicosis in the early stages will not show up on an x-ray. I remember the late Dr. Templeman, who was the company doctor and the G.P. on Bell Island for years, made a study of this, a good man and a great friend of mine, We named the hospital over there after him, Dr. Walter Templeman Memorial Hospital. He and I had many a long conversation about silicosis because he was convinced in his own mind that some of the miners on Bell Island were suffering from silicosis, but the x-rays would not show it up for some reason or other. And then Dr. Peters, I believe it was, who used to come to Bell Island fairly regularly collected x-rays, and probably has the best collection of x-rays on T.B., on respiratory conditions, on chest conditions in Canada, he made a study of it trying to detect whether or not Bell Island miners were suffering from silicosis and I believe at the end, just before the mine closed, I think if the mine had to continue to work much longer they would have discovered that some of the men over there, who they claim have angina now and bronchitis, it is probably and quite likely that they have silicosis. But I understand what my hon. friend from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) is saying. So again I just want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by impressing upon

MR. NEARY: the minister-and I am sure that I do not have to do this. The minister is a Newfoundlander, like myself, an outport type, was not born with the silver spoon in his mouth - and I am sure that the minister understands the importance of impressing upon his officials and the Workmen's Compensation Board, because half the stuff that goes on in this House is not reported outside anyway. Once you go outside the Overpass half the people in Newfoundland do not even know the House exists.

I was out in my hon. friend's beautiful city yesterday, I was down and made a tour of LaPoile District and I can tell this hon. House that here we are so out of touch with reality, so removed from the problems of the people! Honest to God, it would do members, it would do their hearts good to go out around and talk to the taxi drivers and talk to the fishermen.

MR. MORGAN: Well, why do you suggest we stay here all Summer.

MR. NEARY: Well because we have not come to grips with the real problems of the people. We have so far in this session ignored the real problems of the people in this Province, and one of the real problems is the occupational health hazards that exist in five major industries in this Province. And I know, Mr. Speaker, I hate to be repeating it, that I do not have to persuade the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development, I do not have to persuade that minister, I am sure he is conscious; and I do not have to persuade the member from Kilbride (Mr. Wells), the Minister without Portfolio, because the minister has heard the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout), has heard the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight). I worked with a mining company myself for twenty-one years. I am not completely naive and inexperienced in these matters and I am sure we do not have to impress it upon the Minister of Public Works and Services (Dr. Farrell). We in this House are very conscious of this but can we get that message down the line to the officials? Or do we continuously have to keep the pressure on and convince them, or do they just consider their job

MR. NEARY: routine? I am not saying that they do, Sir, but it would not be uncommon for people when they are placed in positions that they draw their salary. They just consider the job then just routine.

We have to pay special attention, these five areas where we have high risk occupational hazards, we have to pay particular attention to these five areas. Having said that, Sir, I can only say that I support the bill. I would have liked to see the fifteen per cent become effective as of January 1st., 1976 rather than July 1st. I agree with my hon. friend that some of the old cases should be reviewed and upgraded. And the Workmen's Compensation Board is one of the wealthiest organizations in North America and they are well able to afford to look after those people who legitimately are the victims of industrial accidents, Sir, and I hope that the minister will comment on the few points that I made, that I made in good faith, in all sincerity, not a criticism of the minister. These are constructive, positive suggestions. I hope that the minister will now see why I linked the strike, the work stoppages, 300,000 man-days lost there, how I linked that with 200,000 man-days lost through industrial accidents. They both have an adverse effect on productivity in this Province and maybe we can reduce the number of industrial accidents, and doing that would increase production in this Province, productivity in this Province and once we do that we will all be able to enjoy the same standard of living that we are enjoying at the present time.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

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

MR. RIDMOUT: Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) and my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) I think have said very well and very eloquently some of the major points that the principle of this bill raises. While I am not allowed, and I do not propose, to get into this recently released report on asbestosis in Baie Verte, I just might say for the benefit of the member for LaPoile it

Mr. Rideout:

says very clearly, now whether it is true or not could be debatable, "Asbestosis and asbestos related diseases are avoidable." You know, you can believe that if you want, I would prefer to believe it. I would like to believe that it is true. But it says, "They are avoidable." But, Sir, I think this bill as far as industrial health hazards are concerned is a very important bill in that for the first time it brings into law in this Province a very important principle, and that is the principle related to industrial diseases. But I am disappointed in the sense that that principle should extend much further than it does at the present time. It says nothing, for example, about the onus of proof. Is the onus of proof, to prove whether or not an employee contacted an industrial health hazard, say with Advocate Mines in Baie Verte, who has the onus to prove that? Is that with the company, Advocate Mines, or is it with the employee?

Now as I understand it, in cases like St. Lawrence, for example, until certain provisions were made, and in other cases throughout this Province and throughout Canada, the onus of proof had been on the employee. And I say to the minister, and I say to the House that that is wrong. If a man works in an asbestos mine for fifteen years and he contacts asbestosis, I do not think that he should have to prove that he contacted that industrial health hazard working for Advocate Mines in Baie Verte or working for IOC in Labrador or whatever. The onus of proof, if there is any onus, should be on the company to prove that he did not get it there, that he did not contact it there. That is a principle that I think is very essential if this legislation, and the good thought and the well meaning behind this legislation, is to provide the benefits that I feel it should to the industrial workers of this Province.

I know, for example, the Steelworkers Union of this Province, and in particular in Baie Verte, recommended that to a committee of ministers a couple of years ago, Manpower and Industrial Relations, Mines and Energy and the Minister of Health. A couple of years ago that principle was recommended. I am glad to

Mr. Rideout:

see that part of the principle will be made into law by this bill, and that is, that industrial health hazards will be included in the Workmen's Compensation Act. But I am very disappointed because it does not go far enough, especially with the onus of proof. I think that is very, very important. The onus of proof should not be on the individual. The onus of proof should not be on the employee, it should be on the company. And I think when that is done then the important principle that is begun here will have been carried to the proper end. It is the right step. And I congratulate the minister for bringing in this piece of legislation. It is the right step. It is an important step. But I fail to see why it did not go all of the way, and especially deal with this principle of onus of proof. I think that is very important. And I would ask the minister to respond to that when he gets up to close the debate.

Now, Sir, another important amendment that I see related to the industrial diseases in this bill that I am worried about is that in Clause (2) it says "The amendment would make it certain that industrial diseases are fully covered when they appear within ten years after retirement." Now under normal circumstances that sounds great. A worker may not retire until he is sixty-five years old, and under normal conditions, you know, taken the given life expectancy of us humans, he might not expect to be around much after seventy-five. So that if the disease turns up then, well obviously if he is not around it would not turn up, so there would be no problem. But what about cases where a man might retire at age fifty-five? And he could retire at age fifty-five to go into - retire from working in the mining situation, to go into business of his own; for example, he could retire at age forty. What happens to him? Well what happens if it turns up after ten years? That man would be alive, if he retired at age forty, he could well be alive at age sixty, and suddenly, because the gestation period for asbestosis, the best medical knowledge tell us, is about twenty years.

DR. FARRELL: There would be signs before that.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well there might be signs before that, but they would not be conclusive signs, or we might know more after Dr. Selikoff does his study in Baie Verte this Summer.

But the normal gestation period as I understand it will be, after doing the bit of research I have done, is twenty years. And the good doctor nods his head and agrees with that. So if a man decides to quit Advocate Mines today at age forty under this legislation, at age sixty he might turn out to have asbestosis or mesothelioma, or whatever that cumbersome word is, but he would not be protected by this ten year limit. I think that is important and we should consider that. I am not too much an authority on any medical aspect, but I have done a bit of research on asbestosis. Asbestos has a very, you know, you can be exposed to asbestos dust for a very short time period, and contact that very hazardous disease. Nobody really knows, from the research that I done, how much exposure you have got to have to it before you can contract asbestosis or some other disease related to it. So I think we have to be very careful about that. You know, it is fine. I know acts can be amended but I think we should take into consideration the best medical knowledge we have now at this present time and plan with that in mind when we are amending an act as important as this, and when we are dealing with a principle as important as this.

So I think that ten years is too short. I would like to see it at least twenty years. I think that would be reasonable, maybe a bit longer would be needed. But I would like to see it much longer than twenty years. I know people working at Advocate Mines in Baie Verte who have left this Spring, for example, to go into woods operations or go back to the fishery. They are only young men thirty-five, thirty-six, thirty-eight years old; that ten year period will have run out for them by the time they are less than fifty. And I think that is wrong. I think there is a danger there, and we should be very careful of it, Sir.

Mr. Rideout:

I think the other major points with regard to this bill have been adequately raised by the previous members who spoke. And I think it is a good bill, the principle of the Bill is good, and I support it, But I am very, very concerned over those two items mainly, one is the onus of proof, I think should be on the employer not the employee, and I am very concerned with this ten year business after retirement, especially for people who are leaving the industry at a very early age.

The Clause (5) amendment I think is also a good one, I should say that in passing. It provides for a period of one year rather than three for an increasing scale of benefits in a recurrence of a disability. I think that is good. And I am very pleased with the rate increases. It is easy enough to say that it does not go far enough. What I would like to see personally is that I think there should be something in the Workmen's Compensation Act that allows the benefits to be paid to the workers to be upgraded every year in accordance with the cost of living. I think that would be more equitable. I think that would be more fair.

MR. MURPHY: Percentage wise rather than the set amount.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, rather than the set amount. If the cost of living index raises 10 per cent this year than their benefits to all people receiving workmen's compensation, not back to 1976 or however far this goes back, but to all people receiving benefits, I think it should raise in accordance with the cost of living index. That would of course do away with the necessity of raising it every four or five years by 15 per cent or 10 per cent or whatever.

But on the whole it is a good Bill. There are good principles in it. And for my part I certainly will support it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment.

HON. A. J. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to engage in any great lengthy debate because I think these gentlemen are very much concerned with what is happening. I would like to say that our government

Mr. Murphy:

is happy that they have brought it to this stage, and please God we hope to go a bit further.

But I just want to say, Sir, in reference particularly to the hon. member's district (Mr. Rideout) with asbestos in Baie Verte, that only today I discussed it with my Assistant Deputy Minister of Environment with regard to the air pollution, and he informed me that they are now preparing a press release between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government that a survey was done in November, 1974, and one in April, 1975 and it took one year exactly to diagnose the results of these findings because he said it is the most complex situation existing today with this asbestosis. So there will be a release made, and on June 8 there will be a meeting between Environment Newfoundland with Environment Canada, and we hope that we will have something where we can work along with all parties concerned, Mines and Energy, Workmen's Compensation and the hon. member and his people, and I hope, please God, that we can start now and working continuously to come up with something perhaps to cure the disease rather than perhaps to pay compensation afterwards which is a very necessary thing, too.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): The hon. member for St. Georges.

MRS. MACISAAC: I would just like to say a few words and make the House aware of something that is causing me a little bit of concern in my area. It is with respect to industrial related diseases. The situation we have run into in the past few years with respect to those diseases is causing everybody in the Province a great deal of concern, probably some unnecessary concern, and maybe mine is unnecessary. But in the area in which I live, St. George's is a very small town. In fact the population is only 2,200, and in the last seven or eight years - of course, to backtrack a bit, we have the Flintkote Gypsum mine at Flat Bay and a stockpile in St. George's, and in the last seven or eight years we have had seven cases that I know of of cancer of the lungs. In fact there are two gentlemen from St. George's who have just returned home from the General here in St. John's with cancer of the lungs. It seems like a large number to have cancer of the lungs in such a small area. I do not know of any tests or studies that have been done. I do not know if there have ever been any done. If there have I have not heard of their results. I have not been concerned about it until this point, but I am wondering about it now since the cancer of the lung rate is fairly high.

I do not want to cause any undue alarm in St. George's, but I would like to see something done about it before possibly it is too late. Fifteen or twenty years ago we did not know, and did not realize and certainly would not have believed that, for instance, that there was such a thing as asbestosis and all those other industrial related diseases that we now are aware of. So if there are no hazards, well and good. The men at Flintkote can work in peace and contentment. And if there is cause for alarm, I think now is the time to find out, nip it in the bud, give them their chance to take the necessary precautions to avoid this type of disaster, if you may call it that. And I hope that somebody in government will take the initiative to look into this, and see if there

Mrs. MacIsaac:

is a possibility that it may be related to cancer of the lung.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

The hon. member must ask the question
from his own seat.

The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

DR. FARRELL: I am sorry I was not in my seat,

Mr. Speaker, I just want to know if the hon. member contacted
anybody in Mines and Energy about this matter, or Environment?

MRS. MCISAAC: Like I said, I am just getting concerned
about it right now, but I intend to contact somebody about it immediately.

DR. FARRELL: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young): If the hon. minister speaks now he
closes the debate.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I find that I have to be
in basic agreement, in principle at least, with most of the comments
that have been made regarding the inadequacies of the legislation
that has been tabled in the House, and I regret the fact that
we have not been able to table a more comprehensive bill in relation
to amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act. There are some
reasons for this, and some of the reasons, I suppose, or at least
one of the reasons which is probably well-known to a lot of members,
is that over the past four or five years, the past three years
especially, the Workmen's Compensation Board has gone through
a pretty rough period in terms of staff morale, investigations into
workings of the Workmen's Compensation Board. There is a royal
commission report on it. There has been an extensive analysis
done of the administrative structure of the board, and on down the
line, and it is only in the past year that the board has really
settled down. And it is unfortunate from the workers' point of view

Mr. Maynard.

the injured workmen, or the people who have died through industrial accidents, and their widows and children, the dependents that they have left behind, it is unfortunate that the board went through this very difficult period. But it did happen, as it happens, I suppose, in many organizations. I do think though at this point in time we have a good board and that we have a good staff. The morale has certainly improved a tremendous amount. The board seems to be functioning in a manner which I think would now put it on a par with any other Workmen's Compensation Board in Canada. We are also at the point now where I feel that it is a very appropriate time, and if members are familiar with the act they will know that under the Workmen's Compensation Act there is a requirement that a complete review be done every five years, if possible, of the Workmen's Compensation legislation, regulations and the methods of operation of the Workmen's Compensation Board, and the review of cases that are pending. I think most of the things that the hon. members have said are things that really should come up before a review committee. I am not trying to shove off the responsibility, Mr. Speaker, but I do not think it is possible for Cabinet to be able to sit down and do the necessary analysis of a complex piece of legislation like the Workmen's Compensation Act.

