

too was an interesting trip. It was an eye-opener for me, of course, because I had never seen that part of Newfoundland. One comes in contact with a sturdy, independent people there—a carefree sort. The coves and the little fishing villages and out-of-the-way places are fascinating. You see a country poor in resources but rich in values.

We in Canada have for a little over 100 years been trying to redistribute wealth, and we must realize that they have only really tried to do that in Newfoundland for the past 20 years. They need our massive help and we ought to be generous to them; they are trying to help themselves, and it is a struggle.

New Brunswick also received a considerable amount of our attention. I suppose that was mainly because of the three members of the Senate to whom I have already referred and who, I might point out, never missed a meeting and were perhaps the hardest workers.

New Brunswick is a province that tries hardest, particularly in the social welfare fields. Senator McGrand had been talking endlessly about the natural resources of New Brunswick, but until we saw them we did not really appreciate them. In the company of Senator Fergusson and Senator Fournier (Madawaska-Restigouche) we finally saw the great natural forest wealth of the country. It is rich land. And yet the people are poor. You wonder why that is so until you find out that those natural resources belong to the great pulp and paper corporations, and what they do not own they control, and what they do not control they influence. With equal impartiality, they pollute everything. It is not hard, then, to realize that New Brunswick has a special problem.

The young people of New Brunswick, just like the young people of Newfoundland, venture out, go back again and venture out again. When you do some thinking you realize that there in New Brunswick the way of life is one that is perhaps preferable to the asphalt jungles these people would have to face in other parts of the country. They lead their lives as they see fit, and they lead full lives. It is our business to make sure that we give as much assistance as we can to assure an adequate level of life there.

I will say little about the west other than to suggest that the developing parts of the country around Edmonton and Calgary are exciting, as are Saskatchewan and the Yukon. Those senators from the West who are on the committee were always present when the committee was in their provinces. Of course, they were present on other occasions as well.

I would point out that on occasion we were joined by persons who were not members of the committee. The Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Flynn) came and sat with us when we were in Quebec; Senator Michaud sat with us when we were in Moncton; Mr. Bell was with us in Saint John and Mr. Fairweather and the former leader of the provincial government in New Brunswick sat with us on one very eventful day—I believe it was in Bloomfield—when we stopped at a beautiful old church. It was a venerable place, and its minister had ideas. I believe he was called the “Pulpwood Padre”. He impressed upon us

the natural wealth of the province and what we ought to do about it. I was happy when the ladies finally brought in cookies and doughnuts. I think he might still be speaking, had he not been interrupted. But I must say he was an interesting person. You will find his brief on record—it is a good one.

Honourable senators, let me say something about the senators who came with us on this odyssey and joined in the work. The three ladies on the committee were a particular delight; they gave us tone and they added greatly to the respect accorded to us. Other honourable senators referred to them as the “Senate sirens”. But, as I say, honourable senators, they were there, tremendous respect was shown for them, and they made valuable contributions to the work of the committee.

I come now to the matter of public hearings. We held hearings here in Ottawa—and in passing I might mention that we held hearings yesterday, this morning and hope to hold one tomorrow morning. We plan to continue until the first week of November to complete our hearings schedule. Our research staff has been preparing studies and material for our consideration. The kind of report that we have to prepare cannot be hatched—it has to be sweated, and the sweating has already commenced.

Honourable senators, I have some other points to make. You may of course come to the conclusion that the chairman has made up his mind about some matters, and you may not be wrong. But I ask you to make allowances for the fact that the chairman wants to be fair. He gives expression to his views—and it would be something new if he sat on the fence. While his opinions may not always be the best or may not always be right, he usually expresses them anyway. I would ask you to make allowances for that today, even if you do not agree with the views expressed.

Honourable senators, there are about 4½ million people considered poverty-stricken, according to the definition of the Economic Council. They are not hard to find nor are they hard to identify. Half of those 4½ million people are what we might define as the disadvantaged, the aged, the disabled, the handicapped, female heads of families with children, relief-ites. These are all people who are no longer in the labour force as such. Then, the other half constitute what we call the “working poor”. These are the unskilled, the unlettered, people working full time, part time or broken time, who are on and off unemployment insurance, working at minimum wages or worse, and never earning enough money to get by on. There is considerable movement between these two groups. The disadvantaged are served by the welfare system which has just grown and grown and grown.

Those appearing before us were unanimous in the view that the public welfare system has broken down, mired in bureaucracy and suffering from lack of leadership. It has failed in its ability to achieve humanitarian ends, and the public capacity to finance it in its present form is in question. The welfare system has failed for another reason; that is because it was considered a supplement to the economic system to provide for marginal people. It was never designed to supply basic needs for a large