And as the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) mentioned, the Workmen's Compensation Board does not report through any officials of government but that they report directly to the House through the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. Therefore, there are no officials in my department that can take a look at the Workmen's Compensation Board, its benefits or its methods of operation and really report on it because there are no officials in the department, mine or any other department really, familiar with it. So that leaves a very limited number of options. Now it is hardly appropriate to ask the Workmen's Compensation Board itself to review its methods of operation, so the only other avenue

Mr. Maynard.

left is the review committee. And that is established in the legislation that the review committee must be set up. I am now in the process of trying to determine people who would best be able to serve on that committee. I hope that by mid-Summer I should have a committee set up. And it is not really easy to find people to serve on it, because the review of this legislation is going to take a considerable amount of time, and I do not mean in terms of years, but I mean in terms of being at it almost constantly for a period of maybe five or six months. And it is pretty well a full-time job for that period of time for the chairman, and almost to the point of being full-time for the other members who will represent labour and employers on the review committee. I am hoping to be able to come up with the names of people to serve on the committee. But in any case it will be put together, and I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be very appropriate at that time if hon. members, such as the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) and the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) would make their views known to the review committee. And I am not suggesting that you not make your views known to me. But I have very - well I am not capable to take a complex piece of legislation like the Workmen's Compensation Act, compare it to similar legislation in all the other jurisdictions in North America, and the British system, which is probably the best system in the world, and really make an analysis of what the act should be or should not be or what the operation should be. But I think a review committee should be able to do it. The last review committee that was set up - it actually ended up as being one person - did not come in with a very good report, and there were not really very many changes made in the Workmen's Compensation Act.

But I am hoping, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. Maynard:

that the next time that I bring in an amendment Bill before this House of Assembly, an amendment to the Workmen's Compensation Act, or my successor, whoever that might be, brings it before this House that we will have a much more comprehensive piece of legislation to renew totally the Workmen's Compensation Act.

Now there are going to be lots of things that people may like to see that are impossible for one reason or another. I am not going to say what these are now because I do not know what things are possible and what are not possible, but I feel that some of the suggestions made may be very difficult to implement. However there are others that can be implemented.

A lot of the comments were made in relation to industrial diseases, mostly dust related diseases. And this is something that is becoming very evident to all governments, all jurisdictions now that it is becoming more and more of a hazard. And I think perhaps a little too late, or at least a little late that all governments in North America are recognizing the fact that there is a tremendous amount of danger from industrial diseases or dust related diseases. The British people have had laws, regulations, threshold limit values and that sort of thing set up for a number of years that have not been adopted in North America, even though North America is supposed to be the most progressive industrial part of the world. The regulations have not been adopted, and to make matters worse those that have been adopted have not been enforced properly. And I would say that our Province here is in much the same position.

One of the problems that we have in this Province, and one of the problems that has been experienced in all the other Provinces of Canada, was that the responsibility for enforcement of regulations regarding industrial diseases, occupational health and safety was divided among various departments and agencies of government. For instance, in our jurisdiction we have the Workmen's Compensation Board, the Department of Mines, the Department of Health, the Department of the Environment, I can go on and on, if you want to get into the

Mr. Maynard:

strict safety matters, the Fire Commissioner's Office in the Department of Justice, and so on.

And it is unfortunately not possible to really do a good job of inspection and enforcement with that kind of a situation. The Provinces of Canada now, again a little late, are moving towards a total consolidation of all the legislation and responsibility for occupational health and safety into one agency or department of government. We are now studying, not only studying but we are looking at ways of implementing the Saskatchewan model where they have had three years of fairly successful operation, the total consolidation of their occupational health and safety laws, regulations and the administration into one division which comes under a department, and it really does not matter which department it comes under.

We have had, as my colleague, the Minister of Health, has stated on a couple of occasions, had a working committee set up on this, reporting through a Cabinet Committee, and the Committee have such people as Dr. Colohan, who is very, very interested in this sort of thing, and who is doing a lot of work to try to come to grips with some of the problems that have been mentioned by the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout).

I think the Committee has identified the problems. And I believe that, it is pretty safe for me to say, that we will be making some very significant progress in this field within the next few months. One of the things that we are looking to of course is the report by Dr. Selikoff in Baie Verte, not looking forward to it in the sense that we want to see how many people have been injured there, but certainly looking forward to it in the sense that probably the problem has not been as bad as has been anticipated, and that we can head it off, that we can take some action to rectify any problems that may be there. Certainly I can assure the hon. House that this government will not ignore any solutions that Dr. Selikoff may want to propose in regards to any problems that may exist at Baie Verte.

The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) mentioned

Mr. Maynard:

the ten year limit as being too low, and that is quite possibly so. The ten year limit is more or less based on experience in industrial related diseases. It is very difficult at this time for anyone, I suppose, including Dr. Selikoff himself, to determine what is exactly the gestation period of silicosis or asbestosis. And I suggest that we would have to perhaps be a little more definitive in how long it takes for the disease to really show up in order to lengthen the period, although I agree with him. probably ten years is too low a limit, and we will certainly have to look at that one very carefully. Again it is something that I believe a good competent review committee could go into very deeply and could come up with the kind of things that we need to put in a Workmen's Compensation Act whether it is only the things that the Act presently covers or other aspects of occupational health and safety that should be covered by the Act.

There were a couple of other questions asked, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to comment on. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) came along after his speech and asked about the coverage for inshore fishermen, how it is being handled at this time. Unfortunately when we brought in the amendment to the Act, I think it was in 1973, giving mandatory coverage to fishermen in groups of three or more, but since that time we have had very little response from the fishermen. Most of the boat captains are not taking advantage of it. We have tried to encourage the fishermen to participate, and to pay the assessments and to have their people covered, and technically the fishermen are covered now under the Workmen's Compensation Act by law, but we have not been collecting the assessments and we are now looking at ways and means of collecting the assessments so that we can really give coverage to all the inshore fishermen. There is a possibility that we may use the same system as the Unemployment Insurance Commission uses for their collection of assessments, and that is payroll deductions. It appears now that that would be the only possible way of doing it.

Mr. Maynard:

On the building for the Workmen's Compensation Board, Mr. Speaker, there is some indication made that it was a waste of money, that the money could certainly be channelled into other areas such as more benefits to widows and this sort of thing. The fact of the matter is, Sir, that by building the new building for their own use, the Workmen's Compensation Board will actually save money. It will not cost them, it will save money compared to the rent that they are now paying for the space that they have to rent from whoever owns the Phillip Place.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Lundrigan.

MR. MAYNARD: So - I suppose it is still Mr. Lundrigan, is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. MAYNARD: So it is an actual saving to the Workmen's Compensation Board, not a net expenditure.

The Board has decided to build a building which will cost approximately \$4 million. The vicinity will be close to the present General Hospital, and the building of course, as are all Workmen's Compensation Board buildings across Canada for those Boards who do have their own buildings are specially designed for patients visiting in wheelchairs or in some other manner, and this sort of thing, with special ramps and what not. So it is very necessary. The space that they have there now, I have a feeling the Workmen's Compensation Board was forced into it, not through their own initiative, some years ago, and they do not like it very well. It is a cramped space, certainly not suited to the work that the Workmen's Compensation Board is trying to carry out for the people they try to deal with from day to day.

There is no thought of building a large building to house any parts of the public service, but they may be renting some space to the Public Utilities Commission. I understand that there has been some negotiations between the two bodies for the rental of space, but there will not be any space available as I know the plans right now, for any other departments of government or certainly

Mr. Maynard:

not for any private individuals or industries.

AN HON. MEMBER: Can they afford it?

MR. MAYNARD: Well that is the other thing, Mr. Speaker, I think the figure was mentioned that \$27 million was the net value of the Workmen's Compensation Board, and that is quite true that their value is \$27 million. But I believe that hon. members should look at another figure that is in the same analysis where their liability at this time for pension awards is \$20 million, just a liability for pension awards alone at the level that pensions are at the present time. And then there is a disaster fund. And there are other reserves that they have to keep in order to protect themselves, or protect the workmen in case there is a major disaster or a major increase in accidents, and certainly the Workmen's Compensation Board is not a fat cat as has been indicated. It is a board that collects money from industry and spends most of that money, except for what it has put into investments to protect the pensions of workers who are in a situation where they will get a pension for the rest of their natural lives. It is unfortunate that it has to be done, but it is one of the responsibilities of the board. They cannot afford to go into a big building. Any suggestions that they could build a building of a quarter of a million square feet is absolutely out of the question. I can hardly think that the one comment that was made that the board is the richest institution in North America is very relevant, Mr. Speaker.

One of the problems that I mentioned last year, I think, when I was introducing an amendment to the Workmen's Compensation Act, and the problem is still with it - I do not know how to deal with it - the board is trying to deal with it in every manner, and probably short of compulsory legislation there is no other way to deal with it - and that is getting employers to take people back to work after they have been injured. The rehabilitative effort - it is very, very difficult to get employers to agree to take

Mr. Maynard.

anyone back to work, even after they have been retrained, if necessary, Even after the Workmen's Compensation Board agrees, if necessary, to pay a certain amount of the salaries, it is still very difficult, and that is true almost across the board. I do not know how we are dealing with it. We have tried every persuasion that we can use to get employers to overcome this feeling they have about taking back injured workmen, but it is difficult. And again it may be something that we will have to enshrine in legislation in order for it to be done. But I would rather that that came out of a total review of the Workmen's Compensation Act. Again I hope that the next amendments that we introduce to this House on the Workmen's Compensation Act will see a much more wide-ranging review, and amending of the act that is so necessary and so important to so many people in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading,

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Workmen's Compensation Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. WELLS: Order 17, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 17.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Urban And Rural Planning Act," (Bill No. 60).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is a change in the composition of the Board of Arbitrators on expropriated land under the Urban and Rural Planning Act. Previous to this the composition of the Board of Arbitrators was appointment by the minister of the chairman and one other member and the owner of the land appointed one. What we are proposing here in these amendments is that the department would propose one member, that the owner would propose one member, and those two members would choose a

Mr. Peckford.

chairman so that it makes it a little bit more democratic and fairer to the owner of the land. One of the problems that has continually badgered governments in this Province has been our various expropriation laws and how sometimes they have not been as fair as they could be, and this is an attempt to help alleviate some of the problems and inequities in the expropriation especially as it applies to the Department of Municipal Affairs. So I move second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the amendment itself, of course, is one that we would not take exception to. What is significant about this bill is what it does not contain. And I think it ought to make certain other amendments to the Urban and Rural Planning Act. I believe the one or two I am going to suggest belong in legislation, or perhaps may belong in regulations under the legislation, I am not sure which. I find myself in somewhat of an awkward situation, because the matters I want to raise I should declare my vested interest in them as an individual as I raise them, although I would like to raise the larger issue because I think it affects more people than me. As you will realize from the regulations or from the definitions under the act, the act provides for regulations involving the erection of advertisements or signs on the highway. And I had been involved in -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I think the rules would require the Speaker to point out that on second reading it is the principle of the bill. This particular bill is a very limited and precisely defined principle to change the composition of the Board of Arbitrators. Obviously if the House wishes to relax that rule, or to acquiesce in its non-observance - the House is master of its own rules - but unless I am aware of that then I think I would be in error in not pointing

Mr. Speaker.

out the requirement of debating the principle of the bill, which in this particular case is quite narrow.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not wanting to delay the work of the House. What I had to say could have been said in about two sentences, and I raised it without realizing that I was treading outside. I had interpreted it that we were on an amendment to the Urban and Rural Planning Act and, therefore, on the debate on the principle of the bill I had some leeway. But if I did not I shall certainly find another opportunity to raise what I think is a fairly important issue, but one which would take only a sentence or two to expound on.

MR. WELLS: Perhaps we could hear a brief outline of the problem you refer to.

MR. SIMMONS: I thank the Minister without Portfolio. It will just be a sentence or two. It is the matter of erection of signs.

MR. PECKFORD: That is road regulations.

MR. SIMMONS: It comes more particularly under that, does it, rather than here? Would the minister then for my clarification just indicate what is meant by, under the definition word, 'provides for regulations including the erection of advertisements or signs'? Does this act have jurisdiction?

MR. PECKFORD: You are technically correct, because regulations with respect to roads are made under the act.

MR. SIMMONS: Under this act, yes.

MR. PECKFORD: Right.

MR. SIMMONS: All right.

But just to say, Mr. Speaker, that sometimes at the appropriate time I might elaborate, but I was in Port aux Basques over the weekend, and on the way back I happened to drop into a motel just East of Port aux Basques, and this matter was raised with me

Mr. Simmons.

once again. I took care to point out previously that it also affects me in a business that I am involved in. In that sense I have a conflict of interest at this moment. But in the larger sphere, Mr. Speaker, it affects a number of businesses which are having various degrees of difficulties in alerting the travelling public to the locale of their business, because of what we feel are very severe restrictions on the placing of advertisements along the highway. I am very much in favour of the philosophy behind it which says, we do not want the countryside to look like one great big billboard. But at the other extreme the businessmen on the highway now, on a protected highway, is allowed one sign on his own property, and this gives the approaching motorist no notice at all. I am thinking of

MR. SIMMONS: motels, restaurants, that kind of retail outlet and I would like to see the act opened up a bit, or perhaps the regulations are what need to be opened up, but I just leave the thought with the minister and I thank the House for bearing with me on this obviously somewhat irrelevant subject.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, as far as this piece of legislation is concerned, as my colleague indicated we are in favour of this particular amendment. We think it is a great improvement over the original bill and it appears to cover all loopholes with respect to death or refusal of a person, an owner, to appoint an arbitrator, a member on the board, and it covers the cases where there are more than one owner in different parcels of land that is involved.

Sir, we are in agreement and as the minister suggested it is more democratic than the original bill. I do not know if this is the appropriate time to raise the point and get some reaction from the minister on the government's declared intention at one point along the road in the matter of expropriation where houses are involved and that is basically a house for a house. I do not know if this is the appropriate time to raise that particular point but if it is I would like the minister to indicate if there has been any change in the part of the government's policy with respect to a house for a house, and if there has not been a change on the stated policy when they are going to enact such a policy.

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

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, just to respond to the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) as it relates to the protected road regulations even though we are I suppose somewhat irrelevant to the specifics of the amendment.

I am very much aware of what the hon. member is talking about and he has a very good point. I have been trying now for a number of months to review the protected roads zoning regulations which are fairly obsolete. I think they were established in the late fifties, as a matter of fact, and very little done with them since. And we have been attempting to try to review these and to find ways of changing them. In that direction we did start a couple of years ago a new, as the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) will remember, a whole new plan for the Great Northern Peninsula, which is almost ready to go now, for protected road and for our field men to sit down with the groups, economic development associations, councils and so on in the whole area and zone it properly into commercial and blah blah, the whole way down the coast or on that piece of road, and to allow certain signs and so on in the given areas after they have been so zoned. But I agree with him that it is an area which has been somewhat neglected in the past and because of my busy schedule in the last six or seven months it has not been possible for me to spend as much time on that particular item as I would have liked to do, and I do appreciate it and what we are trying to do now, with the proper staffing, is to involve a review as it relates to specific protected roads in the Province because each protected road has its own unique character and so on and so therefore what applies to the Great Northern Peninsula and the kind of zoning you will allow in that area, you cannot transfer that kind of a plan right over into, say, the road to the Isles and to try to take into account the unique features of each protected road that we are going to do each plan separately. But it takes some time. So that is what has been moving on that.

MR. PECKFORD: On the house for a house expropriation thing brought up by the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe), the problem as I outlined it sometime ago in the House dealt very much with the old urban renewal schemes at Mundy Pond and at Bhea Heights, and that once these schemes, and the one in Corner Brook also had been put to rest and all the proper - because they are not yet; we are getting near the end of them as far as land and so on goes, then I think is time to look at the house for a house so that you do not have to go back retroactive, which you would have to do until these schemes are finished, you know, if you did it now, into that whole question of what was done on Shea Heights. And government would be bound into a very precarious and awkward situation of having people in those areas also wishing the house for a house, which they did not get, and if the scheme is not legally finished they could probably make the government liable for the changes that would be made now. But it is an area where again a lot of study needs to be done and a lot of decisions and work done which has not been done to date. But that is one of the problems inherent in it is the urban renewal schemes which presented the problem, which was dealt with in a different way at the time, which until they are completed will be rather difficult to bring in that concept which seems again to be democratic.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

On motion a bill, "An Act To Amend The Urban And Rural Planning Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act To Strengthen Security Measures In Respect Of Private Property."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the strongest part of this bill is its title. The explanatory note sets forth very clearly what this

MR. HICKMAN: is designed to do and that is to provide protection within shopping malls, etc. and it has been working most effectively in other provinces. I move second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it is hard to reply to that short explanation by the minister. Looking at the explanatory notes here, "The purpose of this Act is to provide a means of increasing the security of certain kinds of property by establishing in respect thereof of the offence of petty trespass, for which a violator may be apprehended and brought before a magistrate or justice. The offence does not occur unless notice not to trespass is given in one of the prescribed methods which, in the case of shopping malls, etc., would be expected to be by word of mouth."

Now presumably, I can only say presumably, this is an improvement upon the present situation and I do not know if the act says an act to strengthen security measures in respect of private property, and is this related only to shopping malls because it says the word et cetera there, and I think the minister may anticipate what I am getting at here. There are other such private properties as apartment buildings and we had an example during the past week where an unbelievable amount of vandalism occurred on the parking lots, and would this particular amendment to the bill relate to that kind of activity? And probably when the minister is closing the debate he can indicate specifically—because I quite honestly have not read in detail the various clauses in the amendment— but if the minister could just briefly outline what specific action and what specific clauses here are going to improve the situation with respect to the kind of vandalism we have in these so-called public-private properties because it is private, I suppose, legally speaking, but most people tend to look at it as a kind of a public area, any shopping mall where you have a bowling alley or bank

MR. ROWE: area in a shopping area or for that matter parking areas.

So I would like the minister to indicate what other properties it covers other than shopping malls and what specific actions and laws are being introduced here to cut down on what is growing to be a very large problem in this Province.

I do not want to get into the reasons and the motives for the increase in vandalism. Anybody I think who thinks about it knows the possible reasons, but I think vandalism is not only here to stay for a while but there is an extreme threat that it is going to increase over this Summer because of the unemployment situation, which is not entirely the fault of the Provincial Government. The unemployment situation is partly the fault or result of federal and provincial government restraints

Mr. Rowe:

and God knows we have a lack of recreational facilities, and that is probably the main base cause for such acts. But I would like for the minister when he closes the debate on this bill to relate to some of these points that I have just raised.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate. The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, this Bill covers not only shopping malls, but as it sets forth in Clause (2) other premises such as factories, warehouses, premises used in connection in parking or business purposes. The position now is, and I indicated this earlier today in the House, that shopping malls are private property to which people are invited to come. The police cannot be expect to patrol private property, but on the other hand you have security guards there who do not have any authority. And if a security guard sees a person breaking the law this Bill gives that security guard the right, after telling the person that he is trespassing and must move on, to arrest and bring him before a magistrate or her before a magistrate. And hopefully, and I do implore the owners of large apartment buildings and other large buildings and areas and parking areas who, for gain, and at a charge, they charge for parking etc., implore them to provide security on their own properties, so that if an offense is being committed the police can be summoned, and they do have the capacity to respond very quickly to a summons. I move second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that this Bill be now read a second time? Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay", carried.

On motion a bill "An Act To Strengthen Security Measures In Respect Of Private Property", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 21.

Motion second reading of a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation Act." (Bill No. 72).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

HON. C. W. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is identical in form and substance with a Bill that was in the House yesterday. The previous one dealt with The Newfoundland Municipal Finance Corporation, this one deals with The Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation, and the substance of the Bill is simply an agreement by the Department of Finance and the Auditor General that the Auditors reports for both corporations should be in a standard report form as outlined by the Canadian Institute Of Chartered Accounts. And the affect of the amendment then is to enable the department to use that recommended format, that the Auditor General can use that recommended format.

I notice in Section (2) paragraph (3), the House Leader might note, I do not know if there is a typo error, at the beginning of the fourth line "these financial statements" should be "the financial statements". Is that corrected on the Bill that has been circulated?

MR. WELLS: "The" for "these"?

MR. DOODY: No. It should be -

MR. WELLS: "These financial statements referred to above". These financial statements.

MR. DOODY: "The financial statements referred to therein," it should be according to Justice. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. So if the hon. House Leader could move that amendment. The Bill itself, as I say, is standard. It is a housekeeping one to conform with the standard auditing procedures. I move second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, for our part it would seem to be very a housekeeping item, and we have no objections to the amendment proposed.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate. The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: I just spoke, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that this Bill be now read a second time? Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay", I think the "Ayes" have it.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Industrial Development Corporation Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 31.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Waste Material (Disposal) Act." (Bill No. 70).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. R. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, as the explanatory note says, this Bill would empower the minister to make orders fixing the rates to be charged for the collection of waste material in declared areas. It would also provide that the occupier of residential premises in an area is liable for payment of the rate fixed for the area and that non-payment would be recoverable debt. And also in the case of franchise holders, there are consequential amendments and minor drafting amendments. So essentially the gist of this is that the minister may order fixed the rates to be charged for the collection of waste materials. That is the real gist of the bill, and this of course would come under Consumer Affairs and the Environment, the minister who is responsible for this Act. And he may be order also extend or reduce an area, that is, the size of a waste disposal area.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS: This question of waste disposal areas is a serious one that this government has attempted to tackle very often, Mr. Speaker, and I know from experience in my own district it seems that, you know, waste disposal areas are thought of by the advisers to government as being suitable and proper places, but yet when the residents, who know the area of course extremely well, are made aware of the proposal they are understandably upset by it. To put it simply, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, nobody really wants to have a waste disposal area close to his or her own home, and yet these waste disposal areas have to go somewhere, and I think, and we are all aware,

Mr. Wells:

that every effort should be made to make sure that they are too close in the first place to inhabited areas, and that when they are put into effect that they be supervised properly, and made to operate in a sanitary and proper way. And this is something that we are working toward, Mr. Speaker, and which I think with a good deal of expertise now that that has been developed in the department, and I expect the rate of success in the future to be very worthwhile.

And so, Mr. Speaker, these are relatively minor amendments to the Act, and I move second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, probably while I am speaking the minister could indicate to me what - are the rates the same all over the Province? I know it is \$2 in -

MR. MURPHY: This will enable us to vary the rates, you know, depending on the area itself.

MR. ROWE: But at the present time it is the same all over -

MR. MURPHY: They are sort of uniform, -

MR. ROWE: Right.

MR. MURPHY: - not strictly, but I would say basically.

MR. ROWE: And the minister will determine the rates obviously in consultation with -

MR. MURPHY: Yes. As you know, it is in unincorporated areas.

MR. ROWE: That is right. Now that is the point that I am trying to get at. You know, how does one arrive at the rates that are going to be charged to these people in a waste disposal area?

MR. MURPHY: I say it is a mutual agreement between your Waste Disposal Committee and the government.

MR. ROWE: Right. Okay, that brings me to the question of waste disposal areas are these areas that have jurisdiction over the geography of a certain place where you do not have incorporation or you do not have a council.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. ROWE: I apologize, Mr. Speaker, I have a heavy cold tonight and I do not think I am going very straight.

But the issue that I want to raise is this, and I do not know whether the minister has looked into it, or whether it comes under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, or both ministers. But I received a great number of complaints, as have some of my colleagues, and I would assume as have some other hon. gentlemen opposite, from people who live in waste disposal areas, who live in an area that is under the jurisdiction of a waste disposal area.

AN HON. MEMBER: Committee.

MR. ROWE: And they have to pay their \$2 or \$3 a month, whatever it is, and they may be working outside of that community. For instance, Green's Harbour comes under the jurisdiction of a waste disposal area, so some people work out there in Whitbourne or work in, say, Hant's Harbour, or Heart's Delight or Islington where you an incorporated community, so those people really are doubled taxed, because they are taxed because they work in an area that is incorporated and they also are taxed - true it is a very small and minor amount - but they are also taxed by the Chairman or the committee of the Waste Disposal Area.

Now the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing indicated earlier this year that he was going to try and do something to rectify that particular problem. And presumably, if that nod meant that the hon. minister has an answer, I would certainly appreciate an answer to where we go from here with respect to that particular problem.

Mr. Rowe.

The other thing, Sir, that I would like to ask the minister is the exact power of the chairman, and probably Clause 5, subsection 4, may be the answer here. There are certain areas of certain communities under the jurisdiction of a waste disposal area who just simply refuse to pay their rates. And the question I was going to put to the minister is: What is the legal power of the chairman to force these people to pay? Because it is unfair to have one side of a harbour paying for the collection of garbage, and having the other side of the harbour, for some peculiar reason that is unique only to Newfoundland, decide that they are not going to pay the rate for the collection of garbage under the jurisdiction of a waste disposal area. Probably that clause does cover it: "Any sum due and payable by an occupier under subsection (3) is a debt due to the Committee or the Franchise Holder, as the case may be, and is recoverable with costs by civil action in any court of competent jurisdiction but notwithstanding the provisions of Section 25, non-compliance by an occupier with the provisions of subsection(3) of this Section 10 does not constitute an offense." Now not having referred to all these subsections and sections, what I am basically asking is: Does the chairman of a waste disposal area now have the legal power to bring these offenders, non-payers, into the magistrate, and get the money out of them one way or the other?

MR. WELLS: What it is really saying is that if you do not pay, they can sue you for the money, but the fact that you do not pay does not constitute an offense where -

MR. ROWE: Right.

MR. WELLS: - they can take a charge against you, but they sue you for the money.

MR. ROWE: So this amendment, in effect, now gives the chairman or the committee the legal power to get the money from the people being served by the committee, the Waste Disposal Committee, for the collection of garbage. Well, Sir, obviously this is a step

Mr. Rowe.

in the right direction. But I would like some clarification - I know it is a minor and small amount of money, but the with the tightness of money today, and the lack of it, a few dollars mean a lot to a lot of people, and I think in principle it is wrong for people to have to pay taxes in two different areas. As a matter of fact, in conversation with another hon. member in a district some weeks ago, Sir - and if the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing is present or in hearing distance I would certainly like for him to speak to it - it has come to my attention that we have an individual who lives in one municipality, works in another municipality - I think this was the essence of a question one day put to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing - and who pays taxes in a third municipality, and the reason for it is that he has a local government where the taxes are lower than the one in which he lives, resides, or the one in which he works. So he is opted for some reason or another - it is a strange mechanism. I do not know how they would manage to do it - but he decides that he is going to pay a tax in community C. He lives in community A, works in community B, and pays his taxes, which are less than community A and B, in community C.

MR. CANNING : How can he do that?

MR. ROWE: That is what I am asking.

MR. PECKFORD: I can answer that for you, but I have already answered the question.

MR. ROWE: Well, if the minister answered the question, I either -

MR. PECKFORD: And you were satisfied with the answer.

MR. ROWE: Well, I must have forgotten or I was not present.

MR. MORGAN: You are not well tonight.

MR. ROWE: I know I am not well tonight. Now do not provoke me, Mr. Speaker, I ask hon. members. I am a raw nerve tonight, Sir, a very raw nerve, and the least provocation the better for hon. members opposite.

MR. PECKFORD: You should be like me and be happy every day.

MR. ROWE: Usually I am pretty civilized.

Mr. Rowe.

I have taken the appropriate medication to keep me cool tonight. But if the minister has answered the question, and he does not want to get up and answer it again, we can talk about it privately. But the House Leader I think has got the couple of points that I raised on the double taxation bit, and the legal power of the chairman to get the money out of the people, which is now defined in the act; and presumably the rates will be administered or identified with some discretion and we will not have exorbitant rates charged to these people under the jurisdiction of a waste disposal area. And I notice in one other bill, Mr. Speaker, that in default of payment of certain taxes or rates that there is an interest rate charged, or penalty charged. As a matter of fact, I could relate directly to the School Tax Act, an amendment that is going to come in. There is an interest rate penalty charge for non-payment of the taxes. I was wondering what the situation is with respect to this particular bill. Would people just be asked to pay back their arrears or will they have an interest rate - I cannot see anything here on it. I might have missed it - Will there be an arrears interest charged on the non-payment of these particular rates for waste disposal areas?

Sir, I think that basically covers it.

We are in agreement with the principle, and I appreciate it if the minister could relate to the couple of points that I have raised.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker -

MR. RIDEOUT: If the minister would permit?

MR. MURPHY: Oh, I am sorry, 'Tom'.

MR. RIDEOUT: There is just one little question here that bothers me, I understand that this relates to Waste Disposal Committees in nonincorporated areas. Is that right?

MR. _____: Yes.

MR. RIDEOUT: What is the problem of allowing those committees

Mr. Rideout.

to set their own rates, and to do the collection and stuff like that? There might be a good reason for it. So in your response to the member, what is the problem with allowing those Waste Disposal Committees with setting their own rates rather than the minister, as I understand this bill to do, fixing the rates? Do they charge for the collection of waste material? Is that the authority of the job of the minister under this amendment? I wonder what is the problem with allowing the committees themselves to set their own rates for their own particular areas? There might be a good reason, and maybe the minister could respond to this.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, on that, as we know, waste disposal areas are a recent phenomenon. In other words, in recent years, because of the fact that people were dumping indiscriminately. So in incorporated areas there is no problem. They have a council. But the hon. member asked - and I believe that they do fix their own rates, but I think the minister, under the act, who has the power to constitute one of these groups - it is all done by an act under Provincial Affairs - he will then fix the order so that it emanates from the one who established the committee rather than the chairman having to go around. So, you know, actually you set a committee, and then they say, look, what can your group afford? You will have to figure it out. I do not think there is any profit in it or to anybody. You sort of charge enough to cover yourself perhaps to get the truck to pick it up.

MR. RIDEOUT: Where does the money wind up?

MR. MURPHY: Actually, it goes to the Waste Disposal Committee. I say, in effect, what it does, most of it, I would say, goes to the truck driver who collects the garbage pail, and that is why he is covered here as the franchise holder. It is basically the same thing. As far as double taxation is concerned, I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if we would call this fee a tax because I do not think it is a

Mr. Murphy.

tax actually. It is a contribution between a group of people who get together to have their garbage or their waste, you know, collected. And that could happen. What the implications are - I think school tax, as the hon. member has already pointed out, is paid, and then they pay something else somewhere else, somewhere else. But basically with this here what they are trying to do - and one time it was small communities. Now we are trying to make them regionalized so as we can get sites. But there is one thing that I would like to put on the record, that the Department of the Environment does not select dump sites, so-called, which we are doing away with; we are calling it waste disposal sites now, and a rose by any other name would still smell sweet, I suppose. But basically the department does not select these. These are selected by the people concerned. And our only interest in the thing - and I do not say our only, but our basic thing - is to approve or disapprove the site that this group picks out, environmentally. And then it is like the Goulds, as the hon. member says, you know. I noticed an editorial in the Telegram while I was away saying that I should go out and look at these things and do all this kind of stuff, and we had nothing whatever to do with it. The thing was cleared. There is going to be an incinerator anyhow. It is not a dump. It is an incinerator put there. The mayor signs it, clears it three weeks before, and then someone decides that they will have a meeting and object to it. I understand there were

MR. MURPHY: 487 signatures on the petition, about forty showed up for the meeting. Am I right in that, Sir?

MR. WELLS: That is about right. The petition was signed.

MR. MURPHY: I am just trying to clarify this point because we get so much flak on this, and our department gets blamed for it and we have nothing in the world to do with selecting any sight, that is up to the group themselves in an area.

But we are hoping to get into incinerators if we can and we are trying to develop a plan, and I just say this now with the Minister of Industrial Development where we will burn this and what is there then is only about ten per cent of refuse.

MR. RIDEOUT: Is the minister going to provide incinerators?

MR. MURPHY: We have not yet, we have not any money. But we will. We hope to work out a scheme some way or another. I say we are talking about it, you know, we are in the talking stages. But I do not know if there is anything else on the thing basically. All we are trying to do is encourage people to try to keep their junk or their waste material in one place rather than scatter it hither and yon.

MR. ROWE: A question, Sir, because I just want—because I am having enquiries about it and to get the record straight: The government has now decided that they are going to keep on with the same mechanism as they have been using over the past few years and that is there is not going to be any change; if a person lives within a waste disposal area he is going to pay for that service and he is going to continue to pay the taxes in the jurisdiction within which he works, if that is incorporated. That policy is going to be maintained. Did I hear the minister correctly on that?

MR. MURPHY: I presume so. If he wants his waste material taken away he will pay for it.

MR. ROWE: Because the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing did indicate earlier that his department was looking at that

MR. ROWE: thing and we were thinking of bringing in some regulations to change it. So it seems as if there is no change.

MR. MURPHY: Well as far as I know, and again I know the minister wants to close debate on the thing, but basically it is like I live in Topsail Pond in the Summertime, I pay \$2.25 a month to someone to take away - we have not got a committee set up yet, but basically if you want to save up your garbage and not pay it is quite all right with the committee on this.

MR. SPEAKFR: If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. WELLS: Close the debate on behalf of Kilbride, Mr. Speaker, that is to keep the waste disposal area at bay, but that is a bit of a joke really. I think the answer to the various questions are that so far as the rates are concerned, these waste disposal authorities, as I understand it, have not the power as a municipality has, or some of these organized bodies, have not the power to set the rates, but they find out what they would need to pay for the service and they recommend a rate then to the minister and then the minister sets the rates. I suppose sometime in the future they may be given greater powers, they may be able to set the rates themselves and have them approved by the minister. But at the moment they recommend what they need and the rate is set by the minister.

The minister can also of course prescribe the times at which such rates shall be paid. I would think that inherent in that is probably a right to set an interest rate beyond a certain time, you know, if the money is not paid as is the case in taxes anyway, insofar as the recovery of debt, I think I made that clear in the exchange with the member that the waste disposal

MR. WELLS: area or the franchise holder can take the person into court, sue as a civil summons in a Magistrate's Court to collect what is owing, but you cannot charge them with a breach of the act and take them in and have a fine, which is a different thing. So that I think is all right. And it applies to whatever other taxes a person may pay as he works here, there or anywhere. You only pay the waste disposal rate if you are occupier of residential premises within the area. And that I believe answers these questions. I think this process is going to have to be developed and refined more in future as the policy gets on, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure there will be further amendments and changes in the future as the policy is worked out. But this I think will make things a little better for the moment and accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I will move second reading.

On motion a bill, "An Act To Amend The Waste Material Disposal Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: Was the House Leader introducing this bill on behalf of the minister?

MR. WELLS: Oh yes.

MR. ROWE: Right. Well the only reason I am raising this point of order, Sir, is yesterday or last night, I cannot remember when, the minister introduced a bill on behalf of another minister and the minister spoke to the bill and there was no further debate allowed after the minister had spoken. And tonight we saw the exact opposite occur. The minister introduced the bill on behalf of the minister, the minister spoke and then the hon. House Leader spoke after the minister. I would like to bring it to the attention of the Speaker because I do not know what kind of a precedent we are setting here.

MR. SPEAKER: Actually in both cases, both yesterday and today, as I recall it I did inform hon. members that if the minister spoke he would close the debate. Yesterday it may have been the minister under whose department the responsibility was and today it was a

MR. SPEAKER: different minister. I suppose one has to use one's judgement as to who intends to close the debate, but certainly the protection of hon. members is there as long as they are informed that whoever it is in speaking will close the debate.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

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

A bill, "An Act To Strengthen Security Measures In Respect Of Private Property." (No. 66)

On motion clauses 1 through 7, carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation Act." (No. 72)

On motion clauses 1 and 2, carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Waste Material (Disposal) Act." (No. 70)

On motion clauses 1 through 7, carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Livestock (Community Sales) Act." (Bill No. 61).

On motion Clause (1) carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order 17

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Urban and Rural Planning Act." (Bill No. 60)

On motion Clauses (1) through (3) carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order 13

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Workmen's Compensation Act." (Bill No. 47).

On motion Clauses (1) through (9) carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order 11.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Department of Transportation and Communications Act." (Bill No. 43).

On motion Clauses (1) through (2) carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order 8.

A bill, "An Act To Provide Retiring Allowances On A Contributory Basis To Persons Who Have Served As Members Of The House Of Assembly." (Bill No. 14).

On motion Clauses (1) through (38) carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order 6.

A bill, An Act To Adopt A Mineral Emblem For The Province." (Bill No. 2).

On motion Clauses (1) through (2) carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment, carried.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, there was inadvertently one bill that has gone through second reading, but is due for Committee, inadvertently left off the Order Paper, It is The Interprovincial Subpoenas Act, The member for St. John's East, I understand, and the Minister of Justice have agreed on the amendment.

MR. HICKMAN: That is Bill 26.

MR. WELLS: Bill 26, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HICKMAN: Thirty, what?

MR. WELLS: Bill No. 36

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Adoption Of The Uniform Interprovincial Subpoena In This Province." (Bill No. 36).

On motion Clauses (1) through (2) carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall Clause (3) carry? I am sorry. The hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. W. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I would ask leave to withdraw the amendment that was placed yesterday, and propose a new amendment. And this new amendment is in substance the same as the amendment I proposed yesterday, but it has gone through the legislative draftsman in the Department of Justice. The legislative draftsman in his wisdom has certain improvements to make in the languages, he deems they are improvements, and they do appear to be slightly better expressed than in the amendment that was proposed yesterday. And this is the amendment, I move that Bill No. 36 be amended by striking out Paragraph (b) of Clause (3) on page four thereof, by substituting the following, (b) no facts have been presented to the Court from which it can be reasonably infer that the attendance in the issuing province of the person subpoenaed can or is likely to adversely affect the health and well-being of that person and any of his dependents or is likely to cause irreversable economic lost to that person. And (d) the subpoena is accompanied by the witness fees and travelling expenses in accordance with Schedule A.

The effect of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, will be exactly the same as that proposed by me yesterday, and will give the individual who is grossly inconvenienced as a result of being subpoenaed from

Mr. Marshall:

another province a recourse to apply to the Courts of this Province for relief. I have the consent of the seconder to it, the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. R. Winsor), and we are both appreciative of the fact that the government has seen fit to accept this amendment which we feel will strengthen the bill and give the necessary protection to individuals who might be affected by it in the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, last night we indicated—or yesterday, whenever it was, we indicated our support of the amendment brought in by the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), and now that it has been tidied up by the legal draftsman, Sir, we would just like to re-emphasize our support of that particular amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Carried.

On motion Clause (3) as amended, carried.

On motion Clauses (4) through (9) carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed the bill with some amendment, carried.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred, and have directed me to report Bill Nos. 66, 72, 70, 61, 60, 47, 43, 14 and 2 without amendment, and No. 36 with some amendments, and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and have directed him to report Bill Nos. 66, 72, 70, 61, 60, 47, 43, 14, and 2 without amendment.

On motion report received and adopted, carried.

On motion bills read a third time now, by leave.

June 2, 1976

Wape 3141

Pk - 4

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee also reports that having considered the matters to them referred, and they have directed him to report Bill No. 36 with amendment.

On motion report received and adopted, carried.

On motion amendments read a first and second time.

On motion the following bills were ordered read a third time now by leave.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Adopt A Mineral Emblem For The Province," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 2).

On motion, a bill, " An Act To Provide Retiring Allowances On A contributory Basis To Persons Who Have Served As Members Of The House Of Assembly," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 14).

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Transportation And Communications Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 43).

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Workmen's Compensation Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 47).

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Urban And Rural Planning Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 60).

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Livestock (Community Sales) Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 61).

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill no. 72).

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Strengthen Security Measures In Respect Of Private Property," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper (Bill No. 66).

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Waste Material (Disposal) Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 70)

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Adoption Of The Uniform Interprovincial Subpoena In This Province," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper (Bill No. 36).

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House Motion 14, which is first a reading which was inadvertently not asked for today. By leave of the House we could have first reading of this bill at this time. It is an act respecting the Sheriff of Newfoundland and his officials. First reading, if that is agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 14.

On motion of the hon. Minister of Justice, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Sheriff Of Newfoundland And His Officials, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (Bill No. 85).

MR. WELLS: Motion 6.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

RESOLUTION: That it is expedient to bring in a measure further to amend the Income Tax Act, Chapter 163 of the Revised Statutes Of Newfoundland, 1970.

On motion Resolution carried.

MR. DOODY: I think it is in order to say a word or two about the bill. The gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) wants an explanation. This is simply the act which puts the extra one per cent on the corporate income tax as a result of the Budget Speech of a few months ago. This will result, hopefully, in an extra \$1.3 million in revenue during 1976-1977. It is a very simple bill. It is certainly not a very earth-shattering one, but it will amount to an extra \$1.3 million in revenue for the Province this year. So, Sir, that is the explanation of the bill.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, just a few words on this bill. Did the minister say \$1.3 million?

MR. DOODY: Yes, \$1.3 million is what is anticipated in additional revenue.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, we find nothing wrong with this means of collecting a few extra dollars. I do not have with me my figures now, the comparative figures across Canada. I believe this is one of the -

MR. DOODY: It is the highest, I think.

MR. SIMMONS: It is the highest?

MR. DOODY: Either that or we are tied for first place.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, it is around there. I was not sure which, Mr. Chairman.

Certainly we find nothing wrong with this method of raising a few extra dollars. We do not know, Mr. Chairman, tongue in cheek perhaps, we do not know what our parent company is going to say to us as a Liberal Party. We have no idea what our parent company is going to say to us as a subsidiary, that we should be down here openly, daringly supporting this kind of thing. It is certainly going to cost our parent company somewhat. But we will take that chance, Mr. Speaker, as a daring but certain slave of the parent company. We will take the chance. We will run the risk that the parent corporation will read the Riot Act to us in the morning. We will do it, I suppose, on the excuse that the leader is not here, and, therefore - the leader is probably out consulting at the moment.

MR. DOODY: The Leader is consulting with the owners.

MR. SIMMONS: I know we are in for real trouble, Mr. Chairman, on this one with the parent company. There is no question about that. But that be as it may -

MR. DOODY: Take a chance, boy, take a chance.

MR. NEAPY: Andy will look after you after you get into government.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, well there is always a reward, Mr. Chairman, for these things, you know. One never forgets that. So we will bear the brunt of it in the meantime, and we will happily support this bill which would put an additional \$1.3 million into the

Mr. Simmons.

coffers, and we cannot think of a better way of raising that kind of additional money. It is one of the more pleasant things, Mr. Chairman, that showed up in the budgetary measures announced some time ago by the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Simmons:

So we will be happy to join with him once again in supporting this very imaginative piece of legislation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I always knew that my hon. friend was naive, Sir, but I did not really think that he was as naive as he indicated a few moments ago, when he said that the parent company might not feel too happy about the hon. gentleman supporting this bill. Well what the hon. gentleman does not realize is that it is not the parent company that will pay this tax, most of this \$1.3 million, it will be the consumers. It will be the customers of the parent company, because it will be just passed on by the parent company, by the hon. gentlemen who run the service industries in this Province. It will be passed on to the consumer; ultimately, indirectly it will be the consumer who will pay most of this \$1.3 million. So I hope my hon. friend is not labouring under any illusion that Mr. Andy, or the Godfather as Peter Newman called him in his Canadian Establishment, is going to cough up any part of this \$1.3 million. It will be passed on to the poor old suckers, the poor old consumers of this Province. So if the hon. member wants to be smart, and trying to be funny, I think he better stop to think who is going to have to pay this eventually.

I do support the Bill, Mr. Speaker. You could not sock it to the corporations enough to my liking, and then maybe that is my socialistic thinking coming out. We have not gone quite as far as they have out in Saskatchewan with the potash industry.

MR. DOODY: Wait until we find some potash.

MR. NEARY: Well I would not be a bit surprised the way this Administration -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - I would not be a bit surprised the way the Administration is headed that one of these days you will see somebody running up and grabbing the Mace and racing after members of the Cabinet, because this is an unusual and unique House, Sir, that most of the socialistic tendencies.

MR. DOODY: All the red Tories.

MR. NEARY: - and thinking come from the Tory side of the House. And I believe this 14 per cent is probably one of the highest rates taxable to corporations in Canada. So I would not be one bit surprised if one of these days, Sir, fist fights will break out in this House,

MR. DOODY: Never. Shame.

MR. NEARY: - and the Mace will be grabbed from the table and they will race after the Minister of Finance and make a swing at him with it -

MR. DOODY: Oh!

MR. NEARY: - because I would not be a bit surprised if one of these days if we keep on the way we are going that there will be a big nationalization bill brought into the House.

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

MR. W.W. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, there is just one question I would like to ask the minister on it, and perhaps it is in the Budget Speech, I do not remember it, but how high does this bring our corporate tax rate now in relation to other provinces? Are there any other provinces that are higher? Have we got any room to operate? And could the minister perhaps address himself to the question of whether he anticipates if we are at the end of the line as far as our possible source of taxation of corporations in the Province is concerned, or whether he foresees that - although that is a hard question to answer, I know - or whether he foresees in the future that we may be able to raise it a bit more? And thirdly, whether or not a tax of this nature on corporations is going to have any affect on the business development in the Province itself?

MR. NEARY: This means you have got to hit the lawyers next.

MR. MARSHALL: No you are already hitting them pretty good.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I think the point made by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is well taken, that, you know, any increase in a corporate tax there is the obvious danger, and I think happens

Mr. Rowe:

frequently, that that tax is passed along to the consumer.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. ROWE: And I can remember earlier, I think, during the Oral Question Period asking the minister responsible for Consumer Affairs what steps the relevant division of his department is taking to protect the consumer, I think in this particular instance when I spoke to it was against the increase in the gasoline tax being passed along to the consumer. If I can use an example, you have, for example, the trucking companies who are hauling supplies and food all over the Province, and obviously it is an additional expense with the increase in the cost of gasoline. And I asked the minister at that time what steps his department will be taking to protect the consumer against this increase being passed along to the consumer. And I therefore ask the very same question with respect to this bill; is there any system, or can any monitoring system be devised - it may be well nigh impossible with the big corporations, with their battery of accountants and lawyers, and what have you it might be well nigh impossible to monitor corporations to ensure that such increases in corporate taxes are not passed along through some mechanism to the consumer. And I would like to hear from the government before this bill goes through - before this resolution goes through. I will be very happy to hear from the government that they are working towards some sort of a monitoring mechanism to ensure, you know, the cost is not in fact handed along to the consumer. Because I think in every case, in every single case, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is right. We are the ones, the consumers, our people are the ones who eventually end up paying for any corporation tax. On the surface we can bump and bang and wang away at the large corporations, and we can support increases in their corporation tax, the income tax, the corporation income tax. We can support it wholeheartedly, but we do so knowing that really, practically in all cases, the cost is passed along to the consumer, and I would appeal to the minister responsible for Consumer Affairs to indicate whether his department

Mr. Rowe:

is working towards some formula or some mechanism, or beefing up to the relevant division, the Division of Consumer Affairs, I think it is called, to see whether they can more greatly protect the consumer from this kind of a tax.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, with reference to that question, the hon. gentleman said he asked it before, I do not know what method we could use to prevent it being passed on, because business being business I think the cost of business is added and passed on to the consumer no matter what you are selling, whether you increase your wages or anything else, and I think whoever it is the corporation may be, they always have a cost of doing business, So I cannot see, unless it is some charitable organization that has an increased expense of some kind whether it be a tax or, you know, some kind of a commitment money-wise that would say, oh no we will not pass this on now, we will give this to the poor consumer, or something like this. But I would like to see, and as a matter of fact we are trying to study just how we can control things. We cannot, as the hon. member knows, we cannot set prices, establish prices, we cannot roll back prices; all we can do is monitor them and pass it on to the federal representative here and ask him to help us on the thing. And the only thing we can do is to pressure, in one way or another, to the people to let them know that we are watching, but basically I do not know if there is anybody who has any idea of just how this type of thing can be controlled really. But we are looking at it, and I hope under the new set up that we will specialize in this type of arrangement.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Chairman, the questions raised by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) was first; where do we stand in relationship to the other provinces of Canada in terms of corporate income tax? Once again, Sir, we take first place. Our corporate income tax is now 14 per cent. We are leading British Columbia at 13 per cent; and Manitoba, 13 per cent; Saskatchewan is 12 per cent; Ontario is 12 per cent; Quebec, 12 per cent; Nova Scotia is 12 per

Mr. Doody:

cent; Prince Edward Island is 10 per cent; New Brunswick is 10 per cent; Alberta is 11 per cent. So because of the question, is there any room left to go any higher, that is something I suppose that can be debated forever. I do not really know, I would suspect there is not. I think we are getting pretty close to the cut off point or the point of diminishing returns in terms of attracting industry here. Maybe we are not. It would depend to a large extent on the prospects for a particular industry. If it appears to

Mr. Doody.

be a profitable industry in terms of return on the investment, I suspect that the one or two percentage points of corporate income tax would not be the major deterrent. I think that if all other things were considered equal, then perhaps there could very well be a deterrent. The point of the one per cent corporate income tax that we placed in this particular budget was certainly one that raising \$1.3 million was a very important factor. The other important factor was the raising of the tax on gasoline, and the various other tax measures that have been taken during the past several years. It seemed only fair and reasonable that some of the tax burden should be passed to the corporations. Hon. members have stated that eventually all cost increases get passed on to consumers. I guess that is true in every area or walk of life. And the only real monitoring system that there is, I guess, if a corporation is earning more than a reasonable profit I would think that the Internal Revenue Service does a very effective monitoring job through the imposition of its taxation laws. And to say that the corporations have great batteries of accountants and legal experts is probably quite true. I doubt very much if there are more efficient or capable or dedicated than the lawyers and accountants with the Internal Revenue Service or with indeed any of the federal government departments who monitor the corporate and personal income tax areas.

I guess that is about all that can be said on that particular item, Sir. Like most taxes it is not a matter of preference. Certainly this administration, like all administrations everywhere, does not enjoy imposing taxes. Services have got to be delivered to the people. They have to be paid for somehow. There is a limit to how much you can borrow. There is a limit to how much you can get from the federal government. The balance has to be made up somehow, and the taxation field is obviously the only available method of doing it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the enacting clause carry? Carried.

CLERK ASSISTANT: Be it resolved by the House of Assembly in Legislative Session convened as follows,

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the enacting clause carry? Carried.

CLERK ASSISTANT: Resolution to be submitted to a Committee of the Whole House in relation to a measure to amend The Income Tax Act, Chapter 163 of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1970.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the title carry? Carried.

Bill No. 29.

CLERK ASSISTANT: That it is expedient to bring in a measure further to amend The Gasoline Tax Act, Chapter 147 of The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1970.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Chairman, this is the second of the two taxation measures which were brought in during the last budget. It was anticipated that the extra two cents a gallon on gasoline at the retail will bring in an additional \$3 million in revenue for the Province for the same obvious reasons that we spoke about a minute ago, the necessity of maintaining services and the limited areas of taxation that are available to the Province. This two cents a gallon gasoline tax is certainly one that is a great deal, I think, more unpleasant and more undesirable and a great deal more difficult for us to bring ourselves to do. Once again it was a matter of necessity and certainly not one that we welcomed coming as it did on top of the ten cents per gallon federal excise tax which has been imposed on the public just a few months prior to that made it that much more difficult to do. But, as we say, the number of tax areas that are open to the Province are limited, and this gasoline tax, and to answer the obvious question that is going to be raised, I would anticipate, brings us to first place in the various provinces of Canada. Newfoundland's gasoline tax provincially now is twenty-seven cents. The closest to us are the provinces of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia which have a twenty-one cent tax each. The province of New Brunswick has a twenty cents tax.

Mr. Doody.

Quebec and Ontario have a nineteen cents tax each. British Columbia has a seventeen cents tax. Manitoba has a fifteen cents tax. Saskatchewan has a twelve cents tax. Alberta has a ten cents tax. As I look across this line there is Alberta, the mystery is that anybody lives anywhere in Canada. They have no retail sales tax, they have a personal income tax of twenty-six per cent as opposed to our forty-two percent. Manitoba has a forty-two and one-half per cent, and the others which are close to that area. They have an eleven per cent corporate income tax, and a ten per cent gasoline tax. And how one goes about correcting that sort of regional disparity and incentive for industry to establish and for the comfort of the citizenry who live there it is rather difficult to comprehend. But the financial facts of life are there to be seen and to be read. And once again, as hon. members have suggested, this is a matter of, as somebody said earlier, "Cape St. Mary's pays for all." There is very little question about the fact that this will be passed down to the consumers. The hope is that eventually the government of Canada, and indeed of the Province, will come to grips with the petroleum companies and come down to the basic facts of life in terms of their taxation policies on these companies, and be a little bit more realistic and think a little more objectively about this need for huge amounts of earned surpluses for reinvestment in development and exploration. I think that the relationship of the two has been vastly over-stressed and overrated, and I think it is something that should be looked at. In the meantime, that two cents per gallon has been brought into effect with the result of, as I say, of bringing an additional \$3 million in revenue to the Province of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I have never heard such a weak-kneed, feeble excuse in my life for trying to justify this increase of two cents a gallon on the gasoline tax. It is four minutes to eleven now, Sir. I do not know if we are going to end up at eleven o'clock or carry on after eleven, but there is no way that I can conclude

MR. NEARY:

the remarks that I have to make. I have so much to say on the gasoline -

MR. WELLS: If the hon. member permits. It looks as though obviously that we cannot finish this at eleven. I was going to ask the House if they would be prepared to sit a little longer to deal with this motion. So, you know, we are in your hands. If not, well we could stop at eleven. But if the House would like to finish this particular motion, well we could.

MR. NEARY: Just this motion?

MR. WELLS: Just this motion, unless, of course, there would be a strong move to do another one, in which case we could continue. But whatever the House feels.

MR. NEARY: Well, I have no objection.

MR. ROWE: On this motion, I have no great enthusiasm.

MR. WELLS: And when we could call the two bills afterwards and dispose of them.

MR. NEARY: I do not know if at this late date there is any mileage to be gotten out of it anyway with what I am going to say, but I am afraid that I have got to. I will have to sock it to the minister on this one. Because instead of increasing the gasoline tax in this Province, the minister and his government and the administration should be reducing the gasoline tax. There is going to be another ten cents added on top of this, I think, the first of July.

MR. DOODY: Who is going to do that?

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. DOODY: Who is going to put that on ?

MR. NEARY: Who is going to put that on? This is the new arrangement they have with the oil producing provinces. And when I put a question to the hon. Premier earlier in the House about this additional ten cents, whether or not the Province was considering reducing the gasoline tax in this Province to offset the impact of the huge increase that is facing our people in July, the hon. Premier said, "No, the Province could not afford it." And at that time the government had already implemented an extra two cents a gallon

Mr. Neary.

on gasoline in this Province. Mr. Chairman, does not the administration realize the implications of adding another two cents to the price of gasoline in this Province? Do they realize the implications, Sir? Do they realize, number one, that they are discouraging tourists from coming into this Province, that

MP. NEARY:

We have the highest gasoline tax in the whole of Canada, we have the highest unemployment, we have the second lowest personal per capita income? Does the hon. minister and the administration realize that this is going to add another burden to the already heavy burden on consumers in this Province, it is going to increase the cost of living in this Province? Does the minister realize the serious implications of this extra two cents a gallon on gasoline purchased in this Province?

Mr. Chairman, the government, Sir, have sat idly by for the last four or five years and watched the tractor-trailer industry grow in this Province, watch it grow, grown to the extent that it has taken most of the freight off rail and put it on rubber tires. Freight is now being carried across this Province by huge tractor-trailers.

MR. MORGAN: You cannot stop them.

MP. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the minister says you cannot stop them. Well, I have got a few words of advice for the minister. This Province is not getting the revenue from the tractor-trailer industry that it should be getting, and it is high time, Sir, instead of socking it to the poor old consumer and adding on a couple of more cents on to the gasoline tax, it is high time that the government, and the Minister of Transportation and Communications especially, took a look at the tractor-trailer industry in this Province to see if we are getting the revenue for the public treasury that we should be getting from the tractor-trailer industry that is displacing railway workers and that is destroying our highway.

Mr. Chairman, I was down in Port aux Basques the other day. I drove from Port aux Basques back to Stephenville and I saw large portions of the Trans-Canada highway being patched up. There are strips of the highway almost the length of this House of Assembly that have been taken up and new pieces of pavement put down, patchwork.

MR. MORGAN: The provincial government is paying for it all right now.

MR. NEARY: Well the provincial government should not be paying for it! That is the point I am trying to make.

MR. MORGAN: We have no choice.

MP. NEARY: We do have a choice, Sir, we do have a choice. We should be getting more revenue from the tractor-trailers that are destroying our highway, that are coming into this Province and displacing Newfoundlanders. In most cases the tractor-trailers are being driven by drivers from the Mainland.

Mr. Chairman, if the administration would only just sit down for a moment and think of what has happened over the last four or five years in the way of transportation in this Province, and instead of adding two cents on to the price of gasoline were to do what other provinces do, and that is to capitalize off the changeover, capitalize off the technological changes that are taking place by making these companies, by making these transport companies that are coming into Newfoundland and destroying our highway and displacing Newfoundlanders, by making them contribute more to the public treasury, to contribute more to the revenue of this Province. We are not getting the revenue from the tractor-trailer industry that we should be getting.

MR. MURPHY: Would the hon. member permit just a short question?

MP. NEARY: Yes, Sir.

MR. MURPHY: With reference to that. Of our main expenditures the cost of transportation of goods is what drives costs up. Now we are going to urge to increase the expenses of the tractor-trailer and up go the prices again to be passed on to the consumer.

MR. NEARY: Ah, Mr. Chairman, I was anticipating that question. I can tell this House, Sir, that there has been a switchover from rail freight to tractor-trailers in the last three or four years, but can the minister detect any lowering in the cost of living? These tractor trailers that come in here are supposed to be more efficient. They have better deliveries, so we are told. Businessmen like the tractor-trailer industry better. But can the minister detect any decrease in the cost of living because of the changeover or is the cost of living still going up?

MR. MURPHY: They maintain they would be higher only for this changeover.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I submit to the hon. minister that with the emphasis that is being placed on conservation of fossil fuel, with the emphasis that is being placed on conservation of petroleum products and on energy and the increase in the cost of petroleum products that that will work out to the advantage of the railway workers in this Province within a matter of a few short years. Because, Sir, in my opinion it is far more economical to have two diesel locomotives tow 120 or 130 railway cars of freight across this Province than to have all the individual tractor-trailers coming in here burning up fuel. They are diesel and gas guzzlers and destroying our highway. I think it will work out to the advantage of our railway workers and the workers in Port aux Basques eventually, the conservation measures and the increase in the cost of petroleum products. It is going to take a little while.

CN, the mutton heads who run CN should be taking the initiative and should be trying to capitalize off of this, Sir, because -

MR. MORCAN: Not the local mutton heads.

MR. NEARY: Not the local ones, no. I am talking about the mutton heads over in New Brunswick.

MR. MORCAN: And Montreal.

MR. NEARY: And Montreal, Sir, should be trying to capitalize off this by upgrading our railway system and not allowing it to deteriorate, and by getting new cars and by getting faster delivery and to try and regain the confidence of the business community in this Province that they have lost over the last eight or ten years through no fault of their own.

You know, Mr. Chairman, I do not know if members of this hon. House are aware of it or not, but four or five years ago CN made an application to the Public Utilities Board to operate a trucking service across this Province. There was an objection raised by the local truckers and the Public Utilities Board threw out the application. You know, Mr. Chairman, what that has done? That opened up the way for the Mainland truckers to come in and take over the industry in

MR. NEARY:

Newfoundland. If CN had been granted their license, as they should have been by the Public Utilities Board, the jobs would have went to Newfoundlanders.

MR. MORGAN: CN have got a permit now.

MR. NEARY: They got a permit when it was too late, Sir. It was rejected at that time. It was rejected by the Public Utilities Board. As a result, Newfoundlanders lost the jobs. CN would have had all the tractor trailers would have had all the freight delivered on rubber tires. And the application was rejected, much to our chagrin and to our shame. We should have encouraged it. We should have been right in there fighting for CN, although we do not always agree with their policies. But that was one grave error, one great mistake that was made. And as a result the door was opened up for the mainlanders to come in here and take over. Now that they are in here we are not generating the revenue from the tractor-trailer industry that we should be generating in this Province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one other point that I have to make in connection with this bill, Sir, and it always irritates and annoys me, is the fact that the price of gasoline across this Province is not uniform from one end of this Province to the other. I do not see why it should not be, Sir. I do not see why my constituents out in Port aux Basques should be paying anywhere from ten to fifteen cents more a gallon for gasoline than they do here in St. John's, and paying eight and ten cents more a gallon than they do up in Corner Brook, only a couple of hundred miles away. There is something wrong, Sir. There is no justification for it, Mr. Chairman. There is no reason for it. There is no logic to it.

Mr. Chairman, you should be able to fill up your gas tank in St. John's and go down to Clarendville and fill it up for the same price, and

Mr. Neary:

Gander, Grand Falls, Corner Brook, Port aux Basques, the price should be the same right across this Province. The Minister of Consumers Affairs and the Environment claims an assist on getting the price of gasoline reduced in Corner Brook. Well, Sir, I can also claim an assist on that, Because I was probably more responsible for getting that investigation off the ground by the Federal Department of Consumer Affairs than the hon. minister was, And as a result of that investigation and the facts that were made known to the public, to the people of Corner Brook, the price of gasoline dropped by anywhere from three cents to five cents a gallon. But it is not dropping in any other part of Newfoundland, Sir. I asked to have an investigation done down in LaPoile district, especially in the Port aux Basques area, and the report that I got back from Mr. Hurley, the representative of the Federal Department of Consumer Affairs, that there was no justification whatsoever for the huge difference, for the big difference in the price of gasoline between St. John's, Corner Brook and Port aux Basques. It ranges anywhere from ten cents to fifteen cents between St. John's and Port aux Basques, ten cents to fifteen cents a gallon.

Mr. Chairman, that is the sort of thing that the hon. minister should be looking into instead of coming in with a bill to increase the gasoline tax in this Province. The minister should be looking for uniformity right across this Province. There is no way in this world, Sir, that the retailers, that the distributors in the areas that I am talking about can claim that is due to the additional freight costs. No way, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Hurley, the representative of the Federal Department of Consumer Affairs, proved that this is not so, that there should be only a difference of a fraction of a cent in the price of a gallon of gasoline in Port aux Basques as compared to Corner Brook.

AN HON. MEMBER: What has that got to do with the extra cost of gas?

MR. NEARY: What has that got to do with the extra cost to gas?
I am agruing that if the administration, if the government were taking advantage of the tractor-trailer industry to generate more revenue for the public treasury, if they were putting the gears to the big oil companies, that it would not be necessary to have this bill before the House.

MR. W. W. MARSHALL: You can say that again, but that does not make it relevant to the bill.

MR. NEARY: It certainly does make it relevant to the bill, Sir. I claim that the government could get the revenue they need, How much revenue are we going to get from this two cents?

AN HON. MEMBER: Probably three times.

MR. DOODY: Three million dollars.

MR. NEARY: We are going to get \$3 million worth, Sir, we can get that \$3 million -

MR. DOODY: Mark it down.

MR. NEARY: - Yes, we can get that \$3 million in other ways without having to put it on the shoulders of the already overburdened consumer in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: And that is what makes it relevant to this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. MARSHALL: That is not relevant.

MR. NEARY: It is relevant, Sir. I mentioned that when I started to speak, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOODY: Your voice is not good.

MR. NEARY: No, it certainly is not, Sir, but I -

MR. DOODY: It is a little raspy.

MR. NEARY: - will go down in my tracks before I would allow a bill like this to go through without having a few words on it. And I think it is unjustified, unfair, cruel -

MR. DOODY: Barbaric!

Mr. Neary: - inhuman. And this is not the end yet, there is another ten cents going on in July.

MR. DOODY: By the Federal Liberal Government -

MR. NEARY: Ah! By the Federal Liberal Government! Now who is putting this two cents on? Is this the Federal Liberal Government?

MR. DOODY: No, this is the Progressive Conservative Government.

MR. NEARY: This is the Progressive Conservative Party of Newfoundland.

MR. DOODY: No, the administration, I doubt if the party supports it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, I doubt it too. I doubt if anybody supports it. It is an unnecessary tax, it is a cruel blow, Sir, to the people of this Province. It is going to kill our tourist industry.

MR. DOODY: They will be the big spenders.

MR. NEARY: Yes, they are the big spenders. They will come in here and they will not get off the West Coast, thank God, they will stay out in God's country.

MR. DOODY: A five dollar bill and one shirt—they do not change either.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this tax. I am not going to vote for this bill. I am going to vote against it. I think if the government would just use a little initiative and a little foresight and just try to capitalize all of the changes that are taking place in the transportation of goods and products and services in this Province that they could get the revenue in another way without having to sock it to the poor old consumer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I do not plan to support this particular bill, and I will not go over some of the points raised by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). Some of the points where points I was going to raise earlier but he got up before me.

Sir, our concern here of course is simply this, that the consumers of this Province are being pushed, and pushed, and pushed

Mr. Rowe:

far too far now already, and an additional two cents tax on the gasoline tax by itself may not seem too harmful, but when it is taken into consideration and it relates to all of the other tax increases that we have had in this Province, we simply cannot support this additional tax bill, in this case on the sale of gasoline, for the sake of \$3 million.

Sir, I have not written out the list - I have a list, but I do not have it with me. One day I sat down and I tried to list off these things that we could do without, or we should have done without, that would recover a number of hundreds of thousands or millions of dollars in this Province, and I am going strictly by memory, and I can only remember two or three of these things. But if we had to have reduced the size of the Cabinet, for example, as was promised by this administration, there would be a saving in money on the part of this government. If we did not have fifty-one members, if we had the original forty-two members, we would have had a savings as far as this administration is concerned. We spent money, I cannot remember what the exact cost was, but we spent obviously a lot of money to get a commission to define the electoral boundaries of this Province, and then they went ahead and ignored the report of that commission, and brought in their own gerrymandered electoral boundaries.

MR. SIMMONS: Gerrydoodled!

MR. ROWE: Now, Sir, I can go on - it is too bad that I do not have the list with me - the Norma and Gladys - it is too bad I do not have the list with me.

MR. SIMMONS: The Norma and Gladys and Tom.

MR. ROWE: But there are a number of things that this administration have done that if they did not do we would not have saved only \$3 million but more like \$10 million or \$12 million or \$15 million, simple little things that were not necessary. But because the government has done it, now they are forced to sock it to the consumer again and increase the tax on gasoline from twenty-five cents to twenty-seven cents.

MR. MARSHALL: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. ROWE: I suppose, Sir, I guess I am just setting myself up for something, I do not know really -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: You know, the hon. member when he is going through all of the things that, you know, are expenditures-that may be so or not-should not forget of course the \$1 billion debt that the hon. member's administration incurred that has been inflicted on the people of Newfoundland for the next twenty or twenty-five years.

MR. ROWE: What a question, Mr. Chairman! May I remind the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) that we will never let he and his administration forget the \$2 billion, \$3 billion, or \$4 billion debt that they will leave with us when we take over.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROWE: That is what is going to happen. What a -

MR. NOLAN: They have almost doubled it!

MR. ROWE: It was not a question, What a statement for the member to make! After this P.C. Administration have been in power for four and a half years they have managed to double, more than double the debt.

MR. NOLAN: They did in four years.

MR. ROWE: And he has the gall to get up and talk about \$1 billion debt that the previous administration built up over twenty-three years to provide services.

MR. MARSHALL: To a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROWE: A point of order! So point yourself out the - anyway, Mr. Chairman, I will take the point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I do not think

MR. MARSHALL: hon. member is being relevant now, The issue before the Chair is two cents tax on gasoline.

MR. ROWE: I agree, Mr. Chairman, I will change the subject. I was made irrelevant by the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) in trying to answer his question.

Now, Sir, another thing that concerns us is this, and that is the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) pointed out the fact that, I think he pointed out the fact that the prices of food, supplies, clothing and what have you, that is transported through this Province by the big transport trucks, they guzzle gasoline or diesel oil or what have you, and the smaller trucks going up the Northwest Coast and the various trunk roads throughout the Province, they have to pay this two cents extra as well. And of course this is eventually, according to the economic law and facts of life, this is eventually handed down to the consumer, every little sweater, every little sock, every little what have you that you buy there will be an additional cost because of this material being transported by truck throughout the Province. So the consumer pays for it that way, and the consumer of course pays the additional tax for his own consumption of gasoline. So really he is being hit twice, one indirectly and one directly.

Well, Sir, I should not prolong this any longer except to say that we are against this increase in the gasoline tax. We think the government, if they had to have done things wisely over the years, cut out some of the expenditures that were not particularly helpful to the people of this Province and were completely unnecessary we had the great list, in fact it has been read into the record I do not think the government today would find it necessary to have to raise this gasoline tax. But as it turns out, Sir, they made such a mess of things generally speaking that they have had to raise every single tax in this Province. And this is yet another example. So, Sir, we will not be supporting this bill. However, I have no doubt that the bill may squeak through when it comes to the vote.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, we should not be so hasty, the night is young. I have a lot of things we want to say on this subject.

MR. DOODY: I thought I heard you say you were not going to speak on the bill.

MR. SIMMONS: I think I said I was not going to say anything. I am going to speak anyway, the same thing. No, I was prompted to get up by some remarks that my colleague from Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) and he reminded me in particular, when he reviewed the government's record, in particular of - I was going to say the late member for Labrador North, but late only in the sense that he is not a member anymore, he is still a very live individual - Mel Woodward, who moved here at one time an amendment which said in words that he had regretted the failure of the government, that it did the things it should not have done and did not do the things it should have done. And perhaps he sums up better than I could the essence of our feeling on this particular subject.

But I got up for another reason altogether, to interject a question or two to the minister before he closes the debate. In the United States, and I am sure in other countries, but in the United States in particular, the system of tolls is used fairly extensively. Now I do not know what the application of it to this Province is, and I am not at all sure I would be for or against it, and that is not my purpose in raising it now to advocate it, but to open the question I think you have to articulate one or two basic premises about tolls before you can even think about them or contemplate introducing them. And one of them is that they should be designed to get the transient traffic and not the resident traffic. Because if it is designed to collect taxes from the resident traffic then obviously there are other ways, perhaps more efficient ways to do it. But in the United States where you have

MR. SIMMONS: the interstate highways, the highway toll method of collecting taxation is used pretty extensively. Indeed they pay for many of their interstate highways in that way and their bridges and so on.

I was prompted to rise on this point following up the comments made about the out-of-province trucking concerns, and also I am thinking about the out-of-province visitor generally. Because if you look at the visitor generally, including the trucker, there are not many ways in which we can capitalize financially on his presence, particularly if he decides to load up his truck with gas in North Sydney, if the gas is cheaper over there as I believe it is, he can dodge our taxes in that particular way. And he comes into the Province and he uses our roads, indeed I would suggest, and perhaps the Minister of Transportation might concur on this point, I would suggest that if we did not have the large numbers of trucks coming in from out of the Province we would not be experiencing nearly the problems we are with the Trans-Canada Highway. I was over that section from Port aux Basques to Stephenville over the weekend and it certainly has deteriorated over the past few years.

MR. MORCAN: Year.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, indeed it has. And I would say a good measure of it is attributable to the increased truck traffic from out of the Province. But there has to be a way, Mr. Chairman, that we can recover our losses, as it were. There is no reason why the taxpayer in Trinity - Bay de Verde or in Baie Verte - White Bay, or wherever in this Province should be subsidizing out-of-province trucking. And that essentially, Mr. Chairman, is what is happening.

And perhaps a way around it, an approach to the problem, would be to look at some kind of a toll system which - and again I am not a detail man, I am not at all sure I could put you track in terms of what governing regulations should be involved - but one that comes to

MR. SIMMONS: mind would be a licence plate itself. Perhaps we could charge a toll to those who are wearing anything but the beautiful orange licence plate. Perhaps that is an approach to it, at some points along the highways, probably somewhere between Port aux Basques and Corner Brook, that kind of thing, I do not know.

What I am after, Mr. Chairman, is a more equitable way of assessing taxes on the users of the highway and an additional proportion, a large number of users are getting off essentially scott free. They are coming in with their big rigs. They are loading up in North Sydney. Once they get to Port axu Basques they operate on the premise that, I forget the fable but one of Aesop's fables -

MR. HICKMAN: They supply the meals themselves.

MR. SIMMONS: And they even sometimes bring their meals with them. But I was thinking of one of Aesop's fables which had to do with might is right and I do not know which one but I always rely on my friend from Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) for this one I forget the characters involved-but the Aesop fable where the moral was that might is right. But in any event, sometimes the truckers, I think, rely on that principle pretty heavily and they bear down the Highway and are a pretty realistic, a pretty constant threat to the local users of the highway, the people who will bear the brunt of this tax, the local average resident of this Province who has much more of a vested interest and much more of a commitment to the highway system of this Province than the driver from outside. And yet in many respects, and I have watched it happen on many occasions, in many respects it is the local resident, the Sunday driver we call them sometimes, or the driver generally who is the subject of harassment by the operators of big truck rigs, and more often than not these are truck rigs from outside the Province. Well I am glad to see them come and they bring the produce and that kind of thing, but they should at least pay their way. And perhaps the minister

MR. SIMMONS: might see fit to respond to this.

My questions basically are these: Has some form of toll or some form of assessing the out-of-Province user of the highway been looked into; has it been looked into and perhaps dispensed as being unworkable, or has some thought been given along those lines? Has the minister basically got the question I have raised on this point?

MR. DOODY: Oh, yes! Some time ago!

MR. SIMMONS: I see. I keep forgetting, Mr. Chairman, that we have such a competent Minister of Finance. I keep forgetting that the sledge hammer approach is not at all necessary with him. I apologize for using it but I will make up by saying I believe he got it a long time ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

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

MP. STRACHAN: Mr. Chairman, I do not have any home to go to. I have no family here so I do not see any need for me to go home.

MR. SIMMONS: The girlfriend is out of town.

MR. STRACHAN: So I thought I might say a few words for a couple of hours about this -

MR. PECKFORD: Go back again, Sports Newfoundland only.

MR. STRACHAN: If we want to get into that, we can.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is marked on your tie?

MR. SIMMONS: What is marked on your tie, 'Ian'.

MR. STRACHAN: There is nothing marked on the tie.

MR. SIMMONS: Newfoundland and Woodward's Limited.

MP. STRACHAN: It is a nice camouflage cover for petting black bear.

MR. SIMMONS: Newfoundland and Woodward's Limited.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. STRACHAN: I cannot talk of the price of gasoline, of course, for cars or trucks because there are no cars or trucks in the district I represent, or very few. But I should indicate that there are people -

MR. SIMMONS: You might want to talk about the one truck that is out there. There is a story behind that one.

MR. STRACHAN: No, I will not go into the story of the truck. It might embarrass some people. But I should indicate that some communities are paying as high as \$1.46 already per gallon for gasoline. By the way, these are communities which are not supplied by Mel Woodward.

MR. PECKFORD: What about -

MR. STRACHAN: Much lower. In fact the same price as Goose Bay.

MR. PECKFORD: Dollar sixteen.

MR. STRACHAN: But there are some communities that are paying \$1.46 per gallon for gasoline. Another two cents makes \$1.48. Slowly it is creeping up to the \$1.50 mark. As well as that the gasoline is supplied in drums. It is not supplied out of pumps or meters and for every forty-five gallon drum that one purchases, for

MR. STRACHAN:

every forty-five gallons you purchase you generally lose, it is estimated by the industry, one and a half gallons per drum. So in other words you have another loss on top of that.

Some fishermen use as much as 1,000 gallons a Summer and Fall. They use twenty drums of gasoline, close to 1,000 gallons. So this two cents more per gallon indicates or gives to the fishermen another increase, and it is increasing all the time, and these people are finding a great deal of hardship. They have asked for some way to get around this. The only way we can get around it of course is back to our old topic again of getting into bulk storage in which they can be supplied in quantity in bulk so that they can get the gasoline in sufficient quantity, metered, so that if a fisherman buys ten gallons he does get ten gallons. If he buys forty-five gallons, he gets forty-five gallons not forty-three and a half.

I can object to the two cents per gallon partly because we also use a great deal of snowmobiles. Snowmobiles give you an average of five to eight miles per gallon. They are much greater gas eaters than cars or trucks. Sometimes the new machines which are coming out give you a mileage of three miles per gallon. The one that I particularly have I get three miles to the gallon. Snowmobiles are used - they are not a recreation, they are not used to do visiting or various things like that - snowmobiles are used generally as a means of transportation and are usually used for getting to the seal hunting areas or getting to the caribou hunting areas. One has to travel 100 or 200 miles. Two hundred miles by snowmobile is not excessive and so this two cents per gallon extra indicates quite an increase to a hunter or to a fisherman who intends heading out to the far off places.

I know it is getting late but I have plenty of time, nobody to go home to. So anyway I am trying to indicate -

MR. SIMMONS: I gather the price of your stopping is something to go home to. We can arrange that, you know.

MR. STRACHAN: Could I have silence, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. STPACHAN: So already the people who have very low incomes, people who subsist, who have a very short season for work or employment, cash employment, this two cents increase, plus all the other increases which will no doubt come, indicates a hardship, indicates a line is going. I believe, for instance, that snowmobiles and certainly outboard engines used by people should be tax exempt—the gasoline should be tax exempt. This has been a big cry in Labrador for quite some time because people use the snowmobiles for obtaining their meat, obtaining fish, and hunting and because there are no roads maintained since the Highways Department has no interest at all in the area, direct interest, in that they got to put money in to maintain roads, and certainly not maintained roads for the snowmobiles, then we see little point in having to pay road tax or a tax on our gasoline when we do not have anything returned to us as a benefit.

Many hunters and associations now are talking loudly about this and having this whole tax dropped and now we are getting another two cent increase and it might be just increased at this particular time which may create within the coastal communities an incentive to argue still strongly and still further the point that why pay this kind of tax if we have no roads and we are not travelling over roads or highways.

I think this point has been stressed a number of times before in the House. I explained it a number of times. But I would say that these costs or the cost of gasoline, especially since we are paying already a very high price for our gasoline, but another two cents on top of the already high price we pay, \$1.46, does create quite a bit of hardship and will in the future. Many people now have to ration the amount of gasoline they have. They ration the amount of travel they do by snowmobile, and as I have expressed, the snowmobile is often the only means of transportation, the only means of obtaining one's Winter meat or in many cases in Labrador South where

MR. STRACHAN:

people still utilize wood, who still go wooding rather than use furnace oil in order to keep down the cost of living, then the additional tax on the gasoline really hits them hard.

Many people have talked about giving up doing this and turning over to stove oil or furnace oil rather than to use the gasoline in the snowmobile because of the high cost of parts for the snowmobile and the high cost of gasoline. I think essentially I have made the points. I hate like hell giving up but essentially I have made the points.

AN HON. MEMBER: Keep it up.

MR. STRACHAN: No. Apparently my time has expired or else the Minister of Finance has expired, one of the two of us. So I think I have made the points anyway. So I will rest with that anyway. I object to the two cent increase. I hope some other members may talk about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: Mr. Chairman, I can only say that I too object to the two cents per gallon tax increase. As a matter of fact I do not think there is anybody in this Province or anybody in the world who approves of tax increases. I think they are the most barbarous, savage, retrogressive and unpopular things that any government can ever bring in. Although when a government is charged with rendering services to the public on a scale that the public of Newfoundland have grown accustomed to and indeed have a right to, then obviously the revenue has to come from somewhere. One of the areas from which it has to come is the gasoline tax. As I said in the beginning, it is a most unpopular tax, a point which nobody is very happy about.

The two cents a gallon that the Province of Newfoundland has put on the gasoline tax in the gasoline area in the last - I think it was in the 1960's that the previous administration, in the early 1960's that the previous administration put on an addition to the gasoline tax, and now this administration this year put on a two cents per gallon. The federal government put on a ten cents a

MR. DOODY:

gallon excise tax just a few months prior to this and I did not hear a squeak about it. I do not think anybody in this hon. House said a word about it or complained about it, nor did I hear much complaint outside.

Now we have also heard the fact here tonight, and everybody knows it to be true, that the federal government has announced that within the next few months it is going to slap on an additional ten cents per gallon tax. The fact that these people -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. DOODY: I have plenty of time, boy, I have nowhere to go.

It is alright, Mr. Chairman. The unfortunate facts of life are simply these, that these tax increases were unfortunately necessary. They are not comparable to the petroleum taxes that

Mr. Doody.

the senior government has seen fit to impose. Our taxation increases were done out of necessity, The need to supply services, to pay the bills, and the cost increases that the hon. gentlemen have alluded to in their various comments are certainly ones that we are very conscious of, not only in the price of gasoline but in the prices of salaries that have to be paid to the public service, and the prices of maintenance and upkeep of the homes for the aged and infirmed, the cost of hospital services, and the cost of schools and the cost of teachers and all the other things, the roads, and water and sewage systems, and everything else that has escalated fantastically in price during the past few years. These are facts of life, and these are things that have to be done.

The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) mentioned the fact that he is very much in favour of uniformity, that the price should be the same all across the Province. I made mention of the fact that the only real system that seems to work is the one that I notice in the district of my hon. friend from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) where there are no two gas pumps with the same price, 87.5 cents, 87.4 cents, 87.9 cents, 87 cents, a competitive system at work. All the little crowd of people around Port aux Basques seem to have gotten together and decided that they are going to get a price range. The hon. member should look into that and investigate it. Find one of them to crack the price and watch them going for each other's throats like a bunch of jackals. That is what you have to do. Get competition. Get the free market place operating. Get self-service stations. There you go. That is another innovation that the hon. member might bring down to his new district.

MR. NEARY: I am working on it.

MR. DOODY: Good man!

Mr. Doody.

We are delighted to know that. As a matter of fact we are delighted to see that you are so active in the district during the past few days. I understand you had a very pleasant trip down the coast - the salt water ducks.

Another point that was raised that I think is worthy of attention is the possibility of a toll system. I think that should be looked at in the same context as the idea of socking it to the truckers. In one side of the hon. members' mouths is the fact that if you put a tax on gasoline or a tax on anything it is passed on the consumers, if you put a tax on the corporation, that is passed on to the consumers, but if you put an extra tax or an extra surcharge on the truckers, for some mysterious reason that is not passed on to the consumers. So if you slap something on to them that is not passed on to the consumers. These altruistic, big-hearted, open-minded truckers from outside Newfoundland are going to pass it all out in largess and goodness to the poor old consumers of Newfoundland!

MR. NEARY: You have not got it straight at all.

MR. DOODY: Will you be quiet for a minute, and let me finish?

The simple fact of the matter is, as some hon. sage across the House said the other day, "Cape St. Mary's pays for all." And the hon. members got to know that eventually it is going to come down to the consumers. And whether it is done by slapping it on to the trucks that are making the CNR so upset in the Port aux Basques area, or whether it is slapped on somewhere else, the poor consumer eventually ends up paying for it. And the inflationary process has had more to do with that than the taxation process of this Province.

Now the tolls on bridges and the tolls on roads and so on are becoming a matter of history. My understanding is that they

Mr. Doody.

are rapidly being phased out, that they are not a profitable situation any more, that it costs more to administer a toll system, charging a quarter, setting up toll stations, charging a quarter of a half dollar or what-not to cross a bridge, and I think the administrative costs are such now as to make it just unreasonable any more. The cost of salaries, the cost of the equipment, and the cost of all the rest of it, plus the traffic congestion and the hang-ups and so on, the necessity of building bigger roads and so on is just not a sensible or reasonable solution any more. And this Province certainly with the limited communication system that we have at the present time, it would also be unfair. One of the major facts, I think, in the toll system in the United States that the hon. member mentioned, is the fact that a person has an option. He takes a parkway, an expressway, and pays a toll, or he can go by a side road and it takes him a little longer, and he does not have to pay a toll. So if we put up a toll here in Newfoundland, you either use the road or you get out and swim, and even that is just a bit uncomfortable in certain parts of the Province and certain times of the year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: Quite honestly, I appreciate all the problems that the hon. members opposite and on this side have raised. And as I said from the beginning, there is nobody in this House more opposed to the two cents a gallon gasoline tax than I am. I hate taxes. They make me most unpopular and I was always so fond of being loved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: Unfortunately, Sir, the situation is such that taxes are absolutely necessary. They are a way of life. They are a part of the system. They have to be paid, and I am the unfortunate person who has to introduce them. I ask the support of all hon. members of this hon. House in this very worth-while and necessary programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the resolution carry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Carried.

MR. NEARY: A standing vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A standing vote.

All those in favour of the resolution, please stand. Those against, please stand. I declare the resolution carried.

On motion enacting clause, carried.

On motion title, carried.

On motion resolution carried.

On motion that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole reports having passed a certain resolution and recommends that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and have passed certain resolutions and requests that a bill be brought in to give effect to the same.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion bills ordered read a first time.

On motion of the hon. Minister of Finance, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Income Tax Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time now by leave. (Bill No. 30)

On motion of the hon. Minister of Finance, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Gasoline Tax Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time now by leave. (Bill No. 29)

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Income Tax Act." (Bill No. 30)

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Income Tax Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House now by leave.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Gasoline Tax Act" (Bill No. 29).

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Gasoline Tax Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House now by leave.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Gasoline Tax Act." (Bill No. 29).

On motion Clause 1 and Clause 2 carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 30

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Income Tax Act".

On motion Clauses (1) through (2) carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

MR. WELLS: I move that the Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having passed Bill Nos. 29 and 30 without amendment, and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and have directed him to report Bill Nos. 29 and 30 without amendment.

On motion report received and adopted carried.

On motion the following bills read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Gasoline Tax Act." (Bill No. 29)

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Income Tax Act." (Bill No. 30)

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker. I thank members for their co-operation this evening, and would now move that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday at 2:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday at 2:00 P.M.

On motion the House at its rising adjourn until tomorrow Thursday at 2:00 P.M.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

JUNE 2, 1976

32
610. MR. NEARY (Lapoile) - To ask the Minister of Fisheries to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

Any agreements or contracts entered into with private firms, companies or individuals to manage, operate, and construct marine service centres throughout the Province. Were public tenders called, if so did the contract go to the lowest bidder?

ANSWER

This Question is the same as Question # 692 on the Order Paper which has been answered.

Please refer to answer of Question #692.

3

QUESTION 621. CAPTAIN WINSOR (Fogo) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (1) What new fishing facilities such as marine service stations, ice making machines, community stages, were installed or constructed in the districts of Bonavista North, Fogo District, Twillingate District, Baie Verte-White Bay, Green Bay, Strait of Belle Isle, and St. Barbe?
- (2) What was the cost of such facilities and what if any proportion of the cost was paid by the Federal Government?
- (3) Name each community where installations and construction took place.

ANSWER

<u>COMMUNITY</u>	<u>FACILITY CONSTRUCTED</u>	<u>COST</u>
Wesleyville	Marine Service Centre	\$1,115,000
Durrell	Marine Service Centre	\$ 973,500
Fogo Island	Marine Service Centre	\$ 835,000
Englee	Marine Service Centre	\$ 680,000
La Scie	Marine Service Centre	\$ 700,000
Port Saunders	Marine Service Centre	\$1,050,000
Brig Bay	Community Stage	\$ 175,000
Tizzard's Harbour	Salt Fish Shed	\$ 80,000
Port au Choix	Longliner Haulout	\$ 90,000
L'Anse au Clair	Holding Unit	\$ 90,000
Daniel's Harbour	Small Boat Slipway	\$ 65,000
L'Anse au Loup	Ice Tower & Services	\$ 30,000
Red Bay	Community Stage (under construction)	\$ 250,000

In reply to part two of the question regarding the anticipated federal contribution:

Wesleyville	-	\$1,004,000
Durrell	-	\$ 774,000
Fogo Island	-	\$ 990,000
Englee	-	\$1,080,000
La Scie	-	\$ 990,000
Port Saunders	-	\$ 500,000

2

754. MR. NEARY (LaPoile) - To ask the Honourable Minister of Fisheries to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) Terms and conditions under which Dunphy Fisheries were given a provincial loan and/or grant?
- (b) Amount of grant and/or loan?
- (c) How many tons of fish meal has the plant at Diamond Cove (near York Harbour) produced to date?

ANSWER

- (a) & (b) No provincial Government loans or grants were made to a business named Dunphy Fisheries.
- (c) The Department of Fisheries does not have any production figures for the fish meal plant near Diamond Cove.

— Mr. Smallwood to ask the Minister of Transportation and
442 Communication if the Government have plans and firm intentio
to build any additional aircraft landing strips in Newfoundl.
and in Labrador, where such strips will be built, over what
period, at what estimated cost, and the probable source or
sources of the necessary funds.

June 2/76

ANSWER TO QUESTION #442 ASKED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR TWILLINGATE
DIRECTED TO THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND
COMMUNICATIONS AS APPEARING ON ORDER PAPER OF NOVEMBER 24, 1975

The Government has plans to build an airstrip at Burgeo on the island of Newfoundland and at Cartwright, Main, Makkovik and Mary's Harbour in Labrador.

Priority is being given to the construction of an airstrip at Cartwright during the 1976-77 fiscal year at an estimated cost of \$440,000, funds to be obtained from the Ministry of Transport, Eastern Explorations Limited and the Province of Newfoundland.

Second priority is for an airstrip at Main where a survey has been completed. Financial assistance has been requested from the Ministry of Transport and it is hoped work can commence during 1976.

Requests have been submitted to the Ministry of Transport for financial assistance in construction airstrips at Makkovik and Mary's Harbour, work to commence hopefully in 1977.

Estimated costs for each airstrip are in the \$500,000 to \$700,000 bracket.

Contents

June 2, 1976	Page
Statements by Ministers	
Mr. Hickey reported to the House on the journey of the <u>Norma and Gladys</u> .	9543
Commented on by Mr. Simmons.	9544
Mr. Hickey made a statement on the black bear hunting season.	9547
Commented on by Mr. Strachan.	9549
Presenting Petitions	
By Mr. Rideout in behalf of residents of Purbeck's Cove requesting that the road from that community to Westport be upgraded.	9553
Supported by Mr. Simmons.	9553
By Mr. Wells in behalf of some 250 employees of the Waterford Hospital seeking that those who have continuous contact with patients at the institution have a pension plan comparable to that of warders at the Penitentiary.	9554
Spoken to by:	
Mr. Roberts	9557
Mr. Woodrow	9559
Answers to Question for which Notice has been Given	
Answers were tabled to Questions Nos. 424, 425, 610, 621, 754, and 442.	9559
Oral Questions	
Steps taken to halt vandalism in St. John's. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Hickman.	9565
Manpower for the extra services outlined. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Hickman.	9568
Possibility that parking tickets could be issued by people other than policemen. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Hickman.	9569
Cost-shared program to provide financial assistance for the under-employed. Mr. Neary, Mr. Brett.	9571
Cost of such a program to the Province. Mr. Neary, Mr. Brett.	9572
Possible shortage of trained teachers. Mr. Lush, Mr. House.	9572
Query as to how hospitals are to achieve specific budget cuts. Mr. Rideout, Mr. Collins.	9574
Query as to whether jobs have been lost because of cutbacks. Mr. Rideout, Mr. Collins.	9574
Query as to whether hospitals have achieved the aim outlined in the budget, i.e., the equivalent of closing 200 beds. Mr. Rideout, Mr. H. Collins.	9574
Closing of beds at the Janeway Children's Hospital. Mr. Neary, Mr. H. Collins.	9575

Contents - 2

Oral Questions (continued)	Page
Query as to whether the decision to close 20 beds at the Janeway could not be reviewed and the required savings made elsewhere. Mr. Neary*, Mr. Gollins.	9577
*Mr. Neary expressed dissatisfaction with the answer and gave notice he wished to debate the issue on the adjournment.	9577
Query as to whether the objective of closing 200 hospital beds has been achieved, or when will it be achieved; and which hospitals are closing what number of beds. Mr. Simmons, Mr. H. Collins.	9578
Query as to whether the request to close beds was made generally to all hospitals, or were particular hospitals designated. Mr. Simmons, Mr. H. Collins.	9580
Query as to whether the administration did not know from the beginning exactly where the closure of hospital beds was to take place. Mr. Simmons*, Mr. H. Collins.	9580
*Mr. Simmons expressed dissatisfaction with the answer and gave notice he wished to debate it on the adjournment.	9581
Reconstruction of the Hansen Memorial Highway. Mr. McNeil, Mr. Morgan.	9581
Query as to whether the options on the MacPherson property are available to the House. Mr. Neary, Mr. Wells.	9581
Availability of the documents before the House closes. Mr. Neary, Mr. Wells.	9582
The employment of Mr. Allan Evans by the Province. Mr. Roberts, Dr. Farrell.	9583
Amount of contractual payment each year. Mr. Roberts, Dr. Farrell.	9584
Query as to whether the administration has plans to introduce programs similar to LIP and OFY to fight unemployment. Mr. Callan*, Mr. Lundrigan.	9584
*Mr. Callan expressed dissatisfaction with the answer and gave notice that he wished to debate the issue on the adjournment.	9585
 Orders of the Day	
First reading on Bills Nos. 82, 84, 81, 83 and 80.	9586
Second reading of:	
Bill No. 2	9586
Bill No. 14	9614
Bill No. 43	9635
Bill No. 61	9638
The House rose at 6:00 P.M.	9638
The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.	9639

Contents - 3

	Page
Second reading of	
Bill No. 47	9640
Bill No. 60	9679
Bill No. 66	9685
Bill No. 72	9689
Bill No. 70	9690
Committee of the Whole	
Bill No. 66	9701
Bill No. 72	9701
Bill No. 70	9701
Bill No. 61	9701
Bill No. 60	9702
Bill No. 47	9702
Bill No. 43	9702
Bill No. 14	9702
Bill No. 2	9702
Bill No. 36	
Mr. Marshall withdrew the amendment placed the previous day and proposed a new amendment.	9703
The following bills were ordered read a third time; Bills Nos. 2, 14, 43, 47, 60, 61, 72, 66, 70 and 36.	9706
First reading of Bill No. 85.	9707
Committee of the Whole	
Resolution to amend the Income Tax Act.	9707
Resolution to amend the Gasoline Tax Act.	9716
The Committee reported having passed certain resolutions and requested that a bill be brought in to give effect to same.	9742
On motion, Bills Nos. 30 and 29 were read a first and second time by leave.	9742
Committee of the Whole on Bills Nos. 30 and 29.	9743
The Committee reported Bills Nos. 30 and 29 without amendment.	
Third reading of Bills Nos. 30 and 29.	9744
Adjournment	9744